>> SHARON HENRY: So this morning, Amelia is not able to attend. Tracy's going to be a few minutes late. So I think we can probably get started, Sherry. And I think what we wanted to start with was just a review of our ground rules, just because we haven't met in a while, so welcome back.

And I think the ground rules that we had talked about before was just having everyone keep an open mind about what we're discussing. Sherry, help me remember. We can't -- we certainly can't please everyone. And we have to work within the bounds of our legislative mandate.

And all ideas are welcome. And give ourselves the grace to make mistakes and help each other correct. What have I left out, Sherry?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: What I wanted to say, as I was reading the feedback -- sorry -- as I was reading the feedback, we have a very narrow scope. And our scope, and I pulled it up, assess the services, resources, and opportunities available to children in the State who are Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and DeafBlind.

So it is not our job to fix all the problems of special education, 504, and EST. Our role is clearly defined to address -- to develop a tool to allows programs to reevaluate it. And I would offer to the group that

we make a recommendation to the Council in terms of next steps.

I just don't want us to own all those pieces. I was optimistic to see that the SpedEd directors embraced the tool and saw that here is an opportunity for us to have a baseline of expectations that we can then come back and make sure we're doing the best we can for our students.

I know that we can't fix everything with this tool. So I think if we remember that, as we follow the feedback, that our job here today is to really make sure we have a tool that has, you know, lots of credibility, but it may not answer all the problems.

We have to give ourselves the grace to not fix it all. We've done an amazing job. This is a great functioning team. We all are here for the same goals in terms of improving quality of programming. In reviewing some of that feedback, I felt a lot of responsibility that I think we have to shake off.

And remember, the job today is, look at the tool, see how we can provide greater clarity and address some of the finer points. But we can't fix everything today. So I just wanted to get us in that space before we start reviewing this.

And welcome, Meg, so great that you could join us today, thank you.

>> MEG PORCELLA: Thank you all so much. I'll be here until 10:00 and then I'll have to pop off. But Cassie will be here, before I go, so you'll have someone from the AOE here for the duration. I'm happy to be here. Thank you.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'm in Woodstock, we're evacuating homes, closing roads. We were pretty devastated during Tropical Storm Irene. It's about as bad as that was right now. If you see me flying off and being distracted, I apologize. We're moving all vehicles to our campus right now because it's that bad.

I may not make it home today. I've got extra clothes. But that's

okay.

>> MEG PORCELLA: Oh, my goodness.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: It's pretty crazy.

>> SHARON HENRY: Stay safe, Sherry.

>> MEG PORCELLA: Absolutely.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Crazy.

>> SHARON HENRY: So the next item on our agenda was to basically work
through the feedback. What I did was I shared with the group loosely
called a thematic analysis of the feedback we received.

You recall, we had received feedback from internal and external
stakeholders from the AOE, Hands & Voices, and other stakeholders I listed
in the email that I can't pull up right now. And I read through that
feedback, and there were themes that emerged, similar types of feedback.

And so I went through and organized that accordingly, everything that
I sent new that new document is copy and pasted from the feedback that I
received from Cassie. So nothing has been changed, nothing has been left
out, nothing has been edited. It's a verbatim copy and paste. I just
organized it so hopefully we can be more efficient in our meeting today.

So the -- we have two ways we can go. We can go for the low-hanging
fruit, which is to make the editorial comments that were suggested in
detail by Hands & Voices. And that might be a place to start. And then
move on to discussing the more involved themes and discern what is within
our reach and what is not within our purview, as Sherry said, shed some of
the responsibility that is not ours.

Some of it lies with the AOE, some of it lies with the full Council,
some of it lies with the SPED directors and the school districts. We'll
look at those more involved themes and develop an appropriate action plan.

Then I had a category of unactionable feedback that I deem that right
now it's not within our purview, it's not within our legislative authority.

Maybe I'm misinterpreting it so we have a discussion about that. Maybe we can make it actionable.

The last item on our agenda is to make sure we're prepared for our meeting on July 14th, and I have an update from Cheryl DeConde Johnson to share with you at the end of the meeting. How does that sound as an agenda? Okay? We're good?

>> INTERPRETER: Question from Laura.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: A question about the feedback. Did you share that on the Google Drive?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, and I attached it to the most recent email I sent out. Rebecca has it, she's holding it up. Yes.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Okay. Let me look.

>> SHARON HENRY: So if I share my screen, then of course I can't see any of you and I can't see the chat. So Sherry, are you going to be able to share your screen, or no?

>> INTERPRETER: First let's see if Laura can find it, it might be easier for me to see everybody rather than the screen share. Also I'm looking upwards, my apologies.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sure, I would prefer to see everybody as well. I'll make it clear what it is we're talk. If you go to the feedback themes that I shared with you, and Meg, I hope that Cassie forwarded that on to you as well. She did, okay, great.

Okay, good. So let's go to the page 5. Page 5 of the feedback themes. And at the bottom of that page it says, "The remaining feedback was editorial in nature." So what we need to do is agree or not agree with the suggested changes to the wording.

So under essential element number 1, the suggestion was to change individual language options, communication modes, instead of legitimate language and communication modes. Does everyone agree with that?

>> INTERPRETER: Yes.

>> SHARON HENRY: Great. I'm going to keep track because I can't facilitate the meeting, make the editorial changes and keep everything on track at the same time, I'm going to do it manually on my end and I'll share the final copy with you later.

The next comment was about Vermont licensed. We suggest adding -- hey, Sherry, can you mute your microphone? Hold on one second. I think that's Sherry's microphone not being muted.

>> INTERPRETER: If someone is the host, Sharon, you can mute her, click on her box, three dots, and mute.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> INTERPRETER: It's definitely a male voice until the background.

>> SHARON HENRY: Unfortunately, I don't have that power, Rebecca, clicking on the three dots.

>> INTERPRETER: That's strange, you are the host.

>> SHARON HENRY: I am the host.

>> INTERPRETER: If you click on participants, that list will pop up and you should be able to go specifically to Sherry and then click more.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Oh, thank you. I learned a new Zoom trick today. Thank you, Rebecca.

>> INTERPRETER: No problem.

>> SHARON HENRY: Under the next item was Vermont licensed. We suggest adding some type of indication that this section should be at the meeting. Currently it only reads as one of the -- reads as the professional should be but best practice will likely be for more than one of them for any student.

So in other words, what we have stressed throughout our document is that providers should be qualified, but we haven't necessarily stress that can they should be present at a meeting. And when we ran our mock IEP in

May, we actually were going to simulate having one of our qualified professionals not there, because that is often the case.

So we could make the suggestion that the professional be there, the qualified professional be there, it can't be mandated.

>> INTERPRETER: Okay.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sharon, I totally agree, that was my concern, is that we can't mandate they be there. And I certainly -- you know, being invited is what we're -- is the baseline. And I apologize, can you tell me exactly which -- are you on the document that's called "Themes"? I just am struggling to find exactly where you are.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, I'm on feedback themes of the Vermont quality educator tool. I'm now on page 6. Where it says "Vermont licensed." So what I hear Jen saying is that we will just keep it that qualified professionals should be invited and should attend if at all possible.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes.

>> SHARON HENRY: And we certainly should not mandate. Okay.

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy. Also if a provider can't attend, they typically can ask for feedback from that provider at the meeting too. I don't know if that's something we can add also. If they're unable to attend, they can ask for feedback in advance and that can be shared out by the case manager.

>> SHARON HENRY: So the qualified provider should provide written feedback to the group to be shared at the group meeting.

>> TRACY HINCK: Yeah.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, thank you both.

>> TRACY HINCK: My apologies that I'm late, also. Everybody, hi.

>> INTERPRETER: Good morning.

>> SHARON HENRY: I think Tracy's comment just addresses the next bullet point under that section as well, that the provider must be

6

providing input to the benefit of the student. And that way the provider

is actually participating and not just attending.

>> INTERPRETER: Yes.

>> SHARON HENRY: Anything else on essential element 1?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: No. I mean, I guess, how do you -- I'll say

"police," if they're participating or not, what does that mean? That was

my worry when I read that is, does that mean they add one thing? Do they

have to --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I have to step aside. I'm going to have to leave for

a little bit. I'll be right back.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Just mute yourself, okay? There we go. No, I

don't think we can police. I think our tool will outline best practice. I

shouldn't say best practice. It should outline current practice. So their

feedback is reflected in the meeting minutes in terms of what they

contributed about the student and the student's needs.

Does that make sense, Jen?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes, it does. When I read it, I just was concerned,

like what exactly does that mean? Anything, they say yeah, the student has

a moderate hearing loss, is that participating? I guess that was my

concern when I read it, is just how do we quantify participating.

And maybe I'm just overthinking and we don't need to.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, I think that's a little been overthinking. As

a qualified professional, you're doing what your profession requires of you

based on your licensure and your training and what the student needs.

Yeah. Okay. Let's move on to --

>> INTERPRETER: This is Rebecca. I think at the mock IEP, everyone

needs to have a voice, hopefully that would be a way we show people, here

is how you get engaged and participate as professionals to make sure

everybody's voice is heard, people say their piece, and have given time for

that, it's not just, hi, yes, I'm here. At the mock IEP everyone had a

chance to share their piece and hopefully people will see that and run with

it.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right. And of course this tool stands by itself, it

doesn't always accompany our fabulous mock IEP, so I think we have to be

clear in the language of our tool. Thanks, Rebecca.

>> TRACY HINCK: Sharon, this is Tracy. I had a comment on page 1, I

don't know if you guys already talked about this, where it says

audiologists are outside the team.

