

SUMMARY
March 10, 2016 Meeting
Indiana State Advisory Council (SAC)
on the Education of Children with Disabilities
Central Indiana Education Service Center
Indianapolis, IN

Present
(Yes/No)

Council Members:

Tiffany Ball , parent representative	N
Sirilla Blackmon , Division of Mental Health & Addiction, FSSA	N
Rich Burden , Council Chair, IN*SOURCE and parent representative	Y
Michael Dalrymple , Indiana School for the Blind and Visually Impaired	N
Kim Dodson , ARC of Indiana	N
Gina Fleming , Archdiocese of Indianapolis	Y
Melaina Gant , Department of Child Services	N
Carol Guess , parent representative	N
James Hammond III , Indiana Assoc of Rehabilitation Facilities/INARF	N
Kylee Hope , Division of Disability & Rehabilitation Services, FSSA	N
Jan Huffman , parent representative	Y
Latha Joseph , Indianapolis Public Schools	Y
Lisa Kovacs , Hands & Voices International and parent representative	Y
Jodi Logman , community representative	N
John Nally , Indiana Department of Corrections	Y
Danny O’Neill , parent representative	N
Shirley Payne , Indiana State Department of Health	Y
Patty Reed , About Special Kids and parent representative	Y
Dr. Sharon Johnson-Shirley , Lake Ridge Schools	Y
Kristi Tesmer , parent representative	Y
Dr. George Van Horn , Bartholomew Consolidated School Corporation	Y
Lucy Witte , Indiana School for the Deaf Board	N
Dr. Pam Wright , Indiana Department of Education	Y

Also Present:

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Glenda Ritz, Nancy Zemaitis, Tracy Brunner, IDOE

Call to Order

Chair Rich Burden called the meeting to order at 9:30 a. m. Twelve of twenty-three members were present. At the Chair’s request Council members introduced themselves, after which the State Superintendent shared information about her Special Education teaching experiences and her vision for Education in Indiana. Ms. Ritz described the Indiana Department of Education’s plans to implement state and federal legislative and regulatory changes and responded to members’ comments and questions. She concluded her remarks by encouraging council members to be strong and vocal advocates on behalf of students in our state.

Action Items

Kristi Tesmer moved and Sharon Johnson-Shirley seconded to approve the summary of the November meeting. The motion passed.

Information Items

1. DOE Updates

State Director of Special Education Dr. Pam Wright updated the council regarding new staff and plans to hire a data specialist at the Office of Special Education. Council members congratulated Pam on her first anniversary with the Indiana Department of Education.

Nancy Zemaitis, Assistant Director, Office of Special Education, distributed handouts and presented an overview of progress and slippage on State Performance Plan targets per the latest Annual Performance Report (APR) submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. After reviewing the information in the handouts, Nancy responded to questions, comments and suggestions from the council then concluded with a description of the APR time line for state submission, federal review and federal determination regarding Indiana's compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Nancy then shared information concerning the State Systemic Improvement Plan, Indiana's development of and progress toward its selected state-specific goal, and the role of the advisory panel for this initiative. Nancy asked the three SAC members involved in that advisory group to share information as they deem appropriate. General discussion followed concerning the State's approach to implementation as well as interaction among IDOE divisions, stakeholders and the school districts participating in the initial implementation phase. There was additional discussion of concerns about the difficulty of identifying and tracking students who drop out of school before they enter high school and may never have been counted in a graduation cohort for purposes of measuring graduation rates.

Pam Wright recommended, and all agreed, that in the interest of time the council should postpone until May the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) review listed on today's agenda. Pam noted that the State Board of Education Diploma Task Force on which she served has concluded its work; and she responded to questions about how that group's work will be used moving forward.

2. Council Member Reports

SAC Legislative Committee: There was no SAC Legislative Committee update as Chair Kim Dodson was unable to attend the March meeting. Council members briefly discussed legislation passed during the current session of the Indiana General Assembly, which was concluding on the same day as the March SAC meeting.

