

**National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring
Advisory Board Meeting – Pere Marquette Hotel - New Orleans
March 24 – 26, 2004**

Wednesday, March 24 The Status of Monitoring & Accountability and NCSEAM				
Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
1:00 to 1:30	Organization of Meeting & Introductions	Alan Coulter	Get to know five new Board members, 2 new staff, and invited guests	Introduction of new board members: P. Mayfield, P. Trohanis, M. Brauen, B. Gantwerk, M. Armstrong, T. Yanan New Staff: S. Walsh, L. Persinger
1:30 to 2:15	Report from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)	Ruth Ryder and Larry Wexler	Increased awareness of OSEP activities related monitoring/accountability as background information for NCSEAM activities	<p><u>OSEP Update PowerPoint</u></p> <p><u>Ryder</u>: New OSEP memo to be released within days with new data table. APRs due from each state 3/31/04 and are part of the continuous improvement component. 24 states engaged in systems verification component last year. Focused monitoring/intervention include designated high risk states with compliance contracts as well as “low performance” which will be defined in the upcoming OSEP memo. OSEP accountability system includes three levels of inquiry followed by intervention based on inquiry information obtained.</p> <p>Verification visits for general supervision, data collection, and state-wide assessment address Part B & C and provide OSEP an opportunity to assess reliability of state’s monitoring and data systems. More variability in Part B monitoring systems across states, with some still putting C monitoring components in place. Still seeing problems with states using all of the data information they have available to them for monitoring. Discipline data is difficult for states to collect, personnel data in Part C is a problem area, and 619 reporting also has problems. State-wide assessment – 13 states still do not report on performance of students on alternative assessments. Still difficult to see the impact of monitoring system within a state without going to the local level. Communities of practice up and running with some good work products and opportunities arising at this point.</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: PART & GPRA have forced better defined outcomes. The website has all of the performance indicators as well as the objectives with numerical targets. (slides 15-20). Major objectives under Part B (slides 21-29), Section 619 (slides 30-33), Part C (slides 34-39).</p> <p><i>Q&A:</i></p> <p><u>Armstrong</u>: How will performance measures shift to implementation?</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: Goal setting exercise that we hope the states will see value in as use of data is pressed on states. These are values statements, but OMB will tie accomplishment to the budget process. Working to align priorities that go out.</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: APR will provide some of the information regarding these. Will APR be revised for better alignment?</p> <p><u>Ryder</u>: The APR will not provide all. Not planning to revise APR – feel they are aligned well enough.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: When these say “all” does that mean 100%? Are there different timeframes? Will this include racial/ethnic breakdown?</p>

Wednesday, March 24 The Status of Monitoring & Accountability and NCSEAM

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Ryder/Wexler</u>: We have long term, etc. all means 100% and is consistent with law. It will include racial/ethnic breakdowns in reporting as a required area in AYP and all are consistent with NCLB.</p>
2:15 to 3:00	NCSEAM Accomplishments, Updates, & Changes	Alan Coulter and NCSEAM staff	Aware of NCSEAM activities in states and with OSEP related to project goals	<p><i>Project and Technical Assistance Partner Map & Accomplishments Summary</i></p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Goal 1: board diversity refers to viewpoints from which members stake their interest in the larger issue. FMIC has been very helpful in articulating to states. Oklahoma is the last state to participate and that is scheduled for July. All FMICs have been followed-up with workplans. The FMIC will be administered again to evaluate the process of focused monitoring.</p> <p>Goal 2: Map of NCSEAM project partners map shows dark states that are partners with workplans while the lighter states are receiving technical assistance and may be in line to become partner states. Oklahoma is an immediate pending project partner state. Will be developing parent training modules for “Parents as Monitors” so a new workgroup will be established to address this.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: completed review of goals 2 & 3.</p> <p>3+2 review upcoming in next 4 months for continuation of OSEP funding through 5 years. Open to recipients comments:</p> <p><u>Howarth</u>: collaboration with Jane Nell to help find the meaning in the data and develop the procedure manual after a watch dog group caused examination of staffing issues and resources. Through new leadership was able to drum up excitement within the leadership about FM.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: Expressed concern that NCSEAM works only with SEAs and family groups are not part of the process unless the SEA brings them in. Sees participation from families as initiated by states to be an “afterthought”.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Pointed out that in some cases NCSEAM has met with parents who subsequently pushed the SEA to include them in their processes with FM and NCSEAM.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: recommended that NCSEAM notify PTIs when we are coming to the state to invite or solicit their participation at that state level.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: FMIC has been the “foot-in-the-door” tool.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: cautioned that the process not be “perverted”. As long as parents and advocates are on the checklist how can we make sure they are involved . . .</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: our client, on the surface, is always going to be the SEA but we want to work with some local agencies as well.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: Primary client is SEA and purpose of advisory group is to ensure that the system is set up and monitored to make sure we get this accomplished in each state.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: checklist is completed with the SEA and that is our primary client.</p> <p><u>Margolis</u>: checklist represents core fundamental things that FM represents that without it, is not FM.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: We represent the FMIC as the advisory board’s checklist rather than OSEPs. The statements on the FMIC indicates what the board believes is characteristic of stakeholder group and FM.</p>

Wednesday, March 24 The Status of Monitoring & Accountability and NCSEAM

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Howarth</u>: In NM we have significant parent and family involvement in the FM process. We need engaged involvement and not just advice.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: I didn't realize until a few months ago that other states didn't operate like NM in (FM) as it pertains to advocate and parent involvement.</p> <p><u>Trohanis</u>: The collaboration has been extraordinarily positive. Specifically the skills of Jane Nell who was able to stand in front of stakeholders and working through the checklist. Thanks to the NCSEAM staff.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: the integrity of what was meant by FM several years ago evolves as Congress and others get a hold of the term and refine or redefine it. The real question is "are we going in the direction that you believe we need to be going in to address FM and are they making any difference?" I also expect some discussion on Friday about the issue of building capacity with more states in the future to impact FM in more states.</p>
3:00 to 3:15	Break			
3:15 to 4:00	Report of the Third Party Evaluator	Robin McWilliam	Informed of results of independent evaluation of NCSEAM activities and progress on project goals	<p><u><i>Third Party Evaluation Report to Date</i></u> and <u><i>presentation slides</i></u></p> <p>Pretest FMIC completed for states that have done the checklists thus far. Copies of workplans go to Dr. McWilliam. Most common concern in plan is the data system. FM (agencies) is second with stakeholder process as third. Used email approach rather than telephone to get SEA perspectives with much better responses than by telephone.</p> <p>*favorable conclusion by independent evaluator of NCSEAM activities and their impact at this point in time. This evaluation is based on a single-subject concept with each state serving as its own control.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: Can other stakeholders be included in the NCSEAM 3rd party evaluation?</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: Yes, if the board can assure that families are prepared to respond to questions about the center. Is this as possible?</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: It is difficult with this center because a lot of it is about influencing and helping SEAs develop their own systems including use of and involvement of stakeholders but the confounding variable is teasing out NCSEAM's effect on stakeholders when NCSEAM is geared to "service" SEAs as the "client".</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: Can stakeholders be asked if they feel involved, etc. Is there a way of assessing the input that the stakeholders feel they have?</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: It is not in the center's responsibilities to make the stakeholder input happen. NCSEAM must work with the SEAs to encourage the value in stakeholder involvement but perhaps an unfair evaluation component of NCSEAM.</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: We will include P&As and PTI as a component of validity.</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: What is your role and who is your client because I worry about the risk of your (bias).</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: I am independent evaluator and I am accountable to the board to seek data that they find meaningful. I don't ignore OSEP input in the point of the project.</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: concerned about potential bias of all of the relationships.</p>

Wednesday, March 24 The Status of Monitoring & Accountability and NCSEAM

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Wexler</u>: the diversity of the board is part of the safeguards in this process.</p> <p><u>Bledsoe</u>: Do some states also have their own independent evaluators in addition to you (McWilliams) who is evaluating the center. Perhaps the Center could encourage the states to adopt independent evaluators as well.</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: I am evaluating the center and not FM. It sounds like you are suggesting that states be encouraged to independently evaluate their own FM process. This is on the checklist (confirmed by Jane Nell).</p> <p><u>Margolis</u>: You already ask one question that gets at the question about stakeholder involvement that is contained within the report.</p> <p><u>Copenhaver</u>: would it be beneficial to measure “capacity building”?</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: We don’t have information in this area yet. I need to spend time with some of the major entities like NECTAC that will exist beyond the life of NCSEAM to look at that capacity.</p> <p><u>Fisher</u>: Data question regarding graphs. Yellow and blue bars are means on the items.</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: Means of the percentage of completion across states for that particular section. The standard deviations are very broad.</p> <p><u>Smith</u>: What is the future role of the 3rd party evaluator?</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: I need to report back to you on the post-test checklist completion. I will also keep in contact with the states and observe in order to give a report about the process.</p> <p><u>Smith</u>: I am concerned that we need to make sure we get beyond the data systems with states because they could talk about that all day.</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: We focus on data because we have to rely on the accuracy of the data because that is what FM is all about.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: How often are we going to redo the FMIC.</p> <p><u>Luster</u>: 12-16 month follow up with each state</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: you won’t see a lot of growth in that time</p> <p><u>Luster</u>: It may not be huge but we should see some movement.</p> <p><u>Trohanis</u>: The workplans are the “intervention” plans and some question about the role of the plan and the implementation of it requires some evaluation component because it will bridge the needs identified earlier.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: states select what they want to work on, NCSEAM doesn’t dictate the areas though they are encouraged where needed. Therefore the states may not make progress on FM as it has been defined by this board which is source of anxiety within NCSEAM. We always try to involve the RRC in working with each entity. We will have to be cautious about what we conclude about progress on the FMIC.</p> <p><u>Benham</u>: As a board we should not put all of our eggs in one basket when it comes to FM. FM is in a context and does not stand alone.</p>
4:00 to 5:00	Decision-Making on <u>Focused Monitoring Implementation</u>	Alan Coulter and Jane Nell Luster	For discussion and decision making 1. Standardize Data	<p><u>Focused Monitoring Implementation Checklist – Revised 3/2004</u></p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Addressing reliability internally – it was determined that Jane Nell will be the exclusive FMIC facilitator for all pre and post-tests from this point forward.</p>