>> SHARON HENRY: No, so we've skipped ahead to page 5.

>> TRACY HINCK: Oh, okay, I was like, wow, you guys are already on

page 6, you're rocking today.

>> SHARON HENRY: No, we're just taking off [laughter].

>> TRACY HINCK: Gotcha, thank you.

>> SHARON HENRY: No worries. Essential element 2, provide

professional development. So we appreciate the evidence requested be

offered to all students/stakeholders. However, suggesting/noting that

dates/times should be reflective of the stakeholders' ability to attend.

So I think it's back to this point of, is the qualified provider

actually participating and providing valued feedback. So I think it's not

just that the stakeholder was invited but whether or not the stakeholder

attended. So, sort of an attendance log, if you will. And noting whether

or not the qualified provider provided written feedback if he or she was

unable to attend in person.

Is that how everyone else interpreted it?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I read that as -- no, not necessarily

that. That this is saying, you're offering professional development and --

you're talking about number 2, correct?

>> SHARON HENRY: Correct.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: You're offering professional development to the team, and you're also -- and if you add that, you're also requiring somebody to keep track, like an attendance log or something, not just that they were invited to attend the training around a student who is DeafBlind, but also they actually go, is what I think they're looking for.

>> SHARON HENRY: Oh, yes, okay, I see what you're saying now, I did misread it. Okay. Is everyone in agreement with that, that we should suggest stakeholders' ability to attend is noted? Just as another accountability measure.

>> INTERPRETER: Yep.

>> SHARON HENRY: All right. Let's move on to essential element number 3. Parents are included in all, dot, dot, dot. The proposed items for evidence are specific and clear. The input must be documented. We suggest the specific notation input be used for the professional evidence as well.

So again, I think -- and again, this specific feedback came from Hands & Voices, so it's the parent voice reflecting through here. They want the input to be documented with a double asterisk. So when a provider or when the parent or the case manager, whoever provided specific input, particularly parents, that that input be noted, and highlighted with an asterisk, which I'm fine with. Jen?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I guess my concern is, how do we ensure that that happens? Because we're not the people that are taking notes during meetings, typically. And so how do we ensure -- I don't feel like that's something we have control over.

>> SHARON HENRY: No, it's not, but it's something we can suggest is best practice and current practice. Through our education sessions, which we're doing one of July 14th, and at continued education sessions going forward, we keep trying to educate the SPED ED directors that this is a great way to demonstrate parental input and you can point to it at our IEP

minutes.

>> TRACY HINCK: There's a required form for parent input now for IEPs. They don't have to use the one from the AOE website. There is an example of a parent input form on the website. So I'm not sure of the details, I don't know if Cassie is here, but it is like a requirement from the IEP to have parent input documented on some kind of form or some kind of more formal way.

>> INTERPRETER: Oh, good to know.

>> SHARON HENRY: Can you address that, Meg?

>> MEG PORCELLA: I can address that Cassie is not here yet. This would be a good thing to review with Cassie. It is true there is a requirement for engagement or parental involvement and I do not know the fine details, although I do agree with the fact that one does not need to use the form that's on the AOE's web page.

So I am no help at all. You're welcome. Sorry.

>> SHARON HENRY: I will make a note to myself to circle back around to Cassie.

>> MEG PORCELLA: Please do.

>> SHARON HENRY: What we can do in this situation is provide a link to that form. Do you have a copy of it, Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: I do, I can send it you to.

>> MEG PORCELLA: I would also be happy to find the form and put a link in the chat right now if you just give me a moment.

>> SHARON HENRY: That would be awesome.

>> MEG PORCELLA: I can be a little bit useful during this meeting [laughter].

>> SHARON HENRY: So moving on to essential element number 4, suggestion was made to delete "is considered" but it should be required and/or needed. They suggest adding "a program should offer classes to

hearing peers so that maybe normalized and/or learn to communicate with students in students' native or preferred communication mode."

So that is in -- let me just pull up the actual tool. Too many pieces of paper in front of me. This is in reference to the students' opportunities for direct communication with a child's peers. So what they are suggesting is stronger language rather than saying considered but required.

Once again I offer to the group, what are boundaries in terms of balancing our authority versus suggesting what is best practice and what is current practice.

>> REBECCA LALANNE: This is Rebecca. I'm happy to chime in. As a Deaf person I would love the language to be as strong as possible because I do know as an advocate as well, there are a few students I work with and their families that sign language instruction might be there and I start with that and then it gets pushed to the wayside after a few years.

People feel that, oh, well, you know, I don't know who is deciding it, school or other people, you don't need to continue the sign language instruction, but really it's for the peer engagement that they're forgetting about. Parents tell me time and time again, it's frustrating that this service has stopped. If we can make it strong in our representations, I think it will push people to get to that spot and make sure they have, yes, a great time in school, they're doing well academically but they also have that great social experience as well.

>> SHARON HENRY: Jen or Tracy, do you have an opinion?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I guess my concern was the same as you, Sharon, can we use that word "require." Maybe there's a stronger word that's in between "consider" and "require" that we can think about. But the word "require," I just wasn't sure that can be included.

>> SHARON HENRY: Tracy?

>> REBECCA: How about "strongly encourage"?

>> SHARON HENRY: Rebecca, we haven't heard from Tracy yet.

>> TRACY HINCK: Yeah, I think it's challenging, in Vermont there aren't a lot of opportunities. So requiring something that is very difficult to provide, you know, sometimes the school districts don't want to write things on an IEP as a requirement when they don't have a source to do that. Sign instruction can help the other students but they're not fluent in ASL.

So I don't know. I'm no help [laughter]. I tend to think that if there are professionals and qualified professionals sitting at the table for this discussion, then they are the people that are going to sort of advocate for that service. And if it's not being advocated for, then that's a different problem. So then I would wonder if the right people are sitting at the table.

>> SHARON HENRY: And Laura, we haven't heard from you either. If you don't have anything to add, that's fine.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: No, I notice people will be like, if I knew someone who could -- or the problem would be like, they don't have the funds, spreading thin.

>> SHARON HENRY: So maybe a language -- the change in terminology could be, consideration is required and strongly encouraged so that -- they're required to consider all the opportunities that could be provided for direct communication.

So they're required to do consideration. What I hear Tracy saying is that the implementation is the hardest part, right? Okay.

>> TRACY HINCK: I think we all agree they need that. It's just difficult in some situations to implement it.

>> SHARON HENRY: And I like Rebecca's terminology of "strongly encouraged" as well. I'll put both in, okay? I'm just making a note here

on my copy.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I see it as, I think that it's kind of two points that they're making. Well, I guess I'm questioning, are they saying that it's required that students who are Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind, have peer interactions with others where they use a like language or communication mode as them, so if they're using ASL, not necessarily -- and on the flip side is should we be offering ASL instruction to students that are in that student's home school so they can begin to learn ASL, but like I think Tracy said, those students are not fluent users, they're not -- they're peers, but they're not the same -- they're not language or communication peers.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. Thanks, Jen. And then the last comment under essential element 4 was the suggestion to change the vocabulary so that the need for assistive technology is provided where appropriate but also in any and all environments, which I think would make sense to me.

So if the student is using, in let's say math class and social studies classes but then they go to an assembly or art class, the technology has to follow them. So I think -- so it's not just where appropriate, but it's appropriate in all environments, I think is what Hands & Voices is asking for. Jen?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: And Tracy likely has more, but my concern about that is that one assistive technology is not necessarily appropriate for use in all settings. And that's how I read it, that is, if they have assistive technology, it needs to go to all settings no matter what, and that's not necessarily appropriate.

So I think that we need to be careful how we word that. Tracy, you probably have more input.

>> SHARON HENRY: So maybe the way we have it is "where appropriate" actually covers what you're saying, Jen. Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: Yeah, and I don't know if we want to add, so the AAA guidelines for hearing assistive technology outlines that a use plan should be in place. And I think a lot of times that doesn't actually happen. People just kind of order equipment and here, this is how it works, and good luck applying it in different environments.

I don't know if there's a way to put in there that, you know, the AAA guidelines are followed and one of those components is to develop -- the team develops a use plan. And in a use plan, you would look at all the environments and what would be appropriate in those environments.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Thank you. So essential element number 5, training provided. Let's see. To general education teachers. So the comment is that training should be provided for all parties, students, families, staff.

And the suggestion is to add the word "providers" because "providers" is more of a global term, which would include other people perhaps outside of the educational team, is that how you interpret that?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I guess I thought that staff would include providers. So if we wanted -- if people think that's not clear, then I would say maybe switch "providers" for the word "staff."

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I assumed that "staff" included all staff working with the student.

>> SHARON HENRY: I think "staff" in mind as a parent refers to teachers and the SPED director and the admin whereas providers includes the audiologist and TOD. So I'll add providers in there. Then Tracy, in terms of the technology update, the next comment, so it should be a minimum of a yearly review, is that the current standard?

>> TRACY HINCK: So they want to add a minimum of yearly review or when the technology is updated.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes.

>> TRACY HINCK: I think so. I think the yearly review is definitely a minimum. I mean, there's some programs and teams that use this equipment year after year, so that would make sense. And others that are new at it might require more.

So I think that makes sense.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. All right. Essential element number 7. Let me just flip to that page on my copy. Under the evidence, list of community members and organizations available to meet this need. And again, what is being suggested here is that it's required that the emails be sent out, I think.

