

COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL SERVICES  
FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

Raleigh, North Carolina  
December 7, 2016  
9:48 a.m.

---

**TRANSCRIPT OF QUARTERLY MEETING**

---

The quarterly meeting of the Council on Educational Services for Exceptional Children was held on the 7th day of December, 2016, in the State Board of Education Boardroom, Education Building, 301 North Wilmington Street, Raleigh, North Carolina, commencing at 9:48 a.m.

APPEARANCES

COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN  
BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leanna George, Chairperson  
Dale Carpenter  
Jennifer Grady  
Laura Hall  
Susan Humbert  
Mary LaCorte (via telephone)  
Teresa Mebane  
Lisa Phillips (via telephone)  
Vicki Simmons  
Greg Singleton  
Rick Smith  
Jennine Vlasaty  
Unnamed representative for  
Senator Barefoot (via telephone)

STAFF:

Tish Bynum  
Carol Ann Hudgens  
William Hussey  
Heather Ouzts  
Nancy Johnson

VISITORS:

Jacqui Hawkins (via Telephone)  
Gerri Smith, The Arc of NC

COURT REPORTER:

Rebecca P. Scott

Reporter's Note: Any quoted material is reproduced as  
read or quoted by the speaker.

- - - - -

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

I N D E X

PAGE NO.

Call to Order..... 4

Introductions..... 4

Review of Agenda..... 8

Review of Meeting Minutes..... 9

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report  
Proposed Regulation Changes for Significant  
Disproportionality presentation by Nancy  
Johnson..... 11

Agency Update by Bill Hussey..... 18

Presentation by Nancy Johnson (continuing)..... 42

Lunch Recess..... 98

Public Comments Update by Laura Hall..... 99

Unmet Needs Committee Update by Laura Hall..... 102

Executive Committee Update by Chairperson..... 106

Meeting Adjournment..... 118

Certificate of Reporter..... 119

- - - - -

1 Thereupon, the following proceeding was held:

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Morning, everybody.  
3 Welcome to this meeting today for the Council on  
4 Educational Services for Exceptional Children. I  
5 call this meeting to order.

6 If we can, like we usually do, go  
7 around and introduce ourselves, and we have at  
8 least two of our members calling in today. I  
9 would ask for -- I think to assist the court  
10 reporter that if you would say your name before  
11 you start speaking, that might be helpful for her  
12 since she can't obviously physically see you  
13 speaking. That sounds good to me, I think, for  
14 you guys.

15 But, anyway, I am Leanna George. I  
16 am the Chair of this Council. I'm the parent of  
17 two children who receive special educational  
18 services, one of whom is now home-schooled, but my  
19 daughter is still in public school. And I'm from  
20 Johnston County.

21 MS. SIMMONS: Hey. My name is Vicki  
22 Simmons. I'm an adaptive PE teacher with Guilford  
23 County Schools, and a hundred percent of my  
24 caseload are children with significant cognitive  
25 disabilities.

1 DR. CARPENTER: Hi. I'm Dale  
2 Carpenter. I'm the Dean of the College of  
3 Education and Allied Professions at Western  
4 Carolina University.

5 MS. GRADY: Hi. I'm Jennifer Grady.  
6 I am a business representative. I work for Blue  
7 Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina, but I'm  
8 also the parent of two Wake County children, one  
9 who has an IEP.

10 MS. JOHNSON: Hi. I'm Nancy Johnson,  
11 and I'm with the North Carolina Department of  
12 Public Instruction with the Exceptional Children  
13 Division. I'm the coordinator for our state  
14 annual performance report and all the federal data  
15 that we submit to the federal government regarding  
16 students with disabilities. I do all the data  
17 analysis.

18 MS. HUMBERT: Hello. I'm Susan  
19 Humbert. I am the parent of an adult with autism,  
20 and I'm also the EC director of a charter school  
21 in Hillsborough called The Expeditious School.

22 MS. BYNUM: I'm Tish Bynum. I am the  
23 Exception Children Division administrative  
24 assistant and administrative assistant for this  
25 Council.

1 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm Becky Scott.  
2 I'm the court reporter.

3 MS. OUZTS: I'm Heather Ouzts. I'm  
4 parent liaison for the Exceptional Children  
5 Division.

6 MS. HUDGENS: Good morning. I'm  
7 Carol Ann Hudgens. I'm the Section Chief for  
8 Policy, Monitoring, and Audit for the Exceptional  
9 Children Division, and support staff to this  
10 Council.