Wednesday, March 24 The Status of Monitoring & Accountability and NCSEAM

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
	<p><u>Checklist</u></p>		<p>Collection by NCSEAM using the FMIC</p> <p>2. Review of existing FMIC as the measure of implementation of Focused Monitoring (ground rules?)</p> <p>3. Consideration of New items</p>	<p><u>Luster</u>: NCSEAM is recommending adding 2 items. 1) Item 1.1.6 is a recommendation for counting the parent attendance at the IEP for Part B. 2) Item 2.1.1 d adds - individuals who receive or have received services.</p> <p>All other changes were modifying terminology in keeping with national changes in language “goal” replaces “priority”;</p> <p><u>Smith</u>: why “goal” vs. “priority”</p> <p><u>Ryder</u>: align with GPRA</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: I want a definition of “goals”</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: we will provide that tomorrow</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: How do you interpret 2.1.1 d</p> <p><u>Luster</u>: anyone who receives or received services in the past</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: that was one of our goals and we ended up having to do focus groups in order to get the feedback because they couldn’t get in to be on committees</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: I see family involvement as a focus of Part C</p> <p><u>Luster</u>: It may need to be a Part B only issue.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: I like that 1.1.6 in its simplicity.</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: grammatical issue with ‘parents’.</p> <p><u>Howarth</u>: concern about what data would/could be used to rank order districts</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: It is important to remember that this is not a report card for the state. It is a baseline on FM and an instrument used to (constructively) engage a state in discussion about FM.</p> <p><u>Fletcher</u>: Do you actually (NCSEAM) collect indicator data?</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: That isn’t how we would evaluate the effectiveness of NCSEAM.</p> <p><u>Fletcher</u>: If you don’t try to see how the FMIC is related to the impact on indicators then it would just be another process.</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: 1.1.6 – why is it there?</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: The board passed a vote last meeting to have NCSEAM promote a way for families to be counted and this is what was proposed.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: The focus of FM is to help states get better outcomes for kids. . . .</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: The resolution passed was to count parents as part of FM.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: Question could be “does data system include information on parent involvement?”</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: but the question is linked to the indicators</p> <p><u>Fletcher</u>: This item doesn’t bother me and I think whether it is an outcome is up for debate</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: We are trying to move the system forward and conventional wisdom shows us that when parents are involved the outcomes for kids are better. I think it needs to be counted or I don’t think we will see a change in the educational system. This question starts it by planting a seed. It is not about “nailing” somebody on it.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: I agree that it is critical but why include one indicator and not all indicators.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: it is not in the indicator list and is not collected anywhere.</p> <p><u>Howarth</u>: would it be wiser to ask a simpler question “do you currently systematically collect</p>

Wednesday, March 24 The Status of Monitoring & Accountability and NCSEAM

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
Note:	<i>Dinner on your own</i>			<p>parent involvement or satisfaction data?"</p> <p><u>Jennings</u>: Is this the only question that should be asked? Secondly, most of the FMIC questions are process questions not outcome questions.</p> <p><u>Smith</u>: maybe there should be cells under the question with a subsection. We don't know what those things would be.</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: I like Sam's proposal and make sure the question asks about parent involvement AND satisfaction</p> <p><u>Goldberg</u>: if you want to make sure that parents are at the meeting, then one way to do it is to count them. It is a process of encouraging schools to make sure parents are at the meeting.</p> <p><u>Bledsoe</u>: data systems don't mean a thing though; I would hope that involvement would be encouraged through the IFSP process.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: table vote until Friday morning</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
8:30 to 9:00	Orientation to Selecting Indicators (including a review of FM state indicators)	Alan Coulter and Sandy Schmitz	Review of Premises associated with Focused Monitoring, Measures and Indicators	<p><i>Handouts: <u>Overview of Data Availability & Feasibility for Use in Focused Monitoring and FM Concept Paper</u></i></p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: States are focused on data because it is useful in depicting program performance. Current proposals in congress have no new indicators. We are reviewing this because we want to be careful of discussions about what additional variables would be “good to know.” We defined FM indicators through work groups. We have always had to make distinctions about what is measurable and useful now (available to us). We had 26 indicators for Part B and of those we have six are available to us now. Part C had 9 indicators that the stakeholders group thought was important but only 6 are measurable and useful. In all three previous meetings we have struggled with Part B having many more complex data systems than Part C. We now have someone else who will address some of the Part C issues.</p> <p><u>Schmitz</u>: Reviewed the status of states use of indicators. Different states have different focuses on the indicators such as LRE, etc.</p> <p><u>Goldberg</u>: The states are requesting your assistance.</p> <p><u>Schmitz/Luster</u>: States used to collect just what was required and now they have broadened their focus of measurement as they move toward FM.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: The focus now is on “growth monitors”. It is a lot more complicated underneath than it appears on the surface.</p>
9:00 to 9:45	Description of National Early Childhood Outcomes Center	Kathy Hebbeler, Project Director	Informed about NECOC mission and projected activities	<p><i><u>Early Childhood Outcome Center PowerPoint slides</u></i></p> <p><u>Hebbeler</u>: We have a website where most of the basic slides will be available. In five years we expect data that can be aggregated at the national level and regular use of outcomes data for documenting program effects and improving programs at the local and state levels. We are a five year project that started in 10/03. We are funded by OSEP and collaborate with a number of other organizations including SRI, FPG, JGCP, NASDSE, and University of Connecticut.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: Is someone a liaison with Part C people?</p> <p><u>Hebbeler</u>: No</p> <p>Activities include collaboration with stakeholders, T/A based on research (what we are learning and what needs to be researched), and research on issues related to development and implementation of outcome measures. We have a child Technical work group and a family technical work group, Part C work group, 619 work group. We will collect information about state activities in outcome measurement, develop resource documents, seek stakeholder input and build consensus for components of outcomes systems, intensive work with 6-8 states (lab states) for T/A and development of outcomes systems, and develop recommendations for OSEP. No states are selected yet and we have not determined criteria for selection of lab states. We have 2 approaches: fast-track and slow-track. The fast track is based on OSEP’s need for outcomes data immediately whereas the slow track is focused on more comprehensive systems that can be available to states for their own improvement efforts. Eleven steps to building a system to generate outcomes data and fast/slow track: 1) identify overall purpose of system and</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>establish priorities; 2) Identify outcome areas for children & families (<i>look for considerations document on ECO website soon elaborating domains as well as alternative conceptualizations of child outcomes</i>) These outcomes haven't been done because there is no easy way to do it; 3) Develop outcome statements for children and families – at the present there are thousands of these already written that need to be reviewed; 4) Formulate the evidence statements – these are core to the system and drive everything else about outcomes – the question is “what is meant by improvement in young children?” because children will improve regardless and we need to be able to determine the impact of our programs on children that are separate from developmental improvements that occur naturally – OSEP will not be dictating an instrument that must be used with all children nationally; . . . ECO plans to provide recommendations and basis for recommendations for each of the 11 steps. Consensus is our goal. We will be communicating via website, listservs (possibly), and meetings.</p> <p><u>Goldberg:</u> where are you located?</p> <p><u>Hebbeler:</u> California</p> <p>Part of our mission is to connect with the other early childhood groups and link with other national efforts in specific ways, as well as within state contexts because we don't want parallel tracks of outcomes with regular early childhood and early childhood for children with disabilities. We want a coordinated outcome effort. We want to put together a compendium of what is going on out there.</p> <p><u>Brooks:</u> Confidentiality for HIPPA is important to consider because our best outcomes in program evaluation are still how children are doing. I hope you are considering that.</p> <p><u>Hebbeler:</u> We are looking at all of these complex issues and part of what we need to do is document it.</p> <p><u>Brooks:</u> I think a lot of the HIPPA concerns are misperceived.</p> <p><u>Goldberg:</u> Do you have any representation of FICC on your groups?</p> <p><u>Hebbeler:</u> FICC – no.</p> <p><u>Goodman:</u> How do you overlap with the Family measure NCSEAM is going to do.</p> <p><u>Hebbeler:</u> there is some small overlap but we believe we are distinct in that we are planning to focus on capacities. The biggest issue is that others don't recognize the distinction. The measurement issues are likely to be different.</p> <p><u>Mayfield:</u> In the 619 issues do you have local providers or just states.</p> <p><u>Hebbeler:</u> Just states.</p> <p><u>Trohanis:</u> Can you clarify the short 3-5 outcomes on 619 and C?</p> <p><u>Hebbeler:</u> Some of the issues are what are the domains and will they be similar or the same between 619 and C and so far they are not the same. You will have the opportunity to comment through the Federal Register in the future.</p> <p><u>Copenhaver:</u> Have you worked with those 8 states yet? And what marketing strategies are you going to use because my experience is that states don't know what all of these new centers are about. I encourage involvement of RRC and broad marketing plan to inform states.</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Hebbeler</u>: No states are selected or on board yet. We have a mechanism in place to work closely with the RRCs.</p> <p><u>Follow-up from Ryder</u>: I'm going to follow up on the question about states becoming more aware of what is going on with all of the different centers. One of the big needs that has been apparent is that we are putting a lot of money into TA that states don't know about so we are working on a number of different strategies to get the word out. It will start at the leadership conference with state directors where we are doing a presentation and pulling in centers for that conference. We will have short print products about each of the centers as well. In the grand scheme of things we don't really put enough money in TA through centers because our need across states is so much greater than funding available. In a follow up to yesterday I wanted to talk about the GAO work. They are doing an 'investigation' of our monitoring at the request of Senator Kennedy by visiting a number of states. They have gathered documents from OSEP from 1997-present to address 3 questions: What does OSEP monitoring look like? How is it working? What enforcement is OSEP doing? The exit brief is in May with the final report in July 2004. It has been a challenge.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: Why are they doing this?</p> <p><u>Ryder</u>: To inform reauthorization.</p> <p><u>Gloeckler</u>: When I testified last year they focused on enforcement and sanctions because they want to find a way to get states to do what they need to do.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: Could you include families and advocates in the info dissemination about the new centers?</p> <p><u>Ryder</u>: Yes, we are planning on informing about centers via other conferences as well so the word gets out broadly.</p> <p><u>Howarth</u>: Regardless of GAO inquiry its report will go public which has significant implications for this group, NCSEAM. We ought to pay attention to this at meetings that follow the release of the report.</p>
9:45 to 10:30	Presentation of Part C Data and Discussion of Issues	Jane Nell Luster, Sharon Walsh, Pat Snyder, Kathy Hebbeler and Marsha Brauen	<p>1. Awareness of data on Part C Systems, including issues about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • settings data; • exiting data; <p>2. Awareness of plans for child outcome work</p>	<p><u>Ryder</u>: We are moving into the early childhood data on the agenda next. We have a long history of data for Part B and things have been progressing and we have a lot of information in this area but we are not in the same place in the early intervention program. Part C is very vulnerable in states and is often threatened for elimination. They are not as well established as the Part B programs. When I tried to find out what is known about the Part C programs there was less information available to demonstrate the effects/results. It is important to OSEP to begin to demonstrate the success of early intervention programs.</p> <p><u>Data Presentation (refer specifically to slides 3-13)</u></p> <p><u>Luster</u>: Presentation on data related to Part C. The way the data are reported, there is no way to break down the information/data by age. There is very little data that are available in required reports to congress at this point.</p> <p><u>Part C presentation slides (refer specifically to slides 1-28)</u></p> <p><u>Walsh/Snyder/Brauen/Hebbeler</u>: We hope to have a discussion with you about these issues and</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>get recommendations from the board for OSEP. The overall context is based on what information we have available at this time. It is particularly relevant to discuss the level at which information is available. The first issue is child find/identification issues. Slide 7 lists some of the current issues related to the child find/identification indicators. Some states actually have “age of referral” information.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: Although we have grouped states it is based on disability criteria in those states which vary.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: What is the issue that causes the difference for the 12/1 data?</p> <p><u>Brauen</u>: December 1 is a snapshot in time and refers only to that time of children who are under 1 still at that time.</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: 2 states (IN & PA) have CAPTA mandatory referrals to Part C for cases of child abuse 0-3 years. And CAPTA reissues calls for initial referral at that point so this will be expanding.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: Depending on the states eligibility criteria a varied number of those children will be found eligible.</p> <p><u>Hebbeler</u>: We know a couple things from NEILS about this. They would say we are probably more likely missing children 14-18 months and older. There are a disproportional number of upper income SP/LA children identified in the NEILS data. Low birth weight is also a missing group.</p> <p><u>Benham</u>: I’m not sure where the resources are going to come from for the CAPTA issue. I’m afraid states will drop out.</p> <p><u>Walsh/Hebbeler/Snyder/Brauen</u>: Lets’ look at settings issues (slide 11). Note that there are some areas where little to no information is collected.</p> <p><u>Trohanis</u>: Will we know with the new APR how many children have IFSPs?</p> <p><u>Walsh/Hebbeler/Snyder/Brauen</u>: No. Look to slide 11 for issues with setting indicators. Any given state will define ‘programs for typically developing children’ in different ways because there is no federal definition. Dr. Brauen reported that breakdown by age is available but is not reported yet. There is current work to expand the reporting from WESTAT. Dr. Snyder also noted recent conversations on the CoP about settings/environments around locations versus what is actually happening there.</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: The unit of analysis is the ‘child’. When a child goes from one setting to another for services, where is the primary setting? Is it the one where the person spends the most time?</p> <p><u>Walsh/Hebbeler/Snyder/Brauen</u>: Yes. IFSPs are revised often enough to capture changes in setting within the life of the IFSP. What we are looking at is short of what we generally talking about regarding settings.</p>
10:30 to 10:45	<i>Break</i>			
10:45 to 11:00	Recommendations Of Part C Indicators	Sharon Walsh, Pat Snyder, Kathy	Recommendations on any additional Part C Indicators, if any are necessary	<u>Walsh/Hebbeler/Snyder/Brauen</u> : Now looking at Exiting Part C, the issues in current indicators are listed on slide 15. We don’t know exit data by age because it is not collected by age. There is a surprising high number of children who do not stay in Part C through 36 months.