We suggest requiring redacted emails or other correspondence showing the student and family are having events even outside of hours directly shared with them as parents, and then keep track of if the student actually participates.

I can tell you as a parent -- yeah, I don't know who's going to keep track of whether or not we attended. But certainly keeping track of having an email sent directly to parents would make sense. What do people think about that?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I agree. I think -- my notes next to that was, "too much." I don't know how we would manage that and how we would -- I just don't know how we would monitor that or even making that recommendation seems like a lot.

>> SHARON HENRY: So having emails go directly to parents, sure, but keeping track of the attendance, no. Object. On the bottom of page 7, under the appendices, there's couple of grammatical suggestions, adding a comma, linking things, which I'm happy to do, those are all just real editorial things.

On the top of page 8, though, I wanted to check with you all to see

where you are in terms of agreeing with a national certification, for example registry of interpreters for the Deaf is also acceptable, and changing that to "is preferred as it is a higher standard." First of all, is that true, and secondly, are we in agreement that we want to make that change?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I can say that I would not -- I mean, our requirement and what most states use for interpreters working in schools is the EIPA or the NIC. But I don't -- it's not written as the NIC is preferred. It is written as either/or.

And they are different assessments that are used for different purposes, not necessarily one trumping the other. It's just that they are used for different purposes, would be my input.

>> SHARON HENRY: So leaving it as we have it, which is "the national certification is also acceptable," is the way we should leave it? Okay. Does anyone else have a different opinion? Okay. All right. And then on the last category, qualifications of reviewers, are there any other changes to those three or four suggestions there?

I think they're just clarifying the language and tightening up the language a little bit.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Umm -- sorry, I'm just looking at my notes. Okay. I guess the third bullet about removing "Could" and replace with "should" and "outside of Vermont." We certainly can't require the AOE to do anything.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right, way beyond our legislative purview, yes. "Should" is absolutely fine, but we're not saying you must. We don't have the funds, we don't have the authority. So we have to be respectful of that. But we can certainly suggest what best practice would look like.

Any other comments on those minor editorial edits? All right. Let's turn our attention then to the immediate things. Let me just find my agenda. So that was to accept the edits that are proposed. Now let's

discuss the more involved themes and discern what is within our reach, either now or in the future, and develop an appropriate action plan.

So the first theme that emerged, the uncertainty over the application of the tool, it is unclear whether districts are submitting this evidence to the vendor, that is the AOE. And of course that was our discussion from way back when is, who will hold this data?

The AOE has been quite clear they are not interested in collecting the data, holding the data, they are not interested in supporting the tool. That message came through very early on. But nonetheless, this is best practice, we want best practice to be in our state for our kids who are Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind.

And we set out to develop this tool as a way to help vendors, providers, as well as school districts, to self-assess. And we never addressed the issue of who would hold the data. Perhaps the school district would, perhaps the vendor would. So we are still in that -- "not able is probably more close to the truth." So Meg is making the comment, they might be interested but -- can you speak more to that, Meg? I don't want to put words in your mouth.

>> MEG PORCELLA: Please recognize I am jumping into something with very limited context. But I do know that we, because of our capacity, our person capacity, are very conscientious of what the mission -- in other words, what the statutory requirements are of whatever we do, because we very frequently do not have the capacity to do anything above those things.

Although frequently we have the desire, because we recognize something's a good idea. So that was really just me being defensive, because a lot of us would like to do things that make sense like that, but we can't, like we're just -- but we're interested.

So that was my defensiveness. Please disregard me [laughter].

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. So without the capacity of the AOE to

participate, we are limited in terms of, at the moment, the data then would likely have to sit with the provider, I.E. the vendor who is providing this service. And that certainly was the way we went in the springtime, when the UVMMC educational service program trialed the tool in a couple of districts led by Jen and Tracy.

And I suspect that we will probably continue that way, and hopefully we can get more providers on board, even providers who do consultation only and technical assistance only, because the tool serves that type of provider as well.

>> MEG PORCELLA: I mean, it is reasonable for the recommendation of -- it's reasonable that bodies who are in the know about the value of using this tool, if it ends up being there, or any tool, or data collection and data storage, to become part of the standard agreement that goes between the LEA and a vendor, or -- I do believe that for the AOE's Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind grant, we want the vendor to collect data and then provide it to us in a report.

So, like -- what I'm saying is that that data piece, the recommendation could be that that data piece be part of whoever is making a contract with a provider to include.

>> SHARON HENRY: The AOE puts -- am I understanding correctly, the AOE --

>> MEG PORCELLA: If the AOE has a contract with someone. But if somebody is contracting with us apart from that for services, if that makes sense, we recommend you include this type of thing in your contract with the service provider. If I'm understanding this correctly, and I might not be, but --

>> SHARON HENRY: So I would like Sherry to respond to that because I'm not an LEA person.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Sorry, I just rescued all the garden away from three

feel of water. Glad I brought my boots to work.

   >> SHARON HENRY: You got your galoshes, Sherry?

   >> SHERRY SOUSA: Oh, I went under. But we're good, I have extra

clothes. So what's the question? I'm sorry.

   >> SHARON HENRY: So we've done all the editorial changes.

   >> SHERRY SOUSA: Wow, you guys are good.

   >> SHARON HENRY: We've moved to the more meaty themes. And the first

major theme that evolved was, what is the purpose and use and oversight of

the tool, who is the keeper of the data. Meg is being a good sport and

sitting in for Cassie, she says she didn't have the context in the

background but it was quite clear in the beginning that the AOE was unable,

didn't have the capacity to participate.

   So she was making a suggestion that maybe when an LEA contracts with a

provider, it can be recommended in that contract that a data piece be

included, that the service provider would use this tool as part of the

contract that gets signed.

   And I guess my question is, how do we get LEAs to do that and to be

aware of that and is that really a feasible, workable alternative.

   >> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Meg. Absolutely, that's the right --

there are few levers we can pull. And what are the easiest levers? Our

contracts with providers is an easy lever. They want our work, they charge

well for it, sorry, Jen, but it is a way that we partner.

   And so the leverage with LEAs is, they don't want to be sued, right?

We don't want a parent saying to us that my child's needs have been not

met, this is not FAPE. So the best defense is a good offense. So by

requiring in a contract that a tool developed by the Governor's Council,

blah, blah, blah, and that twice a year, once a year, this documentation is

being provided, absolutely.

   And we might be able to develop some contract language that LEAs can

utilize and put in. That's something viable, that maybe we can partner

with AOE in terms of, what's language that should be included in a

contract, or we as LEAs can run it by one of our attorneys.

But I think that's an easy lever. And again, I love the feedback from

the SPED directors, we want this, we want to make sure we're doing a good

job, and if someone says you're not, we can say we followed, blah, blah,

blah, the NASDSE.

I think that's a partnership. The Governor's Council can think about,

do we go back to the legislature and say blah blah blah. To me that's too

high of a hanging fruit for this group. But I think SPED directors want

this, they want a tool. If we can give them language that could be

included in a contract, as an example, we can't supersede that, but I think

that shows the partnership. Meg, what do you think?

>> MEG PORCELLA: So I agree with everything that you just said. My

only potential worry, my only potential worry, is the -- if there is a

statutory or regulatory carrot for including this tool, or if what will end

up happening is we'll have to say -- we, you -- we have to say this tool or

a tool like it, which I recognize you don't want, because you're developing

a tool that you want to be used.

So as long as the tool is accepted and is legally acceptable, then all

of what you just laid out makes sense. The AOE, in my humble opinion, the

AOE has a challenging time with state-level mandates where we say "you

must." So unless it comes from the Federal Government or unless it's part

of IDEA, we are reluctant, for exactly what started this conversation, and

that is, who has the oversight, who is going to make sure.

But what you just described, Sherry, is the thing that makes the most

sense, to say, here is an easy way for you to ensure that your providers

have in their contract exactly what you want them to do. So I think it's a

great thing to aspire to, that's not like a pig flying, that is something

that could actually happen, not like seeing a unicorn.

I hope that lands well.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sherry, how do we reach the LEAs?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So I think let's take one step at a time. So we have a solid tool. Meg said the right thing. Here is a tool or one that's as good. And we know as a Council because we've looked all over the country, they are not as good. We're going to go with the path of least resistance, it's had feedback.

But Meg is right, we can't say you have to use that, because that creates legal situations and we want to stay out of that domain. Our intent is a way to assess the quality of programs, here is a way. And it's true, there's the Federal level, there's the state level, and we always have to supersede to the Feds. That's not good use of our energy.

The best use of our energy is having a great tool with great resources and links and all those, that's what parents want, that's what students need, and that's what LEAs are looking for. So there's lots of good ways we can get it out. We can get it out through VCSEA, there's ways for us to circulate it. We can brainstorm with the group coming in on Friday and say how do we get this language out there.

We've got great groups like Jen and Tracy work with, they may want to put that in there as well.

>> SHARON HENRY: Meg, would you put the tool on the AOE website as here is one option?

>> MEG PORCELLA: Yeah, potentially. I think that we have -- so don't quote me, but you can quote me as saying that we have precedent that is set to say, here are resources that we know are best practices, and if there's a fear among our legal team, and again, I'm speaking completely in hypotheticals because I literally don't know. But if legal has a fear for our putting our stamp of approval on something, we have precedent to say we

21

are offering this as a tool, take it or leave it, rather than saying we're putting it on our website and by putting it on our website we approve it and recommend you use it.