11 MS. VLASATY: Good morning. Jennine  
12 Vlasaty. I am a parent of a son with an IEP.

13 MS. HALL: Good morning. I'm Laura  
14 Hall. I am the parent of an adult child with a  
15 disability, and I am the chair of the Unmet Needs  
16 Committee.

17 MR. SINGLETON: Good morning. I'm  
18 Greg Singleton. I represent the Northeast Region,  
19 Region 1, as an LEA representative. I serve the  
20 Beaufort County Schools as Executive Director of  
21 Federal Programs for Preschool, Exceptional  
22 Children, and Student Services. I have three  
23 sons, including two who have formally had IEPs and  
24 have exited special education services.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: And if those who

1 are on the phone would like to introduce  
2 themselves.

3 MS. LaCORTE: This is Mary LaCorte at  
4 the Exceptional Children's Assistance Center. Our  
5 main office is in Davidson, and we are the  
6 federally designated parent training and  
7 information center right through IDEA. In  
8 addition to that, I'm the codirector of the North  
9 Carolina Deaf/Blind Project through DPI and also  
10 am a parent of an adult daughter with significant  
11 disabilities including deaf/blindness.

12 MS. PHILLIPS: Good morning. I'm  
13 Lisa Phillips. I'm the State Coordinator for the  
14 North Carolina Homeless Education Program, which  
15 is also part of the Federal Program Monitoring and  
16 Support Division with the Department of Public  
17 Instruction.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Thank  
19 you, everyone. I'll take a moment to review the  
20 agenda. Bill Hussey---

21 MS. LaCORTE: Leanna?

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

23 MS. LaCORTE: I'm sorry. In the chat  
24 box, Jacqui says, "This is Jacqui Hawkins, EC  
25 Parent Liaison at Guilford County Schools. My

1 microphone is not plugged in. Sorry." So  
2 Jacqui's also on the phone with us.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. I will log  
4 into GoToMeeting and see if I can't follow along  
5 there too.

6 MS. OUZTS: I'm following as well.

7 MS. LaCORTE: Okay. Great.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thanks. Glad to  
9 have you with us, Jacqui.

10 I'll take a moment to review the  
11 agenda. Bill Hussey is here today. He's just, as  
12 Bill tends to be, very busy. He will be coming in  
13 to do the agency update when he is available to do  
14 so. So if there's any questions about the agenda.  
15 I don't see any concerns with it.

16 We have a -- the focus of the agenda  
17 today is on the State Performance Plan and the  
18 Annual Performance Report and proposed regulation  
19 changes followed by lunch. Then later in the  
20 afternoon, we're going to have an extended period  
21 for committee work for anything that needs to be  
22 done and to review what we've learned from the  
23 report and the plan.

24 If there's no questions concerning  
25 that, we can move on to review the minutes.



1 (Rick Smith and Teresa Mebane entered  
2 the quarterly meeting during the review  
3 of the minutes.)

4 MS. SIMMONS: My name is Vicki  
5 Simmons, and this is a follow-up on the class size  
6 and caseload waiver. The draft that I saw omitted  
7 the teacher's name on the front of the document  
8 saying that the teacher was aware that a waiver  
9 was being filed. And my question is, in the final  
10 draft of the waiver, was the classroom teacher's  
11 name left off -- omitted?

12 And I would say that would be a  
13 concern because the teacher would be one of the  
14 last people to know instead of one of the first  
15 people aware.

16 MS. HUDGENS: This is Carol Ann  
17 Hudgens. And repeating the question so I make  
18 sure I understand. There was a question about  
19 whether the teacher's name still remains on the  
20 class size waiver form?

21 MS. SIMMONS: On the front page and  
22 on the signature page.

23 MS. HUDGENS: Yes, it is -- the whole  
24 entire form, signature and request for waiver, is  
25 now all one page, and the teacher name is on the

1 form, but it has never been a requirement that the  
2 teacher sign it as agreement or disagreement. The  
3 teacher's name is simply recorded to be an  
4 identifier of which classroom is impacted and  
5 which classroom and teacher the waiver is being  
6 requested for. So there hasn't been a change in  
7 process there. It's the same exact noting of the  
8 teacher name as it was previously.