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
		Hebbeler and Marsha Brauen		<p><u>Yanan</u>: Why are a large number of children leaving before age 3?</p> <p><u>Walsh/Hebbeler/Snyder/Brauen</u>: Many reasons: goals met, parent withdrawal, cost, etc. Slide 20 shows issues with indicators of ‘functional abilities’. The state APR is all that is available for data on this indicator at this point. <u>Hebbeler</u>: NEILS considers 1.5 hours per week of services as the “time” for services to show improvement.</p> <p><u>Trohanis</u>: Sounds like the APR is going to be the mechanism to capture the snapshot of what is going on at the national level.</p> <p><u>Hebbeler</u>: That is what we are going to help with the states to make sure we get to a national aggregation of data.</p> <p><u>Ysseldyke</u>: You need to do this at the level of the individual student rather than tracking the group to show improvement because kids go in and out of services and it drives the trend lines apart. Be careful when reporting on performance indicators to report at the individual level rather than the group level.</p> <p><u>Walsh/Hebbeler/Snyder/Brauen</u>: There isn’t a program assumption that we can get each new birth year of kids to show improvement from the previous year’s group of kids. Though this is a question on the table that is important for people to understand.</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: There is a study in CT right now that has been powerful. . .</p> <p><u>Walsh/Hebbeler/Snyder/Brauen</u>: Consider family capacity indicator issues on slide 26. A lot of families start at the ‘top’ on capacity measures so increasing capacity may not be the right question to ask for outcomes.</p> <p><u>Goldberg</u>: I have an issue with the term ‘capacity’ so another term would be more comfortable.</p> <p><u>Walsh/Hebbeler/Snyder/Brauen</u>: The Federal Register notice will allow influence on the terminology and APR questions. The APR language is “capacity enhanced” whereas in GPR and PART it is “family report”. Slide 28 presents NCSEAM recommendations to OSEP regarding the Part C indicators.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: Make sure we recommend portraying cohort breakdown by disability and age groups noted in bullet 2 of slide 28.</p> <p>BOARD VOTE: ACCEPT RECOMMENDATION</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: Do you really want to recommend no change in existing indicators or just ignore it.</p> <p>BOARD VOTE TO GO ON RECORD TO ACCEPT RECOMMENDATION OF NO CHANGE: ACCEPTED</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: If you have the data and it provides no actionable information then it needs to be revisited because it is a burden on somebody.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: We will report back to you about how these recommendations look and how many states currently have the data to report.</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Wexler</u>: The point is to better serve your rankings and if it doesn't make a difference then keep it simple.</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: I think it is critical data because if we can't get at the number of kids born with disabilities and see if it is comparable to served then we can't do much.</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: What did we actually vote on?</p> <p>REVOTE ON MOTION TO ADOPT POSITION THAT THERE BE NO CHANGES TO EXISTING PART C INDICATORS AS RECOMMENDED BY INSEAM: ACCEPTED.</p>
11:00 to 12:00	Parent/Family Perceptions and Participation Measures	Baty Elbaum and William Fisher	<p>Board members will have reviewed the FINAL version of the Part B & Part C Parent/Family Perceptions and Participation Measures and be aware of the Pilot Study Phase</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who owns the data? 2. Can Pilot data be used by individual states as accountability information? 	<p><u>Measures of Parent/Family Perceptions and Participation slides</u></p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: Thank you to the Board for the rich input and experiences concerning the development of the items for this measure. I have collapsed what would be a 5 year process to about a year and a half. Review of phase 1 of instrument development. We have included items having to do with perceptions of child and family outcomes. There are many ways to think about these outcomes. What we are concerned about is starting to look at perceptions of child improvement by different domain areas. This is in the C and B instrument and definitions are provided with the instrument. As far as family outcomes we use "family capacity" language because it is the statutory language and are measuring perceptions of increased knowledge, skills, and confidence. We leave to the ECOC to develop other measures of increased "family capacity".</p> <p><u>Armstrong</u>: Is there a tool out there that measures a child's lack of organizational and planning skills that can help shape objectives?</p> <p><u>Fletcher</u>: Sure there are, but I think people are talking about a set of behaviors that interfere in the learning setting.</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: We will cue parents to skip items that don't apply</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: There wasn't a "don't know" category, why?</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: If you include that column then many parents will select it rather than give an opinion so we didn't want it which is consistent with our view of survey methodology.</p> <p><u>Trohanis</u>: What is the relationship of Health/Medical to the others?</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: We are not going to limit ourselves to practices or issues that are regulated but we want to ask about those issues that we believe are important to families and outcomes whether or not the data are required.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: How is it going to be set up in the survey that the child may only have a delay in one area?</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: Early on in the descriptive information we ask parents to check what areas or issues exist for their child. We are now poised to enter phase 2 which is piloting or national validation of items. We have a national sampling plan.</p> <p><u>Fisher</u>: We determined these numbers by targeting national representation by the disability (Part B), age, ethnic groups with 50 responses per cell. This will allow us to establish a valid/reliable measure for each of these groups. Fifty is over-sampling and 30 has been repeated as minimum in the literature. We want to over-sample in case of problems with survey completion or</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>scanning problems. We want to get the representation we need. Reception of this pilot has been very good.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: Did you determine what numbers in each cell by actual incidence data?</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Those numbers do exist and getting them is a logistical issues.</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: The purpose of doing this is to calibrate the items, understand the dimensions being measured, and select a range of a smaller number of items to measure each dimension.</p> <p><u>Fletcher</u>: You are talking about item development.</p> <p><u>Fisher</u>: We are less interested in ‘satisfaction’ than parent “perceptions”. All of the dimensions that we are looking at popped up in the 4 states that we have already analyzed.</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: NCSEAM is going to provide as much technical assistance as possible to the states that will be collecting the calibration data initially. We will run another pilot to focus on administration once we have the items calibrated. We are considering web-based versions, etc. We are looking at alternate forms and different languages as well. We don’t have enough money for printed different language forms.</p> <p><u>Fletcher</u>: Don’t you want to validate one language and then adapt the form in another language and evaluate the transfer to other groups.</p> <p><u>Smith</u>: I’m concerned about the jargon and reading level of the items in the survey.</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: We did not run any of the standard readability formulas on the items. Based on my experience I would say that the reading levels range from 3-8th grades. The specialized language that is there is part of special education. There are definitions on documents that they will also get.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: Are there going to be instructions given when we do the pilot? Some of the terms just won’t translate into other languages.</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: There will be instructions that will be developed.</p> <p><u>Goldberg</u>: I had experienced Parent training directors look at this. One of the issues is that some of the questions are based on law and some on promising practice. The issue is that some parents will be confused about what is mandated by law and what a promising practice is. Can the items be separated by this issue? Also, on transition, there is no item on interagency collaborations.</p> <p><u>Trohanis</u>: I had a similar feeling in the Part C questions regarding the balance and the law. Some of the wording is an issue.</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: In general the purpose is to provide data that can be aggregated to give the monitoring agency some information for decision-making.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: I don’t want to make a standard that is based only on the law because we are trying to improve programs. I don’t want us to set the lowest common denominator as the standard.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: I really appreciate the survey because it really does tell a story and I think it is a great start.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: We are going to move on this so please get comments about items to Batya today.</p> <p><u>Hebbeler</u>: Parents are going to have a bias for positive reporting and I think a DK option will let</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>you know what families don't actually remember versus making the programs look better than they really are. There may be an issue that "providing information to families" is based on need and the ability of the program to detect those needs and not "overwhelm" the family. I'm afraid that "no" responses will be interpreted negatively when they may not reflect something that is negative in actuality.</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: The data will bear out which items work and don't work so we want to let the data speak for themselves.</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: I worry about a naïve halo effect that might mask what you are actually looking for.</p> <p><u>Fisher</u>: This comes up a lot in this type of rating scale. People don't want to say anything bad about their providers. When you offer an expanded rating scale such as the six points then you divide people with those issues. This point now is not to evaluate or analyze districts or states but just to calibrate the items.</p> <p><u>Elbaum</u>: Phase 3 will be item calibration/data analysis to determine "core" items for each dimension. Phase 4 will include the creation of a unified database. Phase 5 is maintenance of measurement systems. The timeline is forms printed by May 2004 and returned by October 2004 with analysis and shorter survey instrument completed by March 2005 with implementation in partner pilot states by 2005-06.</p>
12:00 to 1:00	<i>Lunch Provided by NCSEAM</i>			
1:00 to 1:45	Presentation of 619 Data and Discussion of Issues	Jane Nell Luster, Sharon Walsh, Pat Snyder, Kathy Hebbeler and Marsha Brauen	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Awareness of data on 619, including issues about settings (LRE); 2. Awareness of plans for child outcome work 	<p><i>Data Presentation (refer specifically to slides 15-18)</i></p> <p><u>Luster</u>: There are no OSEP ranks for preschool for last year. The settings reflected on the graph include only the top 4. We do not have breakouts by age because it is not available; it is not reported out by age.</p> <p><u>Ysseldyke</u>: So enrollments change over time, so what? There can be so many reasons why this happens. Is more good or is less good?</p> <p><u>East</u>: What is the follow up at looking at the data?</p> <p><i>Part C presentation slides (refer specifically to slides 29-51)</i></p> <p><u>Walsh/Snyder/Hebbeler/Brauen</u>: There is nothing in the GPRA, PART, APR, CIFMS about this.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: Do we have that by race/ethnicity?</p> <p><u>Luster</u>: Yes.</p> <p><u>Mayfield</u>: You'll find in a lot of states that we don't do a good job of serving minorities. . .</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: There may be different comments about why the data change if you look at each state rather than across the whole country.</p> <p><u>Ysseldyke</u>: I understand that but I think we only have correlates of kids getting services, etc. I was in PA when we did child find and our goal was just to track how many kids were getting into services and shifted quickly into what was happening in services. I could make the argument that less kids in services could be better because it means fewer are needed.</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Yanan</u>: Is there a way of ensuring the kids aren't getting missed? If there are weaknesses in the identification processes then we may be missing kids but wouldn't know it.</p> <p><u>Ysseldyke</u>: That is a difficult question to answer. You have to deal with the elicit concept of appropriate success.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: Our concept of good or bad is shifting because of increasing resources over time.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: I think you have to count it, because if you don't then you can't ask the questions and work toward improvement.</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: I think it would be helpful to have the breakdown by age cohorts.</p> <p><u>Benham</u>: Is there anything that looks at birth-3 and 3-5 ages?</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: That's why we want to see an age breakdown in reporting.</p> <p><u>Brook</u>: The question we should be asking is why aren't we picking up more children earlier?</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: Do we have access to data that show that when we don't pick up kids earlier that they don't need special ed?</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Yes, but we aren't able to present that today. Those are research projects and these data are the current data collected for systems' transparency.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: We collect percentage, right?</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: We collect numbers.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: You can come up with an estimate.</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: Not all states have the same preschool programs.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: I don't think you need to break it down by age unless that state has a low enrollment overall. If the enrollment is low in a state then a breakdown will tell you where in time the breakdown is for children.</p> <p><u>Ysseldyke</u>: You can't put unique identifiers on kids so you can't track them over time unless we have something like that.</p> <p><u>Brauen</u>: There are 40 states that have individual record keeping systems for kids with disabilities which may or may not use unique identifiers. They collect what they need for the December 1 data but those cannot be run longitudinally.</p> <p><u>Ysseldyke</u>: That sounds like a significant thing for a monitoring center to make a strong position for use of unique identifiers. Unless you get there you can't answer some questions.</p> <p><u>Brauen</u>: There are so many issues about what number to use.</p> <p><u>Ysseldyke</u>: If you can't make some connection between who is who then you can't look at important issues.</p> <p><u>Brauen</u>: That is a costly proposal for which funding is often not available.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: The real key is for kids that move back and forth between regular and special education.</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: We are starting that sort of system now in NJ.</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: I'll bet we are talking about two different populations.</p> <p><u>Walsh/Brauen</u>: Let's move to 'transition' and 'environments'. Slide 39 shows the issues with indicators for the environments data. States have a hard time reporting on kindergarteners</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>because settings are more similar to Part B in some places.