So there's a precedent for both of those things.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you for that clarification.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Meg is in a tricky place, because every special needs population has their own group of advocacy, and you have to be really careful. Now, we have a tool for Deaf, DeafBlind, Hard of Hearing. Do we have a tool for autism? It snowballs really quickly. And so we have to be cautious. We want to do this work, we want to get it out, but I understand the position it puts AOE -- I mean, this is an amazing group, they've done amazing work. There isn't a replicated tool for every category.

>> MEG PORCELLA: The website has limited capacity for space. It's not as though we wouldn't want to. It's just a matter of, there's a sense that if we post it, we condone it. And I'm not saying we don't condone it. I'm saying I can't say right now. So that's the place where I'm being careful.

At the same time, to everyone's point who's mentioned the advisory council, the advisory group, that's a great use of that group's leverage in making recommendations to the Governor. So --

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, thank you. So you know, Meg, we presented to the VSA/VCSEA on May 19th.

>> MEG PORCELLA: We call them the V's, they're the best way to get their membership into the schools.

>> SHARON HENRY: Tracy and then Jen, I think.

>> TRACY HINCK: This is Tracy. I just had one comment. I think too, to go back to how this evolved, the advisory council is tasked with assessing programs, and this is one way we can say here is a tool that we can assess these programs.

The other tie to this is, there's a significant grant through the AOE

22

for this population. And how do we know that those funds are being applied

to all the students in the continuum of needs that they have? And so I

think that's why this evolved maybe more than other disability categories,

because I don't know this, but I don't know if there's a grant for, you

know, the other disability categories.

I think there is for -- I know there is for visual impairment. But I

don't know about the other ones. And I don't know if there's a tool for

the VABVI programs. So there's a lot I don't know. But to give some

context, the Council is tasked with this and the AOE is part of the

Council.

So it's kind of embedded, right? They're a member of the Council; is

that right?

>> MEG PORCELLA: Yes. The secretary or designee is a required member

of the Council. This is one of those councils, and I was reading the

statutory language last week, that doesn't advise the AOE. This council

advises the Governor. Many of the other councils advise the Secretary on

best practices.

Also to answer your other question, we have three what we call

statewide consultant grants. One is called the interdisciplinary team.

But it is for the low incidence disability population. So that would be

the students on the autism spectrum. And that grant is currently held by

the entity known as the I Team out of UVM.

And then the blind and visually impaired and the Deaf and Hard of

Hearing and DeafBlind, those are the three grants that constitute the

statewide consulting grids.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. So to get us back on track, so the purpose,

use, and oversight of the tool --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Jen had her hand up.

>> SHARON HENRY: I'm sorry, I missed it. Go ahead.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: No, I think another concern that we need to consider is that not all of the providers are at this table. Some of them chose to not participate in the subcommittee. And so getting -- how do we ensure that all providers are willing to use this tool, is another big challenge.

And if it is part of the grant from the AOE, I guess that ensures one entity will do it, but allow do we ensure that all providers are willing and able to use this tool, is another -- I think it's just a big hurdle.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sherry?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I think the idea of the grant, that would be a great location. But again, it's back to the LEAs, that if they want to make sure that they are providing FAIP, and here is a tool that allows for FAIP, and if we provide them with potential language, model language for a contract, that's going to be our biggest -- and again, I am so excited that VCSEA was supportive.

Half of the attendants were ex-SPED directors. So get on board. It's going to be a momentum, SPED directors and superintendents are going to look to this tool as part of their contract and I guess you have to do that, requiring once a year to provide the data that's highlighted within the tool, I think that makes sense.

>> SHARON HENRY: And where would the data then be housed or sit, Sherry?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Then the responsibility of the LEA to hold that data.

>> SHARON HENRY: I see.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: And again, they may have three students. It's a low incidence disability, they may have one student. So you can hold that data and say, okay -- because you're holding the contracts, and a part of that contract renewal is this documentation is provided on that student, then you as the LEA have the evidence you need to show that, yes, I'm delivering FAIP.

And the families can see it. It's open, it's part of the student's

file. A family, parent, could see it and say, are you using -- again, the

parent group, huge -- when they're in that IEP meeting and they're saying

how do we know this is a quality program as a parent, you can ask, and you

can write it into the IEP, that the tool be used as a way to assess, show

me what tool you're using, and here is a model tool.

I think the power is in the parents, the power is in the LEA. And I

respectfully say Meg has very little power.

>> SHARON HENRY: And very little support personnel, it appears.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Right. I as a SPED director would never let AOE hold

my papers. Sorry. In terms of confidentiality and documentation, I'm

like, no, that's confidential, you're not having access to my web-based

special ed files. That's how we hold it. It's really -- I mean, that's

what an SPED director --

>> SHARON HENRY: And Sherry, if we want to do a statewide assessment,

how is the State of Vermont doing, we get all the LEAs together to share

their data.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Right, you can do a survey, how many of you are using

this tool, what level of fidelity. We can send out a statewide survey of

SPED directors. As you saw in the response, this is less than 1% of our

student population, we already know who -- I mean, AOE knows who has

students who meet this category.

I though there's concern whether students are correctly identified.

But I think SPED directors would respond. I think that's the best we can

do. This is tricky stuff. We can't even track the number of students who

qualify in these category areas. If we can in some way use our levers that

are easy to use.

And every year we build into it, every year we do a revision, every

year we collect input, every year we keep building on this tool, it's going

to be -- we're going to be presenting across the country, guys, because no one else is doing this. It's amazing.

>> SHARON HENRY: Rebecca?

>> REBECCA LALANNE: Yeah, as Jen mentioned, I also had a concern about all the providers using the tool. So maybe in the future, like we talked about, if we can get some more people on board and if it does become law, if the Council can really push this through, if we can have the Bill of Rights for DeafBlind, Deaf, Hard of Hearing children.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, Rebecca. We've already presented to the VSA/VCSEA, Cheryl DeConde Johnson is our keynote speaker, we've done a lot in a very short period of time. So future education sessions, to additional providers in Vermont, is obviously an avenue that we can continue to pursue, continue to work with the LEAs, et cetera, et cetera.

So those are all very promising avenues. So thank you for those suggestions. So under this bullet, the other second line was, who will be the keeper of the organizational tool and related data. So what I just heard was it could be the LEAs. There are -- case managers can sometimes be SLPs, TODs. Can the special ed case managers keep up with this type of work?

The way I read that question is, it's way outside our purview, but if it's part of the contract, then they will need to keep up with this type of work and hopefully it will make their job easier because they know that they're providing high quality services to this low incidence population.

Are there any other comments or thoughts before -- about this first bullet about use and oversight of the tool before we move on?

>> TRACY HINCK: I just had, as part of it, the discussion, so most TODs and Hard of Hearing do have some training in special education. And the statement about audiologists being outside of the team, that's actually not accurate. Audiologists are part of the IDEA, they are a related

service, just like SLPs and OTs and PTs.

I just think that might be an area of education for this comment.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sure. Again, it was copied verbatim from the feedback I got from Cassie. Maybe there was someone on the AOE stakeholder team that isn't quite as familiar with the educational setting as you are, Tracy. Yeah, that's a -- we'll keep that in mind as we move forward, who is on the IDEA team, yeah.

Okay. The next comment was, the tool is too onerous. So a number of comments under here. If the vendor is assessing the school districts and schools, could it negatively impact their established relationships. I think that question might be misdirected, because it isn't the vendor assessing the school, it's a mutual assessment.

It's the vendor assessing itself, and also partnering with the school district to provide those services. So did anyone else read that differently?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I would just say, I mean, I appreciate those relationships. But I think we all want to offer the highest quality program to students, so we share a similar goal. The things that are in there, and the way we wrote it, are really Federal expectations as well.

This is not novel. The NASDSE -- and in terms of meeting minutes, participation, parent involvement. It's putting an exclamation point on those pieces. And I would hope, again, we want to -- and I'm glad we have so many providers here. We all have the same goal.

And I don't think this is asking for more. And again, if you ask for one student documentation a year and you as the LEA say, I want it to be on Jen, you get to pick who the student is, it's random, of the three or whatever kids, these are best practices. This is not more than what they should do. This is what they should do.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right, right. So the other question about how are

districts and schools expected to submit the evidence, I think we've addressed that. Maybe we would start with the LEAs holding the data. Submitting the evidence for this many items might be challenging for schools to provide and for reviews to evaluate.

I think we've discussed that a little bit. But -- oh, Cassie, I didn't see your hand up. Welcome.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: Hey, thanks. That second bullet did not come from the AOE or there was some confusion about the audiologist. That was from Vermont Hands & Voices. I just wanted to add that clarity there.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thanks. So I think that we've addressed to the best of our ability that first bullet there.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I'm just looking at the bullet. I think the tool as we found out when we were doing a beta test in the early spring last year, is that it is incredibly time-consuming and somewhat challenging to gather the information.

That being said, I think that, you know, there are things that could probably be done to make it -- you know, to make it more smooth and easy to gather that information. As we do this, I think we will get better at knowing what exactly do we need and how to review all that data.

I think it just took a long time to literally read through meeting minutes to see, is there parent input in there, is there -- and that is the stuff that is time-consuming.

>> SHARON HENRY: Our provider education on Friday is to help providers recognize what's important to be included, because if you don't document, then you didn't do it, right? Basically. Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: And that's -- I've been -- so one comment is, I had about five meetings in the last couple of months, and I asked the case manager and the special ed director if they would be interested in using the checklist as sort of a guide for the meeting.