9 MS. SIMMONS: So it's not the  
10 teacher's signature; it's just the teacher's name?

11 MS. HUDGENS: That is correct.

12 MS. SIMMONS: That would be a concern  
13 for me.

14 MS. HUDGENS: Okay. Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Are there any other  
16 additional comments or concerns about the minutes  
17 as they're written?

18 (No audible response.)

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Do I hear a motion  
20 on these minutes, or do we even have enough people  
21 to make a motion?

22 MS. OUZTS: We have 13 with the  
23 legislative attendee. I'm not sure which one that  
24 is. I sent a message, but if we could know for  
25 sure who that was.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

2 MS. HUDGENS: Our guest is Senator  
3 Barefoot's representative.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Greg just informed  
5 me that he's going to abstain because he was not  
6 here last time, and I agree with that. Anyone  
7 else? So---

8 (No audible response.)

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Since I hear no  
10 motion, let's move on, then. We will table these  
11 minutes to be reviewed for approval for next  
12 meeting. Does that make sense to everybody?

13 (No audible response.)

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Since  
15 Bill is not here yet, let's move along to the  
16 reports.

17 MS. JOHNSON: Good morning. I'm  
18 Nancy Johnson. Again, I am the coordinator for  
19 our State Performance Plan, Annual Performance  
20 Report, and a lot of other things, data analysis,  
21 but I am here to talk to you today specifically  
22 about our Annual Performance Report that we need  
23 to submit to the federal government on February  
24 1st of 2017 and a portion of it on April 1st of  
25 2017.

1                   Excuse me. And I need to apologize  
2 first. I've been traveling around the state quite  
3 a bit over the last few weeks and in and out of  
4 classrooms with children, and I have a cold. So  
5 I'll be clearing my throat a lot.

6                   One of the reasons that I am  
7 presenting to you is that you serve as the  
8 stakeholder group for our Annual Performance  
9 Report, and so in years past with those of you who  
10 have been around for a while, we've gotten a lot  
11 of input related to setting targets and strategies  
12 and activities. Over the years, the plan has  
13 changed quite a bit in terms of that process a  
14 little bit. So I'll explain a few of those things  
15 as we go and try to explain, as we go, things so  
16 that those of you who are new will have a better  
17 understanding as well.

18                   Just to give you a -- I'm just going  
19 to do a brief overview so that -- to remind those  
20 of you who maybe aren't so new and those of you  
21 who are new Council Members. The State  
22 Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is a  
23 component of our overall general supervision plan  
24 and our general supervision that the State is  
25 responsible for focusing on a variety of things,

1 as you can see in this slide, including data  
2 collection, dispute resolution, results, and  
3 compliance as well, and the Annual Performance  
4 Report deals with all of those things.

5 The State Performance Plan itself and  
6 Annual Performance Report is a series of  
7 indicators, and there are 17 now. You also have  
8 these slides as a handout. So you may want to  
9 take notes if you have any questions. And I'll be  
10 going over the data that we have so far for each  
11 of these indicators briefly as we go through, but  
12 these are the indicators. Some of them are  
13 compliance and some of them are outcomes, and I'll  
14 be differentiating for you.

15 Here is kind of a general summary.  
16 In February of 2017, we will be doing our eleventh  
17 submission. It's hard to believe, but we are 11  
18 years strong. The APR now is 17 indicators. In  
19 the last couple years, it was changed. We used to  
20 have 20 indicators, and they reduced some things  
21 and then added a new indicator. It is combined of  
22 both compliance indicators -- and an example of a  
23 compliance indicator would be Indicator 11, our  
24 90-day timeline from referral to placement -- and  
25 results indicators. An example of a results

1 indicator is our graduation rates, Indicator 1.

2 For each of the indicators, we had to  
3 start 11 years ago with baseline data for each of  
4 them, and wherever our baseline data was, for  
5 certain indicators, we were allowed then to set  
6 targets to move forward. For example, in  
7 Indicator 3, which is about our reading and math  
8 assessments, we were able to set a baseline of  
9 wherever our kids were performing proficiently at  
10 that point in time and then set reasonable targets  
11 over the next six years as long as we showed that  
12 we were making progress by the end of the six-year  
13 plan.