</p> <p><u>Mayfield</u>: I think age is an issue here as well. Home would be a less restrictive setting for a 3 year old but not necessarily for a 5 year old.</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: I disagree.</p> <p><u>Brauen</u>: It looks at the setting in which the child spends most of his/her time.</p> <p><u>Howarth</u>: The rank order indicator presents problems when states have different preschool options and is interested from the data perspective but may be a problem from the monitoring perspective.</p> <p><u>Bledsoe</u>: Could there be a look at this like there is in EI?</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: So if we are going to rank we could have another piece of information about that state?</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: GA is the only state with public universal pre-k</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: The data are not reflecting a critical issue because it only reflects where the child is receiving special education.</p> <p><u>Brauen</u>: That isn't available in the current data systems but it is changing.</p> <p><u>Ysseldyke</u>: I would suggest that you make a list of the 10 questions you want to answer by gathering this data because it will guide you in refining your data collection systems.</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: That brings us to "readiness" which is "Are the children making progress in this setting?" There is no nationally collected 618 data on child outcomes. The issues haven't changed in this area.</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: We want children to move into kindergarten when it is age appropriate, not when they are "ready".</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: We know what high quality typical early childhood programs need to look like. Most of our typical EI programs don't meet those standards and if our goal is to place children in those programs then what is the point. I don't know what the LRE data means in that sense. I think it is an important policy question.</p> <p><u>Snyder</u>: There is not much difference in the typical versus sped programs in the literature out there right now.</p> <p><u>Mayfield</u>: If you look at self-contained preschool sped classrooms it is not good practice either. If I had a choice as a parent then I would want some typical peer interaction.</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: Is it an outcome or is it something else?</p> <p><u>Hebbeler</u>: We are going to have a huge data source through Head Start pretty soon.</p> <p><u>Trohanis</u>: Refer back to the stakeholder paper on FM. It would interesting to go back and see the work here in comparison to where we are evolving.</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: In light of that, we may want to postpone a vote until tomorrow after folks have the opportunity to look at that paper.</p> <p>Regarding parent involvement indicator the issues are noted on slide 49.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: What does facilitated mean in the APR?</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: States are developing their own probes.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: What is 'parent involvement'?</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Ryder</u>: Involved in training, at IEP meetings, systems development, etc. <u>McNulty</u>: So this is ‘systems level’ involvement?</p>
1:45 to 2:00	Recommendations of 619 Indicators	Sharon Walsh, Pat Snyder, Kathy Hebbeler and Marsha Brauen	Recommendation on 619 settings as a Part B indicator, if appropriate	<p><u>Walsh</u>: Slide 51 shows the recommendations for Part B 619. The vote will be taken tomorrow.</p>
2:00 to 3:00	Presentation of Part B Data and Discussion of Issues	Jane Nell Luster and Alan Coulter and Larry Gloeckler	Awareness of School-Age data and the issues related to accountability and monitoring	<p><i>Data Presentation (refer specifically to slides 16-33)</i> <u>Gloeckler/Brauen</u>:</p> <p><i>Regarding the diploma gap:</i> <u>Gloeckler</u>: It doesn’t have much meaning because ‘diploma’ is different in different places. <u>Gantwerk</u>: Is there research about whether or not it is better to have a diploma outcome on postsecondary outcomes whether kids pass the test or not because they know there is an achievable end? <u>Ysseldyke</u>: I think that is going to be address by the National Center on Special Ed outcomes. <u>Wexler</u>: There was a study that showed in some states they set a standard and in others they let the LEA decide so it showed the complexity of the problem. <u>Armstrong</u>: Isn’t it important that we begin to measure the progress that OH is going to make against ourselves because the variability in states is so great? <u>Coulter</u>: In this instance, the purpose of comparing states is at the national level. We want to be able to advise OSEP about how to use their limited resources. The numbers simply point in the direction of further investigation. Even though diploma is shaky it is what families want to know and want their child to achieve. The diploma rates are based on what the community defines as the criteria for a diploma as opposed to a national standard about diplomas.</p>
3:00 to 3:15	<i>Break</i>			
3:15 to 3:45	Recommendations on Part B Data and Indicators	Alan Coulter, Jane Nell Luster, and Marsha Brauen	Recommendations on 1. current Part B Indicators 2. additional Part B Indicators, if any are necessary.	<p><u>Coulter</u>: Do you want to make any different recommendations about the indicators than we have put forwarded in the past. <u>Goldberg</u>: I’m still concerned about comparing states on the diploma issue because of the difference between states. <u>McNulty</u>: This issue is being addressed in most states with problems in the meaning of this and I think it is the right indicator to look at. <u>Fuller</u>: I really like these. <u>Armstrong</u>: What about post-secondary outcomes? <u>Coulter</u>: In the past we ranked that outcome as high, but the problem was that the data weren’t being collected that would allow some kind of general comparison. It is in the APR but isn’t</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>something that reflects uniformity as an indicator. <u>Howarth:</u> We collect it in NM but it is somewhat haphazard and we don't have the data for students without disabilities. That would be something that would put such data into perspective. <u>Coulter:</u> We have poor communication from state to state about rehab, and we have the same problem when it comes to leaving school and looking at those post-secondary outcomes. <u>Armstrong:</u> I'm going to forward that idea again that this body needs to continue to consider post-secondary outcomes as a direction for NCSEAM advisory board to discuss during the future. <u>Wexler:</u> The release of the rank tables is not an incredible event, they were always released but they were alphabetized before. This has been going on for 25 years. <u>Ryder:</u> We are not using the "gap" this year but we are using the trend data over 5 years for ed environment and exit.</p>
3:45 to 4:30	Third Party Evaluations of Focused Monitoring in States	Mark Mlawer and Sandy Schmitz	<p>Discussion topics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accuracy of self-assessment in identifying compliance issues 2. Follow-up on corrective actions 3. Ability of state to enforce compliance 	<p><u>Mlawer:</u> I did an evaluation in Louisiana last year and am looking at a broader breath of information this year. Self-review is important to FM because we can't go everywhere. We went to several districts shortly after they did their self-assessment to do an evaluation and compare ours to their findings. In LA we found that self-review wasn't very effective. We found that different parishes took the exercise differently. As a result we were able to make specific recommendations to the SEA about this practice of self-review. We look at effectiveness of FM by looking at student outcomes. We looked at diploma rates, participation in regular assessment, as well as other indicators. FM was not the sole causal agent in the improvements in these areas. I also looked at data from focused districts in these areas across 4 years. Improvement was shown. I also looked at FM outcomes by looking at the follow-up monitoring reports to look at the corrections that had been made as a result of the reports. The result in this area was not as favorable in terms of showing improvement. Corrective action reports reflected unacceptable performance or activities surrounding this. <u>Coulter:</u> The reason to discuss this is because it is an opportunity to get a mid-course check in a state that has been doing FM for a while and see how they are doing. We talk about self-review as being a key component to ensure compliance across the state and it has to be rigorous enough to get at the issues. <u>Schmitz:</u> Regarding those big 6 indicators, states try to FM on those when they go out. There are several states considering the FM visit to be a self-review. We have seen states struggle with timelines and this will help us help states on that issue. <u>Coulter:</u> Remember that the FMIC has an item about 'standards on the indicators' and it is almost always checked NO. <u>Goodman:</u> They have a self-review every year and then a corrective action plan? <u>Mlawer:</u> Parishes did not do their reviews in consistent timeframes. Some did it in 4 days and some took the whole year and the documents were difficult to follow. <u>East:</u> What if you had done that same review in a state that was not doing FM? I'm interested in</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>showing that the FM efforts have added value. You could do that by comparing to states that don't do FM. I think it would help a lot of other states come along.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Some of the focus areas as well as other areas improved. We thought it would generalize and it has been shown in the LA evaluation.</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: I have a hard time correlating improvements in academic performance absent the data. I would like to see other focused variables at work in any focused 3rd party evaluation.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: I would have loved to do that but there just wasn't time in the LA project.</p> <p><u>East</u>: There is clearly a tremendous need for research in a number of areas for us to validate.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: When we choose a focus for monitoring it is naïve to assume that other districts that weren't picked are not also going to start focusing on it once they get the word.</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: I just think that it would be nice to look at the other things going on to see what helped after the light was shined on a specific district.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: I asked the team members from the districts if the training they received helped them when they got back to their districts and they said yes.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: I would love to see OSEP fund this type of work. Once you select an indicator for focus it gets a reaction from the public and when you combine that with TA then you get some progress. States have to be willing to step in and promote ways to do this effectively. FM helps identify the right districts to focus on and do a deeper analysis than we could if we monitored all of the districts, but if the state isn't willing to follow-through then it is no better than the old system.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: I agree, that's the bottom line.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: States push as far as they can until they are told to stop. Is the federal government going to hold states accountable to do this because the states will hold their legislators accountable? It is the key reason that the monitoring systems don't work.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: I think that is exactly correct. Unless states are pushed from outside then they won't come up with anything and I think the feds have several dilemma. If you don't enforce what you find then is it won't matter.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: You have to have a good sense of history. I can tell you that 15 years back in LA Mlawer would have had many more districts with problems on the follow-up. Can OSEP document that they have had more states under special conditions, etc.? I think they can document a trend in that area. NCSEAM's question is how can we go in and help a state without the director losing his job the next year or 'going off the edge.'</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: My experience here was with the Luke S consent degree as a court appointed consultant. When the court was behind them we saw growth and when the court was done, we saw slippage. This agenda is the same here (LA).</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: There was evidence of improvements in student outcomes that was important.</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: It is just hard to hear the same problems over time as though we can fix it when we don't have the longitudinal, individual student data to do that.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: I would argue that we are better off than we were years ago on these issues.</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Tucker</u>: I would not.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: If we set the bar so high then we might as well pack up and go home because it won't happen because of the cost side. The question is can we push changes over time.</p> <p><u>Fisher</u>: At least there is a longitudinal measure for reading where lexiles are used across the nation and the use is growing.</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: I don't think we can achieve everything for every kid. I do think we can demonstrate, pilot overtime, that it does work.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: A lot of the stuff that helps individual kids is not what we are addressing as NCSEAM.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: I heard the report from Mlawer and as a beginning state it still shows opportunity for great improvement in (LA). Has LA come up with an improvement plan?</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: I haven't seen one. As for enforcement, I don't think much will change.</p> <p>[Note: Louisiana has a strategic Improvement Plan for student outcomes – it is posted on their website, along with reports of how the state and specific districts have been progressing.]</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: There is a trade-off in the advocate and family community because they want to keep the focus on the whole list of 800 things because they are worried about their kids. I think including the parents and advocates in the process will help improvement the enforcement.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Remember that we got a self-report FMIC but now we have 3 verification reports from OSEP with states. We will have information about whether OSEP finds what the state said they were doing during the verification process. The structure is in place for the comparison that is needed for FM.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: That structure has to include that sort of follow-up.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: The perception that FM is advocacy driven will kill the process in a state with the SEA.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: I think we just need to be at the table because we can help, not that it needs to be or even can be driven by the advocates/families.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: There is an inadequate supply of families trained to participate in FM activities but where I have seen it happen, they were treated very well as members of the teams. Now the parents are in a state of distrust of other members of the team regarding abilities to interview parents, etc.</p> <p><u>Howarth</u>: I agree with parent and advocate team need to be at the table. We don't have superintendents and policy makers here at our board table. There is a very real tension within the SEAs customer service orientation between policy makers' demands of SEAs and needs and relationships with LEAs.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: I'm saying the same thing. You are saying don't stress sanctions too much and I'm saying don't forget it.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: Don't over-generalize what I said about District X in the LA report.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: I heard 15 of 18 follow up corrections.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: Yes, with some special problems.</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: I'm just saying that I remember it (topics of conversation) being the same in 1977.</p>