And every single one of them was like, yes, this is great, we're

really appreciative of this. What I found is the discussion in all the

areas is there but when it got transferred to the documentation is where it

kind of fell off. So we talked about a safety plan, but then it didn't

always make it into the plan.

So I think we, you know, may have some work to do, making suggestions

about where to put things. One example is something simple, like all the

providers were at the meeting and they were on the invite but instead of

putting their role, they put the agency they work for. And so it was just

kind of interesting, because that doesn't really tell us about the

provider. It just tells us where they work.

And we don't really care where they work, we want to know what their

area of expertise is. So things like that, how do we guide teams and

specify, this person is a licensed speech pathologist or whatever and not

just put where they work. I think we're learning a lot from the beta

testing from the checklist and the tool.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. And again, I come from a medical perspective

as well as a physical therapist, it's always drilled into us, if you don't

document it, you didn't do it and it won't hold up in court. Talking about

it isn't good enough, you also have to do it and implement it, there's

three steps.

Okay. So the second point there is, another common theme is related

to the workability and inclusiveness of the document. Reviewers commented

that it gives districts even greater accountability than the IDEA mandates

and repeats some of the IEP process, for example consideration of parent

and assistive technology.

What are people's thoughts about that comment? I'm not sure what

workability and inclusivity means, myself. Inclusiveness? I don't know,

Cassie, if you were a part of those conversations, if you can expand a

little bit. Or were you just the --

    >> CASSANDRA SANTO: Sorry, took me a minute to get to my unmute there and have this document up at the same time. So IDEA doesn't necessarily mandate the meeting notes and things like that. Not to say that people shouldn't be doing that. But I think the criticism was that we can't force schools to take something, to take notes, when it's not mandated under law, and then using it as evidence, if those notes were missing, they wouldn't necessarily be held accountable for that because it's not mandated.

    And then particularly for certain types of plans, there isn't often meeting notes. So it's just something to take into account when you're talking about the three different types of plans. What does IDEA actually mandate, right? ESTs don't occur on a national level, that's a Vermont thing.

    So it's just keeping in mind what actually is mandated by law for documentation.

    >> SHARON HENRY: And what is meant by workability and inclusiveness of the document?

    >> CASSANDRA SANTO: The workability, I would have to go back to the original feedback, but the workability was related to the fact that those plans are different in nature, and also different in the requirements. And so it's just keeping in mind how do we make it workable if they're all grouped together and the requirements might look different for each type of plan.

    >> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, I think that at one point there was a suggestion that we create three documents, one for an IEP, one for a 504, and one for an EST. And that seems onerous and not perhaps as helpful. But we'll keep that in mind.

    Other comments on this particular --

    >> CASSANDRA SANTO: Can I add just one more thing, Sharon?

Personally, the checklist sort of helps to navigate. I think where it feels confusing to reviewers we talked to is that evidence is associated with all the plans within that bigger document.

But when it came into checklist form, some of that was removed and it focused on what is the principle you're working towards rather than what evidence are you collecting to prove that you're doing that.

>> SHARON HENRY: So are you suggesting maybe just a checklist for an IEP, a checklist for a 504, a checklist for an EST?

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: No, the checklist you created did a good job of focusing on what is the goal on each of these points rather than the focus on the evidence. In talking to reviewers, they didn't get to see that checklist, though only saw the bigger table that identifies the evidence for every single thing. And when you pulled the principles out and made the checklist, as a special educator myself, that felt reasonable and doable to me, I would totally bring that to a meeting and use that to guide my thinking, that's way more acceptable, the checklist you made.

>> SHARON HENRY: Right, the checklist and the tool have completely different purposes. So any other comments on this? And the other thing, so basically we'll keep it in mind as we edit the document to make sure we don't confuse things as best we can, but other than that, I don't think it's actionable.

>> TRACY HINCK: Some of the comments, it seems like this tool is meant to be like a critical measure, like criticism. But it's really not. I think, you know, like Sherry was saying, and Sharon, it's designed to help us in Vermont as providers and school teams no matter what plan they have. We're not lawyers, we're not trying to like mandate something.

We're trying to give a guide, because it is low incidence. When you go to a school, most of the school teams have never worked with a child that's Deaf, Hard of Hearing, or DeafBlind. It's a way to not only guide

any team meeting but also a way to evaluate, we made this decision, did it get documented so we can implement it, because like you said, Sharon, sometimes you talk about something and then you all decide this is a good idea and it never gets written down so it never does get implemented.

So these are things we can all do a better job of. Any provider, in my opinion, should want to do that, should, like, want to be thorough. And this is just a way to do that.

>> SHARON HENRY: Mm-hmm. Thank you. All right.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Thank you, Tracy, well-said. We all have the same goal, gives us a baseline, and we're coming from a very positive positioning, and that's always good. Thank you. And Tracy and Jen wrote the checklist, full disclosure, they did that great work.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes. Okay. So the next major theme that came through is the tool is not consistent in use of language. Express concerns related to the students with EST plans, 504s, and IEPs being grouped throughout the document. I think that was for ease of writing the document.

But for those of you who are in the field, what concerns you have, is there a fixable solution that we should attend to that's actionable?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: I'll jump in. I don't think -- so as someone who is a 504 coordinator, writes EST plans, again, the elements that are in here are very similar. Parent involvement, all the same team members. I think to me, whether you're 504, EST, or IEP, the onus is on you, the school district and the team, to document conversations.

You're going to have meeting minutes from all of those meetings. You're going to have parent involvement in all of those meetings. I don't have a problem with having the same expectations developing around the plan, because we're still talking about -- the disability is still there, right? The special need is still there.

The only differentiation is in terms of the level of programming and

its funding source. So EST, concerns, anyone can bring it concerns, but

there still needs to be a plan, goals, and objectives. If you look at

Vermont's STFs, that's what we have in our district. A 504 plan, it has

all those elements, there should be meeting minutes and parent involvement

and all the team members still need to be there and by law should be there.

Then you have IEP, which is, now it's impacting learn, right? Now

we're talking about access. So to me, if I'm offering a quality program,

whether it's EST, 504, or IEP, it's still the same level of expectation,

the student needs this to access their education. That might be my

district and I'm naive, so I would love you guys to say.

>> SHARON HENRY: Any other comments on that? It also addresses the

next theme, which is tool does not reflect different education plans. So

the group suggested that the plan type should be identified in individual

grids, which I don't think is feasible, but what I hear Sherry is saying

is, the level of expectation is the same regardless of whether it's a 504,

EST, or IEP.

>> TRACY HINCK: I'm wondering if there's a way, this is Tracy, if we

can make it clearer that this should apply. And again, we're not -- I

mean, the evidence is for each agency's or entity's own information. So

when I sit at a meeting and then I look at the meeting minutes, you know,

every meeting, the person who wrote it is different, so the idea that these

key components land somewhere in writing.

So is there a way we can make it clearer, do you think, in the tool,

in the checklist, that the idea behind this is to apply to whatever, even

if they're not on any plan, you're going to meet on a student with a newly

diagnosed hearing problem, you know, what are the things that you want to

talk about and address and record the outcome?

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, I think it could be addressed in a well-crafted

introductory paragraph. I think Cassie had her hand up. Or did you --

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I just appreciate -- I was thinking the same thing. There are some differences in the components of those plans that the legislative -- or within IDEA. I think what Tracy said is just a really great suggestion of how you might separate some of those things out and reminding people that this is just used as a way to review what you're currently doing.

And of course it's best practice to have all of those things, to always be doing an agenda and always be taking notes. In terms of how it falls legally, that's where that feedback was coming from. I also think reviewers, when they were initially looking at it, and you guys can correct me because I'm kind of new, but at that time the hope was this was going to be under the AOE's periphery and as a requirement.

So I think some of the reviewers understood it that way as well, hence why that feedback sort of came up, recognizing that IDEA can only mandate so much in terms of what evidence it's collected.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, Cassie. Are we ready to move on to the next theme, which is tool is not consistently inclusive. It is not inclusive to have this for one disability category and not others. The events detail may not support inclusive models.

I'm not sure what this means. I'm outside the special ed world. Does anyone have an interpretation? Jen?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: The way I understood that is sort of what I think Tracy mentioned earlier, is that, you know, we're requiring that they have social opportunities with other similar peers. But do children who are on the autism spectrum, do they also have that opportunity?

Do children who have Down syndrome? That's where I read it, that it's not inclusive or equitable across all disability categories.

>> SHARON HENRY: But that's not the point of our work, is it? Or --

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I don't think so. But I'm wondering if the reviewer was saying that that is not -- that's not equitable, because just this group of students has this, these special opportunities and not other disability categories. That's how I understood it.

>> SHARON HENRY: Cassie, and then Sherry, please.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: Just wanted to agree with Jen, that's also how I understood it when receiving that feedback.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thanks. Sherry?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: We are not in the position to mandate. All we can do is recommend conversations where parents and those with the highest level of expertise are involved in the decisions. And I often say, they'll ask me my advice, it's up to the team. The team has to have a conversation.

They determine what is the right -- and their mandate is least restrictive environment, if it's special ed. So we have to -- these are the tools and expectations. But we can't mandate this. This is not law. These are the things, as Tracy said well, here are the things of a high quality meeting.

It could be applicability to other disability categories. If someone wants to take this tool and move it to theirs, absolutely, if they have guidelines. But I think our attempt is, parent voice, student voice, experts' voice, all coming to the table and having a high quality dialogue around what is in the best interests of the child.

Other than that, we have no power. We just can offer a tool.