14 As you can see, we are in our  
15 eleventh year, so we've re-upped these plans over  
16 time. For some of the indicators, they are set  
17 already. Compliance indicators -- for example, I  
18 mentioned Indicator 11, the 90-day placement from  
19 referral to placement, the target is required at  
20 100 percent because it is a compliance indicator.  
21 So the US Office of Special Ed Programs sets some  
22 of those -- or sets the compliance targets for us.

23 Other indicators like graduation,  
24 while a state has a right, in essence, to set the  
25 target, we are required to use the target that the

1 State uses for all kids. So for graduation, our  
2 target is 80 percent because that is the target  
3 for all kids rather than setting it specifically  
4 for students with disabilities. So you can see  
5 there's kind of a variety of things, and each  
6 indicator is a little bit different. So as we go  
7 through these and talk about the data, I will  
8 remind you of those items.

9 The last thing in terms of the Annual  
10 Performance Report, on April 1st, 2017, we will  
11 have our third submission of Indicator 17, which  
12 is our State Systemic Improvement Plan, and that's  
13 what's really new about our Annual Performance  
14 Report. It is a plan that states go to -- had to  
15 go through real in-depth data analysis three years  
16 ago, and we got to identify an area of improvement  
17 for our state. And so it is focused on results,  
18 and I'll talk about that as I get to that  
19 indicator.

20 Okay. So I'm just going to kind of  
21 review by data, and I know, on your paper, these  
22 slides are tiny and hard to see, so you can maybe  
23 kind of look at this as well. This slide is both  
24 for Indicator 1 and Indicator 17, and I'm going to  
25 talk about Indicator 1 right now, which is the

1 blue line. That is our four-year cohort  
2 graduation rate for students with disabilities.  
3 You can see, since we started 11 years ago, we  
4 have made quite a bit of progress.

5 The green number, the 67.1 percent of  
6 our students graduated within four years, and  
7 those were -- how the cohort works is, kids  
8 entering ninth grade in 2011-12 and did they  
9 graduate within four years of that entry into  
10 ninth grade. So they're part of that cohort. And  
11 why I've got that one in green, 67.1, which is  
12 last year's data, is that for this indicator, we  
13 are on a year data lag when we report to the  
14 federal government. So in reporting, I am  
15 required to report the year that shows the 67.1,  
16 but in our explanation, I will also talk about  
17 that we already have our data for kids who entered  
18 ninth grade 2012-13, and we've seen an increase  
19 again to 68.9. So we want to show that we are  
20 continuing each year to make progress on that  
21 four-year data.

22 Now our five-year data -- our  
23 five-year cohort graduation rate is what we use  
24 for Indicator 17, so I'll be talking about that in  
25 a little bit, but you'll see it again in



1 comparison to our four-year rate. Our dropout  
2 rates---

3 DR. CARPENTER: Can I---

4 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

5 DR. CARPENTER: Dale Carpenter. Can  
6 I ask a question about that last slide?

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure.

8 DR. CARPENTER: How does that compare  
9 to the rates for all children?

10 MS. JOHNSON: All children is over 80  
11 percent right now, and our target for the state is  
12 80 percent. So that's what our target is, but it  
13 is -- we have that gap, and that was one of the  
14 reasons we selected our five-year cohort  
15 graduation rate for Indicator 17. We're making  
16 mammoth efforts in our state to focus on improving  
17 graduation through a variety of means, and I will  
18 talk about that when I talk about Indicator 17  
19 because we still have that gap.

20 **(Mr. Hussey entered the meeting.)**

21 MS. JOHNSON: Oh. Do you want me to  
22 stop so you can go ahead?

23 MR. HUSSEY: Finish your---

24 MS. JOHNSON: Oh. Well, it's going  
25 to take me awhile because I just got started.

1 MR. HUSSEY: Oh, okay.

2 MS. HUDGENS: It seems like a good  
3 segue.

4 MR. HUSSEY: And I apologize for  
5 interrupting, but I had to go to a medical -- I  
6 got an earlier medical appointment than I was  
7 supposed to have and they called me and asked me  
8 to come. So, anyway, that's probably more  
9 information than you need, but that's why I'm  
10 running late.