Thursday, March 25 Collaboration, National Data, and Indicators

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Fisher</u>: We also don't have an economist at the table. We don't have someone here to evaluate the investment to get the return.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: I want to acknowledge Virginia Beridon, SEA director for LA who allowed the presentation today. Most SEAs would have said no. I agree with the notion that federal monitoring has been excellent in finding the problems. It is quite good at doing some things just not everything.</p>
4:30 to 4:45	Recap of Thursday's Discussions and Preparation for Friday	Alan Coulter	Reflections and verifications of the day discussions Review and adjustments to Friday's agenda	<p><u>Ryder</u>: I've been with OSEP since 1988 and the division director for 7-8 years. I think that a lot has changed during this time. I think we will still be sitting here 10 years from now because it is never going to be good enough. No one was under enforcement in 1988; 1993 was the first time we put a state in a compliance agreement. We also put the first state on special conditions right after that. They are making a difference. We made changes in general supervision systems in 3 larger states. We are doing stuff but I don't think we do a good job of letting others know what those things are. I think we have made progress in enforcement in the last 4 years.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: My comments are about whether you are politically supported to take the positions you need to take. The dilemma is always how far can you push before the system doesn't back you up?</p>
6:15 to 6:30	<i>Travel to Networking Session Location</i>			
6:30 to 9:00	<i>Advisory Board Networking Session</i>			