>> SHARON HENRY: So that item basically will be unactionable, there's nothing to change in our tool based on that feedback. The next point is, Vermont HireAbility is not mentioned in this tool, programs and/or districts need to include this organization as part of planning, do they have qualified individuals who specialize in working with our population of all ages to assist with upcoming transitions and anticipate the needs of

35

the program, district, family, student may not have.

>> INTERPRETER: So Kate Parish and Joey Dotson, they're the transition councilors. They said it's not a big part of their -- it's a small part of their role, to help the students with transition.

>> Just making sure you're aware that Kate Parish and Joey Dotson, it's a small amount, they want to make sure they're part of this whole conversation when transition plans are happening.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: This is Jen. I just wanted to make sure it was clear that HireAbility is mentioned in this document in our tool, under I think it's essential element number 7. We specifically name that that organization should be at the table when discussing transition.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, I recall our discussions --

>> SHERRY SOUSA: It is state and Federal law that at age 16, transition services are offered and brought to the table and invited. So that's already Federally and state mandated. So I don't know if we have to add that to it because it's already the expectation, and if you don't, you're in not good shape as a special ed team. So it's required by law.

>> SHARON HENRY: So there's no action to take on that bullet point, then, it's already in our document and it's already Federal and state law, so we're okay there. Okay. So on page 2 still, looking at credibility of evidence.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sorry, Sharon, to interrupt. I just wanted to clarify, Laura, were you commenting that the RCDs should be specifically mentioned in this document? Rather than just saying HireAbility, are you suggesting that we include a subset of RCDs when appropriate? RCD is rehab counselor for the Deaf.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: No, I just warrant to make sure they have qualified people at the table from HireAbility. Because they collaborate with other counselors. It doesn't have to be RCD. It's already Federally mandated

and it's indicator 13, thank you, Kathy, for putting that in there, and Meg as well. It's there, we just need to make sure the appropriate people are there so I don't think you need to have a subset category so again, because it's already part of their process to include it I don't think we have to make a specific mention.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I don't know. I guess I think, as you mentioned, that I question if it does make sense to specifically say something about including RCDs when appropriate. You know, my experience is RCDs will typically get involved, if it's a student that is using ASL.

But not necessarily for a student that is not using ASL but is Deaf or Hard of Hearing.

>> INTERPRETER: Typically they only work with students at a certain decibel loss, that's their qualifier. Don't quote me on that, I don't work for HireAbility.

>> SHARON HENRY: So what is the action plan here, do we need to make any changes to the tool or no?

>> INTERPRETER: Say it again, I'm sorry. We had an interpreter switch and I lost the screen for a second.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sure. I'm asking the group, based on this discussion, do we need to make a change to the tool or is the tool fine the way it is?

>> REBECCA LALANNE: I think leave it as is.

>> INTERPRETER: Laura is on the fence.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Jen?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I guess my vote would be maybe even in parentheses, HireAbility at appropriate or something like that, because my experience is they're not always brought in.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay.

>> INTERPRETER: That's a good point.

>> SHARON HENRY: So the next set of feedback has to do with the credibility of the evidence that we listed. So we have a set of standards that we described, and then we as a group said, here is the evidence that would support this standard as being met, here is the evidence that this standard is being met, et cetera, et cetera.

So we have a bit of feedback, particularly from Hands & Voices, about, huh, how does that evidence really prove that your provider or group is meeting that standard? So -- in essential element number 1, where the goals of the student and family are represented and integrated, if you flip to our tool, and look at the evidence that we suggest, how is it that meeting invitations, agenda, and minutes show that the family is being represented and integrated?

I know what my response is but I want to hear from the group first.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Jen again, sorry. I think that if we are including the notation about adding double asterisks to indicate that that was parental input, that might be an area to show in the notes, that the parent input was actually integrated into the student's plan or goals as appropriate.

>> SHARON HENRY: Other comments? To me it speaks to having clear minute-taking and clear documentation. And I think the idea of adding the double asterisks is a good one, to make it clear that that piece of feedback came from a parent. Sherry?

>> SHERRY SOUSA: So I have to evacuate my office. So you guys are in good hands. I'm going to go over to the emergency site and keep that open. Good luck, stay safe, stay off the roads. You guys are doing great work. Take care.

>> SHARON HENRY: Sherry, we'll talk to you soon and we'll see you Friday.

>> SHERRY SOUSA: Yep.

>> SHARON HENRY: In Montpelier. Super. Be careful. Bye-bye. Okay.
So essential element number 2, students and families are actively engaged
in transition planning. The evidence we proposed was meeting invitation
and including HireAbility agenda and/or meeting minutes.

The meeting agenda only signifies that attendance but does not signify
active engagement. I think once again, the idea of providing the asterisk
next to family engagement would highlight the family and student input.
And I think that maybe is this an opportunity, Jen, to put in parentheses
RCDs for example as appropriate? Okay.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I can't unmute myself. Are you saying -- where would
you add that information? I guess I'm unclear where you would add the
information about RCDs. What are you thinking?

>> SHARON HENRY: So under essential element number 2, under the fourth
column, where it has our evidence listed. So this is the evidence that the
group would submit in support of having met the standard that families and
students are actively engaged in transition planning.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: So where it says meeting invitation including
HireAbility and then maybe add and/or RCDs as appropriate, okay. I guess I
just want to -- RCDs are part of HireAbility. They are under HireAbility.
I want to make sure that RCDs might be appropriate.

>> SHARON HENRY: So I can say RCDs, as appropriate, in parentheses.
Okay. Okay. And then the other comment under that same bullet for
essential element number 2 was, Hands & Voices is making a point that we
caution having a meeting agenda as being evidence of professional
participation in a team meeting.

So even though a qualified audiologist attends the meeting, did they
actually -- how do we know they actually participated in a meeting. I
think it's -- as a professional myself, I just have a hard time even
knowing how to address that comment, because by definition, you're a

professional, so you therefore comment and offer your expertise in the best interests of that student.

So I'm not sure where to go with this.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sharon, I think, again, it's all about documentation. I think that it could be clearly documented in meeting minutes who was offering what information. I agree that it's not always clear or done that way. But that would be the easiest way to ensure that is trying to educate folks around ensuring that information is in meeting minutes.

>> SHARON HENRY: So, audiologist, period, and whatever she said, and TOD, whatever that person said, and -- yeah. So that would be a matter of a lot of education of the special ed team, to get them to create their meeting minutes in that way.

>> TRACY HINCK: And any team.

>> SHARON HENRY: Any team, yeah.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: And I think, like you mentioned before, Sharon, I think this Friday could be an opportunity for you and/or Sherry, as we're doing the mock IEP, to mention, you know, evidence for many of these things -- sorry, meeting minutes is a great piece of evidence for a lot of this -- you know, a lot of these things that we're looking for.

And so ensuring that meeting minutes are -- that when you're doing those, that it's made clear who is giving what input in the meeting is important, in order for us to utilize them in the future as we look over, you know, services for students who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing or DeafBlind.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. I'll make that point on Friday. Okay. I don't know what BRB means, but Tracy, did you --

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Be right back.

>> SHARON HENRY: Oh, be right back.

>> TRACY HINCK: Sorry, I'm back.

>> SHARON HENRY: Why don't we take a five-minute break so everyone can run to the bathroom and we'll reconvene at 10:45.

[Pause]

>> LAURA SIEGEL: For future reference I think it's important to highlight that. And mention that to the students in the future, you know, so they know what RCD stands for and what it means.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, absolutely, I agree.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Sometimes people don't know, they're not aware, they haven't heard of that before. So I think it's important to inform.

>> SHARON HENRY: Absolutely. We'll wait one more minute for everyone to get back and then we'll start again. Jen, Tracy, Cassie, are you back with us?

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: Yes.

>> SHARON HENRY: Cassie, did I miss your hand on the last comment? Did you have a comment about our last edit?

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I had my hand up, Sharon, but it was probably more than anything just to agree with you all.

>> SHARON HENRY: Great [laughter].

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: We have to assume best intentions, that people are participating as they should be. And some special educators know how to take notes. One complexity in the field of special education now is staffing shortages, so you have a lot of new people coming in who may need some training on how to take notes. Those are all just things that I think, you know, are learning curves for anyone new to the field.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: That's all, just agreeing, mainly.

>> SHARON HENRY: Absolutely. Okay. To get us back on track, we're on page 3 of the themes document. We're now looking at essential element number 4. And I'll just flip to that on the page. The comment is, the

students' needs for assistive technology, I think we already discussed this a little bit, the items of evidence note using plans where technology is recommended. How will the program show that the student has acquired the technology and how the usage is going?

Tracy, do you have a comment on that feedback piece? Showing the recommendations, show the evidence or follow through our procurement.

>> TRACY HINCK: I mean, I guess I would hope that the provider on the team, which should be an educational audiologist, is, you know, updating the team on the progress and implementation and there should be a use plan in place. And there also should be, you know, some kind of checking of the equipment, no matter what plan they're on, it should be checked for function.

>> SHARON HENRY: And the checking for function is part of the use plan?

>> TRACY HINCK: Mm-hmm.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. Okay. I'll just add that to the document, that the use plan could be submitted as a piece of evidence.

>> TRACY HINCK: Mm-hmm.

>> SHARON HENRY: That's what it's called, a use plan, or is there a more fancy name?

>> TRACY HINCK: Umm, I have to look it up. I think it's a component of -- there's like five components, and it's part of the fitting process. So a use plan is like under the category -- so there's selection, fitting, verification, and validation.