11 Just an update again on the agency  
12 issues. Let me start with ECATS. I was a little  
13 late getting here because I was just meeting with  
14 our technical person. We are ready to send it  
15 over to DIT, which is our state group looking at  
16 all of our technical information and all of  
17 our -- they have to review everything on the RFP  
18 and what's going on with that. So the vendor and  
19 the Department have signed and agreed to  
20 everything. We are now sending the whole package  
21 over. We are hoping for a merry Christmas, most  
22 likely a happy new year where we could probably  
23 get this thing through.

24 What will happen now is that we will  
25 send it over. They will read it, respond to the

1 things that they need for us to change, and will  
2 send it back. We're sending over a document  
3 that's probably 45 or 50 pages that goes through  
4 all the summary of decisions made, why we chose  
5 the particular vendors that we chose, and also  
6 what's going on -- what's being -- has been going  
7 on in what's called BAFO, best and final offer.  
8 And so really that's the whole set of  
9 negotiations.

10 Now those negotiations have been  
11 going on now for over three months, four months  
12 actually. So it's been a serious conversation  
13 with the vendor. We have gone through each and  
14 every element, and so, therefore, that's what  
15 we're looking at. But if we can get it done prior  
16 to February and get everything signed with the  
17 attorneys, then we're in position to get started  
18 with this as a full implementation with the IEP  
19 element particularly by August of next year.

20 If we get past February, we are  
21 probably in a situation where we will not be able  
22 to get it started until January of '18. So we are  
23 pushing hard. For me, this is three and half  
24 years' worth of finally getting this thing done,  
25 but we're very excited about where we are with it.

1                   If we get it done, at March  
2                   Institute, we will be bringing teams in from  
3                   charter schools and from LEAs to be trained around  
4                   the paperwork and its connection to the new  
5                   process and be moving forward with that along with  
6                   the vendor who will be doing ongoing training  
7                   across the state. So we've got our fingers  
8                   crossed that, like I said, we could have a merry  
9                   Christmas or a happy new year.

10                   My sense is it's probably more of a  
11                   happy new year with all the changes that are going  
12                   to come and the times that people are going to not  
13                   be at work, but it is at that final stage. No  
14                   longer something happening here in the building,  
15                   no longer negotiations with the vendor. Now we're  
16                   just getting it approved through the state  
17                   process.

18                   School Mental Health Initiative.  
19                   Last -- not December but in November, the school  
20                   mental health group met with the State Board and  
21                   presented a summary of our white paper that's been  
22                   done, and if you remember, the School Mental  
23                   Health Initiative is community-based folks, not  
24                   really DPI, but we've been meeting here at DPI and  
25                   supporting that. I introduced them, and we had a

1 parent, we had a provider, we had folks from  
2 mental health, we had folks from the school  
3 districts talking to the Board about what's been  
4 happening in that.

5 We have a draft bill to move forward.  
6 We were going to move that in January, and due to  
7 our inability to meet in December as a whole  
8 group, there was concern that they weren't going  
9 to -- we weren't going to have ample consensus  
10 about the bill as we moved it forward. And so  
11 we're going to hold it, not do it in January, but  
12 do it in February, and meet on the 5th of January  
13 to reach a consensus relative to the package of  
14 the bill.

15 The primary component of the bill is  
16 a guarantee that each school district and charter  
17 school in the state will have a policy that  
18 stipulates how they will manage mental health  
19 issues. It doesn't mean that they have to do it.  
20 It just means that they have a process and  
21 something in play that will help support getting  
22 children to the services that they need. It goes  
23 on to talk about different elements of that  
24 service and defines what they are, but as I met  
25 with the superintendents last Friday, I made it

1 clear that there's no stipulation in there as to  
2 how to do it or what exactly you have to do, but  
3 you do have to have a policy that describes that  
4 you will have a response to an individual child  
5 who has a mental health need in your school either  
6 to do it through the school or to do it through  
7 connections with your local LME and MCO.

8 So if we're able to get that passed,  
9 it will be the first policy through the State  
10 Board that will actually guarantee that mental  
11 health services will be provided to children  
12 through the school system either by the school or  
13 through their connection and liaison with their  
14 LME and MCO. So we're very excited about that and  
15 really hopeful that we're going to be able to move  
16 that forward.