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
8:30 to 10:15	Advisory Board Policy Discussions and Decisions; Follow-up on FMIC and 619 recommendations	Alan Coulter,	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Definition of a state partner versus technical assistance 2. Travel support for state partners 3. Travel support to T/A states 4. Board members who act as consultants 5. On-site Board meetings once a year 6. Follow up on FMIC 7. 619 recommendations 	<p><i>Handouts: draft policy statements covering 5 policy items; updated address list for board members; 3 draft documents related to terminology workgroup</i></p> <p>Project partner: elects to initiate work with the National Center; designates a contact person; assembles a team; self-assesses on degree of implementation of focused monitoring (FMIC); collaboratively develops a work plan with the Center; and works toward implementation of the work plan.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: State vs. project partners? <u>Coulter</u>: We are dropping the word ‘state’ because we are working with entities other than states. <u>McNulty</u>: In the policy statements you see the last bullet that is new about policy partners. The definition of project partner as people who want to work with the national center from a state team or entity includes building a collaborative work plan and working toward that. Any needed clarification? <u>Yanan</u>: Do you have to work with everyone who comes to you or can you select? <u>Coulter</u>: It has not been our experience to date that they want to deviate on FM but if it were to happen I would speak to my project manager. The FMIC checklist is the measure that was put forth by the board which is sometimes the advice given and that taken. <u>McNulty</u>: The definition of partner includes the development of a work plan and if it weren’t going in that direction then the entity would not be a partner. <u>Goldberg</u>: Do you intend to work with the same partners or add new ones? <u>Coulter</u>: We intend to work with our states but there is line for assistance so we plan to market this and add but it is related to the capacity discussion that we will talk about later. <u>Jennings</u>: Is this definition a new addition or replacing? If so, do we need to define who is a partner? <u>Coulter</u>: We have a definition from the past and we said state partner, where now we are trying to be more inclusive of LEAs, Part C, SEAs lead agencies. A PTI can facilitate us into a state but we are responsible to the agency that is responsible for IDEA. <u>Jennings</u>: I just suggest we add that. <u>Coperhaver</u>: So you don’t plan to limit the number of states? <u>Coulter</u>: We plan to come back next year and lay it out for you <u>Luster</u>: Some states will have decreasing need over time. <u>Wexler</u>: My assumption is that there will be direct relationship between the number of states you work with and how you will have increased capacity in building partnerships with RRCs and so forth so that you can work with more states. <u>Coulter</u>: As a matter of routine we let RRCs know when we are in state for which they have</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>coverage. <u>Wexler</u>: We hope that the RRCs can come to serve some the function for you so that you can be relieved to take on other states. <u>Brauen</u>: I think the center should work with more state SEA levels as a priority over LEAs or other entities. <u>Wexler</u>: I'd hate to see that because some LEAs are bigger than six states and I'd like to see that flexibility. <u>Coulter</u>: That flexibility has been helpful in a past situation when the Sped Dir changed and it changed the district where it was helpful for us in assisting there. <u>Copenhaver</u>: One of the TA issues is supporting and following up if you want success. Maybe that's where the RRCs come in. I think the map is deceiving because there are a number of states doing FM outside the center. I think a survey of states to find this out would be helpful. <u>Trohanis</u>: Terminology I wrote down is SEAs, LEAs, and Part C lead agencies responsible for IDEA defines project partners.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: WITH THESE CHANGES RECOMMENDED PLEASE VOTE: ACCEPTED</p> <p>Project partner travel: Travel support for Project Partners would routinely comprise up to two visits per year for the first two years and one visit per year thereafter. Any additional travel required would be supported by the Project Partner.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: There are occasions where you go more than twice? <u>Coulter</u>: Sometimes other entities like RRC picks it up. <u>McNulty</u>: This is to set some limits and expectations about travel. <u>Coulter</u>: Yes</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: IS THERE UNDERSTANDING OF THE RECOMMENDATION: VOTE: PASSED</p> <p>Technical assistance entities: Technical Assistance can be provided to entities that are not Project Partners, travel support is routinely provided by the recipient of the technical assistance.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: We always pitch the project partner status when we go into a state. <u>McNulty</u>: So by the time you are invited to come in you are on the road to the state becoming a project partner. So you still have flexibility to develop that partner status.</p> <p>VOTE: ACCEPTED.</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>Board members serving as consultants relative to NCSEAM goals: To meet the needs of entities related to the mission of NCSEAM it may be appropriate for selected Board members to serve as paid consultants using project resources. In those instances where their function as a consultant represents a conflict with their role as a Board member, that member will recuse himself/herself from decision making on those matters.</p> <p>The fourth is more potentially more controversial. There are a number of board members who also serve as consultants and this is a policy to make that transparent. This provides flexibility to the NCSEAM to contract with board members as consultants on behalf of the project. The statement is that contractual payment can be arranged and that the board member under contract would abstain from votes on matters when a potential conflict between the role as board member and as consultant might result.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: Add a sentence that the board will be informed of such arrangements.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: I agree.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: Any questions?</p> <p><u>Armstrong</u>: is this common?</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: There is no provision against it. It just needs to be transparent.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: VOTE: ACCEPTED.</p> <p>One board meeting per year: On the recommendation of OSEP, we propose that the NCSEAM Advisory Board meet one time per year on-site. To maintain awareness of the Board members for the activities and accomplishments of the project, obtain input and feedback from the Board, and conduct business of the Board, it may be beneficial to communicate via teleconferences, newsletters, or web-based information sharing.</p> <p>The next is a recommendation to move from two board meetings a year to one per year because of cost considerations.</p> <p><u>Goldberg</u>: We realize the expense so some thoughts are not to pay the honorarium just expenses, or have costs more split between NCSEAM and board members. I think there are issues that need to be discussed that can't be discussed over the phone.</p> <p><u>Coperhaver</u>: Another option is to have an executive board meet more frequently and then the whole board once.</p> <p><u>Smith</u>: My experience is that we have made much better policy by coming together to discuss things with the diverse group.</p> <p><u>Margolis</u>: I think that so many changes have come about because of relationships we have built in the time we have spent together around the table. You can't replicate the intense meetings in conference calls. We have difficult issues to resolve and part of the success of the center</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>depends on our ability to do that. I think we can't do it unless we are here.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: So far no one has said go to one meeting a year but I have heard ideas about cutting costs to make it more feasible.</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: I think it needs to be known that I am the one who raised the issue. It costs \$35,000 plus 2 times per year to run this meeting. \$70,000 dollars is the cost of multiple staff traveling around the country. It is a big chunk of an FTE. It is real money and there is a limit on those funds. In truth, I can make that decision but I wanted to hear from the board.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: This time is rich. I cannot vote to do the one meeting a year. This center needs to go for the ideal to accomplish these goals.</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: I'd like to hear if the group is considering Paula's suggestions. I would continue to come if I met some of my own expenses. It would be a little more work.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: We have always included the stipend and expenses together. We could just pay a flat rate and cover the cost. It was important to us and the project to level the playing field for all board members. If the issue is cost, and if you are disposed to do a flat reimbursement for expenses then we could do that.</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: Some of us already do it solely for expenses because of rules where they work. State agencies with IDEA grants would likely be able to support our participation because of relatedness. This has been one of the best meetings I have attended for people to speak. Is it possible to do it in two days rather than 3?</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: Actually the way it is set up is for 2 nights and that controls costs. Would the university be able to do a direct bill with the hotel?</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: There have been problems with that.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: The dilemma is that it is about the project and maintaining a somewhat delicate coalition to keep the project moving forward and achieve the outcomes that we all want. The purpose of the meeting is to deal both with the issues and maintain those coalitions.</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: To what extent do you think the board has a positive impact on the project?</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: We always put our money where our mouth is. We spend a huge amount on stakeholders' meetings and it can only be construed as relationship building. The focus of the board meetings is to benefit NCSEAM rather than the states that have members on the board. If some kinds of reasonable economies can be identified then I would support continued meetings.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: I think it is in the interest of the center to meet. I think it would of benefit to come up with a policy that reflects the different employment situations of members.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: Would there be a problem creating a differential.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Not from our perspective as long as it is transparent to board members. Consensus has been a goal and it is never really accomplished. For us, part of the investment we make in the board is to accomplish that goal even though it may not reflect all of the stakeholders. I think it is an important direction finding event for NCSEAM. We go out and represent you when we are in states. We could certainly have some individual negotiations with board members to cut costs. I would do that with you individually and we would make that known to board members.</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Wexler</u>: I suggest that folks talk with Alan and discuss what members could pitch in for the general welfare and then let's see what happens with total savings and if there is a reasonable amount of savings then fine. No problem. I think it should be done individually because of each person's unique situation. I would be comfortable with that.</p> <p><u>Goldberg</u>: I would like to make a motion that we go ahead and support 2 meetings a year but there be some individual negotiations with people and look at our own jobs and individual expenses.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: I would add that we make that visible at the next board meeting.</p> <p><u>Margolis</u>: How much did the dinner cost last night. It is something that we could do and organize and pay our own way.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: We have not paid more than \$50 per person. We feel that the evening event is very important to the process of this meeting. We tried a "pay your own" but we didn't get the best participation. Some very important business happened last night. We were instructed to make sure we have an event like that by our project manager. I'd like to continue to do that.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: I think it is okay to set the attendance expectation and still pick up their individual cost.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: I would expect collegial communication among board members about that. I agree that we can work at limiting the cost of that event.</p> <p><u>Armstrong</u>: I am a first time board member, I hope that my presence and the presence of everyone here helped you profit from the meeting. I appreciate OSEP's acknowledgement that it is partly about relationships' building. I will do anything I can to help reduce expenses.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: I support the motion. I'd much prefer to meet twice and work gratis for the center if needed.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: VOTE: ACCEPTED.</p> <p>Recommendations for Indicators for 619 Preschool:</p> <p><u>Mayfield</u>: 619 recommendations include: report identification rank by age cohorts and report ranked LRE by age cohorts by EC, PTEC/PTECSP, ECSE, Home by age.</p> <p><u>Tucker</u>: Motion to accept both</p> <p><u>Trohanis</u>: May need to reset after we see the data.</p> <p><u>Gantwerk</u>: As I understand it the data collection system will change in some significant ways.</p> <p><u>Brauen</u>: It won't happen for a couple of more years.</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: We wanted to start it now.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: We also discussed pulling out the kindergarteners but we didn't know if that was</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>possible yet. <u>Brauen</u>: There is no way at this point because of how it is collected. <u>Coulter</u>: Are we ready to vote? <u>Howarth</u>: I'm not opposed to looking at these recommendations but what are the implications for a ranking system? What does it mean from a monitoring perspective? <u>Mayfield</u>: We want lower numbers in special ed and for 3 and 4 year olds home is good. Home is more restrictive for a 5 yr old but not the three year old. <u>Bledsoe</u>: While we wait for the data update it will provide good support. <u>Wexler</u>: It is a value that 619 should be included. The omission of it is a statement we are not comfortable with. <u>Tucker</u>: I will vote for the motion but not because I think the data are viable but because it keeps it important. <u>Brauen</u>: I think the LRE issues in preschool are a data problem but we need to keep it in focus.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: ALL IN FAVOR: ACCEPTED</p> <p><u>Look at the FMIC checklist for the next issue.