Discussion Items

Under the standing item pertaining to the Council's statutory responsibilities per IC 20-35-3-1, council members did not hold any discussion during this meeting.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Next SAC Meeting Date

The Chair noted that the advisory council's next meeting is scheduled for June 9, 2016.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:43 p.m.

SAC UPDATE

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT /
INDICATOR UPDATES

March 10, 2016

Nancy Zemaitis

INDICATOR UPDATES

- Update on Post Graduate & Parent Survey results
- Slippage/progress on SPP targets per latest APR
- State Systemic Improvement Plan Update

Parent Survey (Indicator 8)

- Survey is to assess the extent to which “schools” (e.g., special and general educators and administrators) have facilitated the involvement of parents in their child’s educational program (e.g., parent conferences, IEP meetings).
- Number of surveys completed: 7786
 - January 2016 through May 2016

Parent Survey (Indicator 8)

- The parent can complete the web-based survey immediately following the annual case conference the school or at home, or the parent has an option to request a paper copy from the Indiana Department of Education.
- So far in school year 2015-2016 we have received over 12,500 surveys

Statement to Parents	Yes %	No %	NA %
	Overall Percentage		
1. I was treated as an equal partner and CCC member by teachers and other professionals in developing the following areas of my child's Individualized Education Program (IEP)			
a. Participation in the general education setting	98.19%	1.81%	
b. In discussing accommodations and modifications that my child would need	95.81%	1.71%	2.48%
c. Participation in statewide assessments	92.59%	7.41%	
d. Extended school year	45.74%	13.70%	40.56%
e. Related services	76.42%	5.75%	17.73%
2. All of my concerns were addressed	96.79%	2.61%	.60%
3. All of my recommendations were considered	94.40%	2.32%	3.28%
4. I know what options are available if I disagree with a decision concerning my child's educational evaluation or IEP.	95.06%	4.94%	
5. There was enough time to discuss all issues related to the development of my child's IEP	97.55%	2.45%	

Statement to Parents	Yes %	No %	NA%
	Overall Percentage		
1. Communication from the school is written in a way I understand.	98.77%	1.23%	
2. I receive regular progress reports on my child's goals as required in the IEP	96.02%	3.98%	
3. School staff answered any questions I had regarding the Notice of Procedural Safeguards (rules that protect the rights of parents)	89.95%	.98%	9.07%
4. I am satisfied with how often teachers communicate with me	92.40%	6.41%	1.19%
5. I am able to communicate with administrators when needed regarding my child	95.81%	1.98%	2.21%
6. I am satisfied with the way teachers address my concerns and/or questions	96.26%	3.74%	
7. I am satisfied with the way administrators address my concerns and/or questions	96.17%	3.83%	
8. I am aware of organizations that offer information and/or support for parents of students with disabilities	82.02%	8.52%	9.46%

9. The school has offered parent training on special education issues	42.15%	22.37%	35.47%
10. If offered, I would attend school training on special education issues	63.95%	11.94%	24.11%
11. I have attended special education training provided by an outside agency	24.57%	50.73%	24.70%
12. The school provides me the help I need to play an active role in my child's education	89.48%	4.66%	5.86%
13. The school shows sensitivity to the needs of my child and other students with disabilities	93.63%	2.72%	3.65%
QUESTIONS NOT INCLUDED IN CALCULATIONS FOR THE STATE ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: 8,10,11			

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
6898.00	7786.00	92.69%	70.00%	88.59%	Met Target	Slippage

* FFY 2013 Data and FFY 2014 Target are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

Parent Survey (Indicator 8)

- Districts have started to request results for planning purposes
- <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/indicator-8-parent-involvement>
 - Full Report with tables broken out
 - Exceptionality
 - Race/Ethnicity
 - Grade Level
 - Response rate range for all districts: 0% - 59.57%

POST SCHOOL OUTCOMES (Ind. 14)

Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A.** Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B.** Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C.** Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

POST SCHOOL OUTCOMES (Ind. 14)

- Survey contains 9 items
- 26% response rate (consistent with other states)
- 88% of respondents – High School Diploma
- 9% - Certificate of Completion
- 2% - Dropped Out/1% reached maximum age
- <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/indicator-14-post-school-outcomes>

POST SCHOOL OUTCOMES (Ind. 14)