17 With our SSIP, we are working -- this  
18 is our third year and we're working on the  
19 evaluation piece. Hopefully, the next time we  
20 meet, we'll have the rough draft of that plan, and  
21 Matt Hopkins will be able to come forward and talk  
22 to you-all about how we're -- what we're doing in  
23 the way of evaluation. This is the year where we  
24 put our evaluation plan out in full detail to the  
25 feds. The first two have been kind of our

1 development piece, then our implementation, and  
2 now we're at the evaluation phase of that. We're  
3 working with UNC Charlotte and two people inside  
4 of UNC Charlotte to basically help us collate all  
5 this data. It's quite a bit, as you can imagine.

6           Again, our SIMR, our measurable  
7 result is graduation. We are on the trajectory to  
8 meet our goal, which is roughly about 87 percent,  
9 over a five-year period to have our rate of  
10 graduation up to---

11           MS. JOHNSON: 77.

12           MR. HUSSEY: ---not 87 percent, 77  
13 percent. Thank you very much. 77 percent. I was  
14 aiming high. 77 percent. And we are on the right  
15 trajectory at this point, and this evaluation  
16 piece will bring all of our buckets together and  
17 really take a look at what we're doing, how we're  
18 doing, and how we're going to measure. It won't  
19 be so much the measurement itself but how. So the  
20 process, we've got to get it on paper and out and  
21 moving forward, and then the data collection will  
22 be at the end of next year showing where we are  
23 and how we're doing with that. So, again -- you  
24 know, again, a big, big push.

25           SPPAPR data. Now just, again, a

1 reminder that we scored very well on our measures  
2 this past year both for this and then for our --  
3 what is the other one called? Differentiated---

4 MS. JOHNSON: Differentiated  
5 monitoring.

6 MR. HUSSEY: Yeah, the differentiated  
7 monitoring. We also -- we also, again, scored as  
8 high as we could in the differentiated monitoring,  
9 so they're going back and taking a look at various  
10 aspects. And so we've had a very successful year.  
11 When you look at the data, there's still lots of  
12 room for improvement. The graduation rate  
13 obviously is going forward and doing well, but  
14 when she moves through some of the other pieces,  
15 you're going to see where we are and you're going  
16 to -- you know, we've done well compared, but we  
17 still have a lot of room to move.

18 And I will tell you I think the  
19 biggest thing right now still -- and there is  
20 going to be a push by the Division to work with --  
21 we're meeting with Curriculum and Instruction and  
22 we're meeting with some of our other groups inside  
23 the Department to look at specially designed  
24 instruction. MTSS is in its second year of  
25 implementation. By the end of this year -- third



1 year actually of implementation -- by the end of  
2 this year, Cohorts 1 and 2 will actually be fully  
3 ready to implement.

4 With that full implementation comes  
5 the understanding that specially designed  
6 instruction, which is an essential element of  
7 special education, is not only going to exist  
8 inside of special education but will exist inside  
9 the MTSS framework as well. And so we're working  
10 through the Division with the other departments --  
11 will be -- as to what that looks like, how it's  
12 going to work, and what we need to be doing to  
13 train regular education teachers and working with  
14 regular education teachers to understand that  
15 integrative framework.

16 The only way we're going to improve  
17 the reading scores and the math scores that you're  
18 going to see in a minute in this process is to  
19 basically have a way in which we translate what  
20 happens within special education and the content,  
21 and you-all have heard me say that over and over  
22 again. The way to do that is through this  
23 understanding that specially designed instruction  
24 is not solely a special education phenomenon.

25 I will tell you, as this conversation

1 goes forward, the messaging -- and so I'm letting  
2 you-all know where this is now. The messaging is  
3 going to be crucial because it's going to sound  
4 like, as we talk about it, that we're talking  
5 about how we're no longer needing special  
6 education. It's going to sound like that. That's  
7 not what anyone is saying. It's just that we  
8 can't keep what we're doing in special education  
9 inside of special education only.

10           It's got to be an expansive framework  
11 that begins to be integrated in the regular  
12 classroom within content, and as we do that, we  
13 have a chance to create a stronger framework to  
14 build for proficiency. And so it's one of the  
15 next big pieces that we're going to be pushing out  
16 and just giving you-all a heads-up that it's  
17 coming so as this conversation begins to happen  
18 and you hear things in your communities that  
19 you-all know what it is that we're talking about.  
20 We're not about doing any anything to special ed;  
21 we're talking about how we can make special ed and  
22 regular ed a much more integrated process so that  
23 we have a way to create change in kids and get  
24 better outcomes inside the special education  
25 model.