</u></p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: I have a motion on my flash drive and Sam and I are in agreement. "1.1.6. Does the state have a systematic method to collect data regarding families? a) family involvement? b) family satisfaction?"</p> <p><u>Howarth</u>: I have a semantic issue that it read "system in place to collect data. . ." <u>Coulter</u>: We have a motion from Mr. Fuller, do we have a second? <u>Howarth</u>: second <u>Gantwerk</u>: I want to know if the state has a system but it may not be of best fit in the DATA:COLLECTION section. <u>Coulter</u>: We can move it or add its own section. <u>Wexler</u>: I have concerns with anything that says "family satisfaction". I'm wondering if what you mean is "experiences". <u>McWilliams</u>: I think if we have a statement like this then "family perspectives" can be many things and gets them counted and that is just a word-smith idea. Conceptually, this checklist defines FM for constituents of the TA and to measure the extent to which the project partner is implementing FM. Is this critical to FM? <u>Brooks</u>: I don't totally agree with you, Larry. We have found through our family surveys that awareness has been raised about listening to what parents have to say. I do think it is critical. <u>Mlawer</u>: I support what Robin said. I prefer that we have a larger discussion that focuses on this question. What sort of data is necessary for an entity to do FM? What is important to it? I</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>imagine that there are going to be a whole bunch of other things on the list. <u>Coulter</u>: That discussion has occurred. It is reflected in the FM paper we handed out on day one. It was not our intention to revisit that discussion when we put this on the checklist. It was to meet the resolution you passed at the last meeting to get parents counted on the checklist. <u>Trohanis</u>: I was going back to the FM paper and I would like to see some statement on the FMIC. <u>Margolis</u>: I think that given the importance of family involvement I think we should substitute ‘perspective’ for ‘satisfaction’ on the proposal on the screen. I think this is a good question. I’m offering an amendment. <u>Howarth/Fuller</u>: Fine <u>Bledsoe</u>: You have spent considerable effort in working with Batya in developing a resource and if we don’t have a place in the checklist to take the states to acknowledge that then it may have less credibility. <u>Goodman</u>: I’m also in support of it. <u>Trohanis</u>: May want to consider placing the item as a new item or replace 1.2. <u>McWilliams</u>: No, just make it a new item.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: VOTE ON ITEM AS WORDED: ACCEPTED</p> <p><u>Luster</u>: I need to know what is meant by “perspectives.” <u>Fisher</u>: The research has repeatedly identified 4 dimensions: family involvement, perspective on schools efforts to involve families, do things for the kids, and outcomes. <u>Goldberg</u>: When the survey is done will there be anyway to rank it? <u>Coulter</u>: There will be a second phase called implementation and we will have to come back to you after we have some information about what the data actually means. We will come back in March 2005 with what the scales look like and determine how you want us to portray that information. We can’t make it concrete yet. <u>Luster</u>: Please clarify systematic. <u>Luster</u>: 1) if the state leaves it to LEAs is that a yes? (NO) 2) if they say every two years we send out a survey to every family is that a yes? (YES) <u>Goodman</u>: There has to be a way to track responses to make sure you have sufficient representativeness from LEAs to make it meaningful. <u>Howarth</u>: If you missed a small district it would still be meaningful for the state. <u>Mlawer</u>: But not for FM <u>Bledsoe</u>: My view of systematic is that it would yield data that is useful at the state level as well as the local level. <u>Luster</u>: Each of these checklist items would be a yes/no. Understand that as we have worded this item that if a state collects it, it is a yes even if they don’t report it. Do I use the domains William said in my questioning? (YES)</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Gantwerk</u>: The purpose of having it is to use this as an indicator. <u>Coulter</u>: Or it could inform other aspects of the process. <u>Gantwerk</u>: Is this up there as an indicator? <u>Coulter</u>: This is for the system piece and you are referring to another item on the checklist where they may get a yes but not on this item. It could be used for selection if the state chose to use it. <u>Goldberg</u>: There are six indicators and this could become a seventh. <u>Coulter</u>: Those six are based on OSEPs decisions at this point. Our intent is to make a measure so useful to states that they would want to use it for their accountability process. <u>Bledsoe</u>: We have only said to collect data, are we going to go beyond to some meaningful use of it? <u>Trohanis</u>: The next level is reporting and this is in the section above and it appears fine to me. <u>McWilliams</u>: It seems we may be confusing the purpose. It is not used to rank states. This is just one component of implementing FM. <u>Luster</u>: I thought I heard that are actually putting the item at the end of the data collection section. <u>McWilliams</u>: I think this is too big of a group to make these technical decisions. It may be better let Jane Nell select board members to help on this issue. <u>Coulter</u>: In the reporting section, if they report some of it they get a yes on the checklist. The reporting piece doesn't deal with families specifically. <u>Bledsoe</u>: In my opinion reporting it is important. I understand that states have discretion. <u>McWilliams</u>: I agree with Brenda. <u>Trohanis</u>: I recommend changing the word 'student' to 'student/child' on the assumptions section of cover page. The glossary of definitions should add 'goal' and 'targets'. <u>Coulter</u>: We will add those as the committee finishes with those. There is a second item in the stakeholder section. 2.1.1 item d. <u>Luster</u>: This came from a state. <u>Coulter</u>: part of the delicacy is the difference between Parts B and C. <u>Bledsoe/Yanan</u>: Just change it to individual with disability. <u>Yanan</u>: I move that (d) be separated out and written as 'individuals with disabilities or an individual with a disability'. <u>Tucker</u>: I second the motion</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: VOTE: ACCEPTED</p> <p>Any other comments or questions about FMIC</p> <p><u>Smith</u>: I wasn't clear on the distinction between goals and priorities. <u>Luster</u>: On page 2 of the document you received this this morning there is a table, the workgroup</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p>wrote the definition there. <u>Smith:</u> Priority is basically a term of ‘art’. I’m just not clear. <u>Luster:</u> I want Alan to address that. <u>Coulter:</u> It says goal states “a measurable condition”. That is why we are changing it from priority to goal. <u>Smith:</u> I’m just not sure if it is correct for FM because priority implies a certain precedence. <u>Wexler:</u> I think that this is a real effort to systematize the use of terminology and it will make the work of the center better. <u>Coulter:</u> ‘Key indicators’ was sort of the same issue. We dropped the word ‘key’. <u>Smith:</u> Something needs to make clear that there are a limited number of goals. Indicators have started to take on a life of their own. <u>Coulter:</u> Indicators is the ‘how is it measured.’ <u>Tucker:</u> We make a list and then figure out what we can actually get (measure it) it. <u>Coulter:</u> I think we still have our limited set. I don’t think this changes anything for us and what we do. <u>Smith:</u> I disagree. I think it is very different. <u>Howarth:</u> How about adding the word priority before the word goal. (2.1.3 a) <u>Luster:</u> Is there a motion to take the terminology changes? VOTE: ACCEPTED</p>
10:15 to 10:30	<i>Break</i>			
10:30 to 12:00	<p>Issues for the Future in Accountability and Monitoring</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity Building at state and federal levels (106 entities will not be partners by 2007) Web site development related to accountability and 	<p>Alan Coulter, Sandy Schmitz, Jane Nell Luster, and Sharon Walsh</p>	<p>Discuss and generate possible strategies to build the capacity of NCSEAM and states</p>	<p>Let’s go to Larry first. <u>Fuller:</u> I move to have NCSEAM provide a monthly newsletter to advocate and family organizations via email. <u>Mlawer:</u> What sort of time and commitment is involved by staff. <u>Coulter:</u> I will comment on this after a second. <u>Mlawer:</u> I second. <u>Coulter:</u> There is no way we can do this on a monthly basis. Maybe twice a year it could be possible. What you are talking about would need some development work. <u>Goldberg:</u> One suggestion is twice a year do a paragraph and send it to us and we could send it out via our listservs. <u>Coulter:</u> I appreciate Larry’s intent. I want to do that but the monthly and logistics are where I am having a problem. It is not on the current radar screen. <u>Fuller:</u> I’m just thinking about building capacity with families and so forth. <u>Coulter:</u> I agree, but I’m just saying that is not where our resources are currently set. Website? Yes. <u>McNulty:</u> Given the fact that the board voted to continue to meet twice a year it is hard for me to support another expense to the project. I think the website is going to be where you get</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
	monitoring (different projects, coherence) 3. National Monitoring Conference Topics and Issues for the next NCSEAM Board meeting; set dates for next meeting			<p>information out.</p> <p><u>Brooks</u>: I think it is important and you have mechanisms to do so without much effort or cost on your part.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: what Paula proposed is doable but what is on the proposal is not.</p> <p><u>McWilliams</u>: People want products. Think of a 12 step series of tutorials that come out once a month and is disseminated through the existing systems. It could be stapled at the end of the year and become a product.</p> <p><u>Bledsoe</u>: Is it to provide information to parents about what NCSEAM is doing in that state so they can become involved?</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: I see it as something like that. I don't see it as big, just small one pager.</p> <p><u>Luster</u>: I propose that Larry let us take this back in the (Goldberg form) to explore it and bring it back to the group.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: I'm happy to do that.</p> <p><u>Mlawer</u>: I support that motion. If anyone was in favor of my earlier proposal to contribute in kind services to the board from members then this is an option here.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Would the offer of the motion agree to withdraw?</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: Okay.</p> <p><u>Smith</u>: I had a concern yesterday that is not a motion just a discussion. I am not a 619 or Part C expert. I'm concerned that the instability of the data (Part C) that exists especially when you compare it to the indicators in the original paper there is just nothing on it or very limited. I'd like to suggest that since some want to see FM fail, I'd prefer that the data in Part C and 619 become more focused so that evidence is not provided to the folks who want FM to fail.</p> <p><u>Benham</u>: Yesterday afternoon I was struck by how it was almost totally focused on B as it was today. I agree that there may be people who are looking for FM to fail and I think those folks are Part B folks not C. I think there is a lack of significant support from Congress for Part C unless you are talking about the state level. I think that at some point that we need to try to be strategic about where we are going with FM. I would urge that we support some resource to improve the data even though I have concerns about top down driven change effort.</p> <p><u>Bledsoe</u>: The other side of the stability of the data is the OSEP emphasis on the data with the APR. I feel that the stability of the data will come along with the processes that are supported by OSEP.</p> <p><u>Smith</u>: I wasn't trying to exempt Part C, just wondering if more time is needed for data issues.</p> <p><u>Wexler</u>: It is already gone, we have implemented and there is a clear policy that will now be enforced. To me the issue is 619. We would be very receptive to support an initiative to include 619 data in the rankings. We recognize data challenges there but it still shines the light. Ranking of 619 data would not occur for a while.</p> <p><u>Goodman</u>: We haven't done much on FM in Part C. We don't know how this model of FM will fit with Part C because it was based on Part B. The lag is inherent and I don't want it to lag further.</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Mayfield</u>: In AL we actually ranked on our data to determine what level of FM we would engage.</p> <p><u>Luster</u>: The excitement and commitment I have experienced with the Part C states is very good. The data issues are ones I am less concerned about because once we look and put it out there, it is going to make it better. The Part C outcomes are more difficult to understand and assign meaning to than Part B. That is the bigger challenge in my view.</p> <p><u>Walsh</u>: The data directors make reports about the status of states on Part C data systems. I think it would be helpful for the board to have the current information.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: I'd like to support that.</p> <p><u>Howarth</u>: What we are trying to put in place this coming school year is looking at transition from C to B. We are going to look at whether that distinction was made appropriately. It took awhile to coordinate the exchange of data. We will be able to provide a monitoring function for those who transition from C to B. To me it is logical to structure an indicator that way.</p> <p><u>Yanan</u>: I have something else. I was talking with Mark about his report and how the sped dir of LA didn't need to share that and Alan should share the thanks to her for allowing that. The Board readily agreed.</p> <p><u>Goldberg</u>: What is the relationship between EOC and NCSEAM and it needs to be on the agenda in the future.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Jane Nell and Marsha and Sharon are on their advisory board and Kathy will be on a future agenda. That is an evolving relationship.</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: What I would request is that at the next meeting we look at building family and advocate capacity.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Beyond the Parents as Monitors training?</p> <p><u>Fuller</u>: Probably.</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Beyond the role of the monitoring team. I will correspond with you between board meetings.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: Will you email us about this list?</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: Yes, give omission or changes to Ms. Poche.</p> <p><u>Luster</u>: Please change my email to jluste@lsuhdc.edu</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: The National Accountability and Monitoring Conference is on 10/4-5 2004. It is at the Hyatt here in New Orleans. We had intended to schedule a board meeting in conjunction with that to occur on Wednesday the 6th and Thursday the 7th closing at 3pm. The location of that meeting will not be at this hotel as it is not available.</p> <p><u>Goldberg</u>: Is there an expectation that the board members be at the national conference?</p> <p><u>Coulter</u>: It is open to wide variety of people. It is our hope by scheduling it with the conference that your travel may be picked up. We also want to field some presentations at that conference and some of it will involve board members.</p>