So a use plan is part of the fitting. It's part of like describing how the equipment is used, how to take care of it, and in what situations it's used and what situations it's not used in.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. I'll add that to that part of the document. Essential element number 5, decisions about the program. Who will

determine what is considered the most recent research or the best, most appropriate evidence-based practice? How frequently would this be reviewed, and by whom? This information should be included within the tool.

As a professional, as a qualified professional, I would say that I keep up with the literature and I attend my national conferences and so forth and so I'm current with the research and know what's current and not. Tracy and Jen, what do you think?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I guess I agree. It's just such a widely-used term, current research. I feel, like you said, it's up to the professionals to keep current and attend conferences and read current literature. And I don't know how -- I don't know how we could better quantify that or objectify that.

I don't know how to do that, to be honest.

>> SHARON HENRY: I don't either. Other than to say it's embedded in the definition of being a professional, a qualified professional. Tracy, do you have anything to add?

>> TRACY HINCK: I mean, the only thing I could add is, you know, I don't think people quote, you know, research all the time at meetings. I don't think there's time. Maybe if there's a question, maybe that's just a question the team can ask, do you want to share current best practices in fitting equipment, or current literature on what the best equipment is, or -- I don't know if someone -- if that is like a talking point, should there be a talking point at a team meeting about current literature or current research? I don't know.

>> SHARON HENRY: I think my impression is that team meetings are pretty busy already.

>> TRACY HINCK: Yeah.

>> SHARON HENRY: I think it's outside of our scope to police

professional organizations and professionals. That's what your

professional organizations do and your licensure requirements do.

   >> TRACY HINCK: And that's part of CEUs too.

   >> SHARON HENRY: Exactly. So that item is unactionable. Okay.

Essential element number 9, accountability that the tool provides. Let's

see what that had to say. We suggest adding that DHH should be identity on

the IEP, 504, or EST where applicable and the AOE should be tracking how

many students are identified as such. Many students are not having this

reported and the AOE does not know how many students are Deaf, Hard of

Hearing, within the state, if other disabilities trump it on the plans.

   So this was a discussion that goes way back to one of our first

meetings, where if a student is presenting with multiple disabilities,

sometimes the student is categorized as just multiple disabilities and each

individual one is not listed. So therefore when the data get rolled up to

the state level, you can't know that that student is receiving Deaf, Hard

of Hearing, or DeafBlind services.

   So this comment is suggesting that the IEP form be changed or the 504

plan be changed to include specific disabilities, if I'm reading it

correctly. I'm not so sure that that is within the purview of our

committee. I think it takes more than just that recommendation to make

that level of a change. But I'll defer to Cassie and Jen and Tracy who are

in the special ed world.

   >> JEN BOSTWICK: Well -- this is Jen -- for me, just the sentence

where it says we suggest recommending best practices for the AOE to require

a program, as Meg has said, and we've seen in the past, they don't have the

capacity to require a program to do that, to use the tool or anything.

They can recommend it or support it. But they can't require it, is my

understanding.

   >> SHARON HENRY: Tracy?

>> TRACY HINCK: I think it's something I bring up at team meetings often, could we put Deaf or Hard of Hearing as a secondary eligibility. I bring that up often, and oftentimes the team just didn't consider it. I don't think it's on purpose, they just didn't. So I bring it up and they say, good idea.

>> SHARON HENRY: So you suggest it to the team leader to add it to whatever specific forms you're working with?

>> TRACY HINCK: Or I just ask the team, does the team think this child's hearing loss is significant enough to put as a secondary eligibility. And I will say as the audiologist, they certainly meet the criteria for Hard of Hearing.

>> SHARON HENRY: And then it gets added to their IEP or 504 at the top where you list disability category.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I can add --

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, I was going to say, Cassie, help me remember when we talk on Friday to mention that.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: Yeah, because in the evaluation process, sometimes you might look at a student under several disability categories, and you might find eligibility under several disability categories and just like what Tracy was alluding to, then it might be marked as multiple, because that student wasn't found eligible in other categories, it's just because it's marked that way as primary and it's kind of having that follow-through of making sure that that secondary is listed.

Another caveat could be that a student might not be found -- the adverse effect piece isn't found in that particular disability category. I think that's very unlikely in these cases. But that's just across the board how it might work. You could be looking at a disability category and not find that there's adverse effect related to that disability category. Again, unlikely for the population of students we're talking about, but

just a bigger component of it all.

>> SHARON HENRY: Thank you, Cassie. So then the second bullet there was, we suggest recommending best practice is for the AOE to require a program to use -- we've had that discussion, we've had at least three or four action plans we can implement in the future in terms of ways to go forward to increase the uptake of the tool. But requiring -- having the AOE require it is not one of them, I think that's been clear. Jen.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I'm just thinking, as we were talking about the disability categories, I wonder if that should be something that we consider adding to the checklist, that has the team included Deaf or Hard of Hearing as the disability category on the child's --

>> SHARON HENRY: That's a great idea.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: -- plan.

>> SHARON HENRY: That's a great idea, we can do that. Would you like me to add that before the Friday meaning?

>> TRACY HINCK: That would be great, I think that's a great idea, Jen.

>> SHARON HENRY: How do I phrase it, has Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind, been added as a disability category on the forms?

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: It could be something like if adverse effect is found in the category of Deaf, Hard of Hearing, is that listed on the IEP as an effect? Am I being too specific there?

>> TRACY HINCK: We're hoping this form is for all plans. So if it's an IEP, that would be great, but we also want to make this applicable to a 504 or an EST. So is there a way we could just make it universal?

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I know what I said isn't universal, Sharon, because that adverse effect component only comes in on IEP.

>> TRACY HINCK: DeafBlind doesn't need that adverse effect anymore. Now we're getting really --

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: And it's only DeafBlind.

46

>> TRACY HINCK: It's only DeafBlind but this tool is designed for kids with that. So, yeah.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: I wonder if it could just be --

>> SHARON HENRY: You know what, Jen and Tracy, just email me the language and I will add it in, okay? Let's not waste our group's time working on that. But yes, I think it's a great idea, it's a way to help the team remember all of these details. All right.

The next one was, additional clarification in the tool, under the appendices, we had done a good job providing resources and providing some definitions. Under communication facilitator we suggested finding who is the team assessing the ASL skills, is it the educational team, the program team, or other.

So I don't have the appendices right in front of me, but wasn't this the ASL skills of the interpreter?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sorry, I don't have that in front of me either. I may need to look at that. I think it's the educational team.

>> INTERPRETER: Where are we looking at again, appendices?

>> SHARON HENRY: The appendices of the tool itself.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Or is it the ASL PI or --

>> INTERPRETER: Oh, okay. Got it. Found it, thank you.

>> SHARON HENRY: Has anyone found it yet?

>> INTERPRETER: Rebecca says she has to plug in her computer.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes, I found it. And I think we're talking about -- it could say educational team. It's on -- well, I don't know what page it's on. It's on page 2 of the appendices, maybe.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay, yeah. So under definitions of qualified providers, professionals, D/HH/DB services, Jen?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yes, under communication facilitator.

>> SHARON HENRY: So I think our intent was that the communication

facilitator would pass one of those two tests with the appropriate

proficiency.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: And appropriate proficiency is what I -- is

determined by the educational team, is what I think is what they're

questioning. It's determined by team when considering, but perhaps adding

"by the student's --" sorry, I've got to read this. By the educational

team.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. The next comment was a suggestion about

clarifying --

>> LAURA SIEGEL: This is Laura. Where were you looking, again? Where

is that at?

>> SHARON HENRY: If you go to the appendices, Laura, that was part of

our tool, on the second page.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Got it, thank you.

>> SHARON HENRY: They were suggesting that we outline what makes a

good reviewer, someone who just graduated from school might not be so

qualified, should we add something about education and/or experience that

would make that person a suitable reviewer.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: This is Laura. I just want to share something that

recently happened. I had one teacher who was teaching another spoken

language. And she reached out to me asking me some questions about, you

know, what do I do to become an ASL instructor and teaching that language.

I said, have you been signing multiple years? They said, no, I just

started learning online, and now I'm at the same level as my student and I

want to teach now. I said, that's concerning. For hearing students that

want to take ASL, they might be taking it from someone who the school has

no idea of their proficiency and that can do a detriment to the student's

learning as opposed to the community.

I'm wondering is it worth adding something into this somewhere, some

oversight on who is actually taking responsibility to teach the ASL? Because I do worry about who is being brought on board, not just for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing students but also for hearing students writ large. I don't know if we need to add that somewhere in there.

>> SHARON HENRY: So this comment is about people who are reviewing the grants or reviewing -- I'm sorry, reviewing the evidence submitted based on the Quality Indicator Tool. So it's not who is teaching ASL to students in the classroom.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Oh, okay. I'm just wondering if maybe we wanted to add something in there at this point in time.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Sharon, I'm struggling a little bit. When we wrote this, this blurb here, where we thinking that this was going to be used by those that were reviewing the grant applications?

>> SHARON HENRY: No. I misspoke. This is qualifications of reviewers who would review the evidence submitted based on the use of the Quality Indicator Tool. So it's reviewing the evidence that's submitted for the indicator tool.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Okay. That would indicate we're going to be collecting the data and sending it to somebody to review, and I don't know that that is --

>> SHARON HENRY: I think this needs to be probably deleted from our appendices, because we're not going to operate in that way. I think what we originally had envisioned, if all the data were fed up to the AOE or some other central body, then we would engage qualified reviewers to look at the evidence and the quality of the evidence.