- Want to increase the number of respondents
 - While the sampling plan is deemed acceptable, we would like more data
- Have included information in ‘Tuesday Tips for Teachers’
- Plan to include in other information dissemination

POST SCHOOL OUTCOMES (Ind. 14)

<i># of respondents: 199 (sample)</i>	Number of respondents	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
higher education	71.00	33.21%	36.80%	35.68%	Did Not Meet	No Slippage
higher education or competitively employed	125.00	60.26%	64.00%	62.81%	Did Not Meet	No Slippage
higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment	167.00	79.49%	78.00%	83.92%	Met Target	No Slippage

GRADUATION (Indicator 1)

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
6,495	8,847	69.29%	67.00%	73.41%	Met Target	No Slippage

DROP OUTS (Indicator 2)

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
518	7,460	8.51%	8.51%	6.94%	Met Target	No Slippage

ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION/PROFICIENCY (Indicator 3)

NOTE: Data not available at time of report submission

Suspension/Expulsion (Indicator 4A)

Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
6	370	1.94%	1.30%	1.62%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Suspension/Expulsion (Indicator 4B)

Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	# of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
1	1	370	2.50%	0%	0.27%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Education Environments [children 6-21] (Indicator 5)

	# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total # of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	107,606	152,534	70.01%	68.00%	70.55%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	16,094	152,534	10.65%	11.50%	10.55%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,148 null	152,534	2.08%	2.15%	2.06%	Met Target	No Slippage

Indicator 6 Preschool Environments (Indicator 6)

<i>Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 : 17,931</i>	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,194	40.69%	40.00%	40.12%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,063	33.13%	33.00%	33.81%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Preschool Outcomes (Indicator 7)

	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	72.27%	73.00%	69.83%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	19.83%	23.00%	18.21%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Disproportionate Representations (Indicator 9)

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	370	0%	0%	0%	Met Target	No Slippage

Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories (Ind. 10)

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
10	10	370	1.94%	0%	2.70 %	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Child Find [Initial Evaluations] (Ind 11)

Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
10,376	10,299	98.84%	100%	99.26%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Early Childhood Transition (Indicator 12)

	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	98.56%	100%	99.25%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Secondary Transition (Indicator 13)

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
408	509	81.05%	100%	80.16%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Resolution Sessions (Indicator 15)

Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
38	46	80.43%	73.00%	82.61%	Met Target	No Slippage

Mediation (Indicator 16)

Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements

Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data	Status	Slippage
6	47	53	79.25 %	75.00 %	100%	Met Target	No Slippage

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

NEXT STEPS

- Report submitted to OSEP February 1, 2016
- OSEP reviews
- Dependent upon the OSEP review, State may be able to provide 'clarification'
- OSEP reviews
- OSEP makes a 'determination' of whether or not the State is complying with IDEA, per the indicators
 - Meets, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention, Needs Substantial Intervention

STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

◦ Phase 2- SSIP Planning...

- The National Center for Systemic Improvement(NCSI)- supporting Indiana through a Technical Assistance Plan
- The Instructional Practices Advisory Council determined Evidence Based Practices to support 3 areas of Root Cause using research from NCSI

STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN

- NCSI-Learning Collaborative kicked off with virtual meetings- focused on Multi Tiered Systems of Support Framework
- SSIP Pilot work has continued (visited Garrett Keyser Butler, conducted Root Cause Analysis, and made recommendations for TA)
- State Development Network IDOE team support has built capacity for the SSIP to begin implementation for Phase 3 through involvement of SSIP Team members in SDN meetings, and professional development.

FUTURE: See Infographic (DRAFT)

Indicator 14 (Post School Outcomes)

<http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/indicator-14-post-school-outcomes>

1/3 of school districts are surveyed each year and only a representative sample from that 1/3 are sampled for purposes of contacting and surveying their graduates. This is a slight change in process to try to get a better response.

Indicator 8 (Parent Survey) <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/indicator-8-parent-involvement>

As of January 2016 the number of parent surveys turned in were 9718. This surpasses what was submitted last year at the same time, and is on track to surpass the final total submitted for 2014.