Friday, March 26 – Educational Benefit and Board Policy Planning

Time	Topic Area	Personnel Responsible	Expected Outcomes from Advisory Board	Minutes
				<p><u>Smith</u>: Is there a registration fee? <u>Coulter</u>: I'm sure there is. <u>Wexler</u>: It has to be self-sustaining. <u>Coulter</u>: We have representation on the conference planning committee. The agenda items for the board meeting at that time includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • invite K. Hebbeler back • report on progress on parent/family involvement and perception measure • report on modules for parents as monitors should be done by that time • report for NCEO as it relates to AYP <p><u>Wexler</u>: Since NCEO is doing the analysis of APR data that might be helpful to have them present to the board on B and C. <u>Coulter</u>: If you are not attending the conference you need to come Tuesday evening. <u>Howarth</u>: I'd like to hear the GAO report. <u>Wexler</u>: We'll be happy to share whatever they share. <u>Mlawer</u>: I think it would be helpful to get an overall sense of where the states are now on FM putting aside where you guys are active. Put together some key items from the FMIC. <u>Coulter</u>: We can reflect on and describe the measures we use. We will have done some follow ups With some states by the next meeting and will want to report that to you. <u>Luster</u>: You'd like to know what is going on in the states where we are working? <u>Mlawer</u>: That and the states where we are not working <u>Coulter</u>: We'll start with the national monitoring conf. <u>Wexler</u>: It is likely to be a 3 + 2 report by then. <u>Luster</u>: It is possible that the next meeting will be more an information rather than an action meeting. <u>Goodman</u>: Mail any reading ahead of time so we can have more of a discussion than presentation. <u>Coulter</u>: Jane Nell stays on the road 90% of the time, Sandy is on the road as well, Sharon is on the road too and they work very hard. You get email from them on the weekends and so forth. I want you to understand that this project got off to a fast start comparatively. We hope that you understand we are trying to put out the maximum amount of effort. These people are only 2.8 FTEs. We hope we are meeting your expectations and we appreciate this board meeting. <u>Tucker</u>: We appreciate the staff. <u>Bledsoe</u>: I appreciate your follow through from the last meeting and commitment.</p> <p><u>McNulty</u>: MOTION TO ADJOURN.</p>
12:00-1:00	Lunch provided			