And then similarly, while we're here then, the scale can be deleted from -- well, we can still leave the scale. If the LEAs are still interested in looking at that, or we could change this bullet to be that if school districts and providers, you know, really want to take this to the

next level, they could engage qualified reviewers and they could be or

should be from out of state as well, sort of soften it a little bit.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah, because I do think that the initial thought was

that this would be a tool that those that were applying for the grant would

be submitting their evidence with this tool, and then there would be

reviewers. But that, you know, has not -- as we know, is not a viable

option.

So I think that that might be why that was still in there.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yes, yes. Because this was 12 months ago, I think,

thereabouts [laughter]. And then the next question was, should an

intervenor be applied within this document. Both as a potential qualified

reviewer but also within the context of the actual tool.

And I'm not familiar with that terminology, an intervenor.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: An intervenor is somebody who specializes in working

with a student who is DeafBlind and ensuring that they have access to not

just the language and communication around them, but also sort of making

them more aware of their environment in general and making sure that they

can best navigate and access and engage with all of their environment

around them. It's sort of how I would describe it in a nutshell.

Rebecca or Laura, if you have other things to add in terms of the

definition. And then I would just say, I think it probably does make

sense. I can't remember if there was a reason why we didn't include it,

because I do think it likely would make sense. But if -- yeah.

>> SHARON HENRY: I can go and add it in the document, because the

legislative mandate is for Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind services. We

did meet with Tracy Lucelli Evans early on. It's too long ago for me to

remember that word, intervenor, maybe she mentioned it and we missed it,

and it didn't make it into our tool. But I'm happy to add it.

>> JEN BOSTWICK: So an educational interpreter is somebody who works

with students who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing to make sure they have access to the language around them. And an intervenor is -- sometimes is that plus plus, a lot of other pluses, to make sure they have access, because they can't see the social happenings around them and things like that.

And just being aware how they best learn and access their environment in a comfortable way.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. All right. I'll do that.

>> TRACY HINCK: Sorry, this is Tracy.

>> SHARON HENRY: Tracy.

>> TRACY HINCK: I can send you some information about the intervenor trainings, I don't know if that would be helpful, or the kinds of certification that they have, if you think we want to add that.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah, because maybe we want to add that to our list of qualified providers in the appendices.

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: I wanted to share something additional I learned today that I'm looking into, because you mentioned, Tracy, on this topic on intervenors, and Laura, if you have any more information about this I wanted to connect with you about it anyways, but DeafBlind intervenors, it is right now a national license or process of modules you go through or courses that you take.

I was in another meeting where somebody claimed that Tracy has said that that licensing is going away at the national level. So I don't know if anyone hear knows anything more about that. But know that I am looking into it and I will update you guys, or Laura will, as I investigate that a little bit. Just wondering if that might be related to the decisions you guys made about intervenors.

>> TRACY HINCK: So Dr. Susan Bruce from I think BC, Boston University, anyways, she is kind of -- sits on committees for that licensure and training, I can send with you the information she shared with me about it.

51

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: That would be excellent, thank you.

>> SHARON HENRY: Great. So we're on page 5 of the feedback themes document. And we have four bullet points to consider. And my question to the group is, are these four actually even actionable.

The first one was about essential element number 9. We suggest recommending best practice is for the AOE to require a program to use this tool. I think we've had that discussion, I think we know what the answers are. I think what we could do is make the revisions to this tool and ask Laura to post it to the DAIL website when it's done. I think we can ask Cassie and Meg to consider posting it on the AOE website, which is -- Cassie, we had that conversation with Meg this morning, so we can follow up with that.

So I don't perceive that bullet point as actionable. Does anyone see that any differently or want to comment on anything there? Okay. We'll move to the next one. Overall notations. We suggest under education quality standards, describe what a high quality education should look like for students attending Vermont schools.

Way outside our purview. Anyone want to comment on that? Okay. The next one --

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Where are you looking again?

>> SHARON HENRY: I'm on page 5 of the feedback themes.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: Okay. I was on the wrong page.

>> SHARON HENRY: On the left hand side it says are these items actionable by the School Age Subcommittee. So the first two are, no, they're not actionable. The next item was -- or next feedback was, should a tool be developed to assist school personnel when going through a hiring process for individual or district providers.

We have no legal authority. The school district hiring is a fairly regulated process. We will not be stepping into that arena. Unless

someone sees it differently than I am seeing it. Any other comments on

that?

And then the last sentence there was, we question who will be doing

the actual evaluation work within a given program. And again, I think that

discussion we had earlier, where we were engaging the LEAs and the special

ed -- the educational team, and the providers, and together they can do the

evaluation and the LEAs can house the data, eventually.

So nothing to do there. And then lastly, we question how to avoid any

implication or impropriety or bias from the review committee and potential

standing relationships. I think this was in the context of imagining the

data being rolled up to the AOE and having qualified reviewers review it.

That system isn't going to work. So I'm not so sure there's anything to do

with that, especially if the evaluation will be occurring at the district

level. Comments on that bullet point?

Hooray, we made it through all of the feedback. Thank you, Cassie,

for coordinating that for us and engaging your stakeholders for that

feedback. I don't know that I can -- I have to go to Boston this afternoon

through Wednesday for my husband's appointments at Beth Israel. So I'm not

so sure I'll have time to make the feedback changes before Friday. I will

do my best.

But what we can say at our session on Friday is, check back to the

DAIL website next week or something, and we can give them the link. If I

can do it by Friday, great. But I'm not making any promises, given

everything that's on my plate this week. So Jen and Tracy, you'll get me

the changes for the checklist, that change I'm sure I can make. And Linda

has agreed to bring copies of that checklist to the meeting on Friday.

And the way that meeting is going to run is that we of course will

Zoom in Cheryl DeConde Johnson. Well, we'll have lunch from 12:00 to 1:00,

that's how come we're getting everyone there [laughter], at the Capitol

Plaza, then Cheryl DeConde Johnson will start her presentation at 1:15, and she's going to talk about the following five topics.

The Perez versus Sturgess case. This was the Supreme Court case about why the court ruled in favor of the students and the parents, and talk about the impact of not following the IEP and outcomes, and student outcome concerns, and talk about why the court ruled in the family's favor.

The second thing she's going to talk about is the importance of qualified professionals, licensed in key areas, trained in Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind. The third thing is the importance of student outcome assessments. And certainly here in Vermont, we're a long ways from being able to reach that, so it will be great to hear her comments on that.

She's going to talk about our evaluation tool and the checklist we've developed here in Vermont and why it's important and how it can be used with students who are receiving direct instruction as well as those who are receiving consultation and technical assistance. And then lastly, sharing of audiology results with parents, with families, even though that's a little bit more on the early intervention side of the house.

Linda wanted her to talk a little bit about that, because even once a child reaches school age and if hearing status is changing, I think how it is conveyed to parents is important. So that was going to take about 45 minutes to 50 minutes. And then have time for question and answers, taking us to about 2:15. And then Michelle Johnson was going to speak from 2:15 until 2:30 on what the Vermont NASDSE Coalition has done, what they've been up to. Unfortunately I haven't heard anything from Michelle John for over two months.

I reached out to Linda last week and again this morning. So I don't know if she's available or not. If she's not available, then we'll go right into the same presentation that we did at the Vermont superintendents meeting. I'll do my little ten-minute PowerPoint overview and then we'll

go into our mock IEP, remembering to highlight the things that we talked about this morning in terms of how to structure the meeting minutes and that sort of stuff.

Is everyone who's here also able to attend on Friday? Just raise your hands if you can attend. And Cassie, are you going to be there on Friday?

>> CASSANDRA SANTO: Sorry, I will not be there on Friday, I'm with my inaudible that you had that day.

>> SHARON HENRY: So Sherry will be there, I know Amelia won't be there. I was the kindergarten teacher, maybe I could flip over into the parent role and we can ask Linda Hazard to be the teacher. Do you think that's reasonable, Jen and Tracy?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: Yeah, or Laura could also take on a role. You can't? Okay.

>> LAURA SIEGEL: No. Conflict of interest because of my actual role and work.

>> SHARON HENRY: Yeah. Yeah. Okay. I'll ask Linda if she's will be for kindergarten teacher or parent, whatever role she doesn't want, I'll be the other one, I'll float. So I think our session went really well on May 19th. But maybe what we can do during the IEP is actually stop and say -- make it more explicit, okay, this is essential element number 4 that we just addressed, and in the meeting minutes, we're going to asterisk the parent input so that we highlight parent input, things like that.

So let's be ready to free-wheel a little bit more. Is there anything else you wanted to change or as you reflect back to May, which now seems forever ago?

>> JEN BOSTWICK: No, I just texted Linda to ensure that Emily, the interpreter who participated last time, is able to come again. I don't know if Linda knows. I'll confirm that. Because if she's not then we'll have to think about how we reconfigure the group again.

>> SHARON HENRY: Okay. That might be an opportunity where we role model the professionals not here because of a conflict, working with another student, and she provides her written feedback and one of us reads her written feedback. I don't remember what she said, so someone else will have to write down what she said.

>> INTERPRETER: Okay.

>> SHARON HENRY: Anything else?

>> INTERPRETER: No.

>> SHARON HENRY: Great. Thank you all for your diligence in sticking with us. And I look forward to seeing you all on Friday. And hopefully everyone will stay safe and dry and out of trouble. All right. Thank you, everyone. Have a great week and I'll see you at the end of the week.

>> INTERPRETER: Bye, everybody.

>> SHARON HENRY: Bye-bye.