1                   So those are kind of the big things  
2 that we're doing right now. Nancy will go on with  
3 the rest of that, but are there questions from  
4 anybody? Yeah.

5                   MS. SIMMONS: Bill, this is Vicki.  
6 You mentioned the possibility of piloting the  
7 ECATS before -- before the rollout.

8                   MR. HUSSEY: Right.

9                   MS. SIMMONS: Is that still a  
10 possibility?

11                   MR. HUSSEY: It really depends on how  
12 this thing -- what the timeline is because -- and  
13 I can't really talk more because then there are  
14 references to the vendor and everything else. So  
15 I have to be careful how I go there, but it's  
16 really an issue of how quickly it comes out  
17 whether or not we're going to need to do that or  
18 whether or not we can basically work with the  
19 systems to process what this new system looks like  
20 and can we move forward.

21                   What we really wanted to try to do  
22 was to try to run, not really a pilot in the  
23 truest sense in that we'd have somebody take over  
24 this system and run it solely, but to run parallel  
25 systems, and we weren't going to do it in a full

1 system. If you can remember, we were going to do  
2 it within schools within systems so that we could  
3 take a look at the broader picture and get enough  
4 in the way of an end and numbers that we felt like  
5 we could move it forward and that the system  
6 itself would manage.

7 So that's still out there as a  
8 possibility, but it really depends on how soon or  
9 how late we get this in. And, you know, we'll  
10 just have to figure that out. So that's still a  
11 possibility, but it really is about the timeline.

12 MS. SIMMONS: I had another question.

13 MR. HUSSEY: Sure.

14 MS. SIMMONS: The ECATS -- would you  
15 remind me if it's a total state acceptance of  
16 ECATS?

17 MR. HUSSEY: There's one element  
18 that's total, and that's the IEP, so every  
19 district, ever charter school will use the same  
20 system. We will not have a dual system as far as  
21 reporting special education which will be  
22 essential for us because we want every bit of this  
23 inside that system. We want to be able -- with  
24 the CLEAR, the Comprehensive LEA Report, we want  
25 to be able to pull data through one system and get

1 it out to everybody at the end of the year. We  
2 need to be able to go in at any point in time and  
3 work through that system and not have that dual  
4 process. So that one piece will be constant  
5 regardless.

6 MTSS and Medicaid are choices that an  
7 LEA can make, and if they choose to do either one  
8 of them, they come free and they come with the  
9 reporting mechanism free. You can add bells and  
10 whistles above what we're going to offer, but they  
11 come free, but you have to use that system. So  
12 it's really not going to be that difficult for the  
13 MTSS because there are not that many different  
14 MTSS systems out there that could be a problem for  
15 Medicaid because there are multiple Medicaid  
16 agencies across the state who do billing for  
17 individuals. You know, so people are going to  
18 have to make a choice. If they use a system,  
19 they're going to have to use the vendor that is  
20 within the system. If they choose not to, then  
21 they can use whomever they want to bill.

22 And that actually brings up -- if I  
23 could just kind of take off. We did get -- if you  
24 remember last year the Medicaid piece, we had --  
25 there was a report done on expansion of Medicaid.

1 They basically expanded pretty much everything we  
2 asked them for in special ed except one-on-one or  
3 adult support.

4 We are working with DMA right now.  
5 They will report out in early January. I'm  
6 meeting with the head of DMA in the latter part of  
7 December to basically say we appreciate what  
8 you've done, but you didn't go far enough on the  
9 free care side, which really is for the regular ed  
10 side of the world, and trying to expand that.  
11 This works in conjunction with the mental health  
12 component because if we can bill more for social  
13 workers, counselors, evaluations by school  
14 psychologists, we can increase the rates for  
15 nursing where we can actually -- it is functional  
16 to bill for nursing, and then those things would  
17 help us.

18 And they didn't approve any of those  
19 things, and so we're going back to DMA to argue  
20 that we should do that and that it will impact the  
21 whole structure of Medicaid, so not only the  
22 fee-for-service component but the administrative  
23 costs and also the cost of reporting. Both of  
24 those pieces will be increased which will be a  
25 benefit to the LEA. There's no state money being

1 brought in because we can utilize money that's  
2 already existing inside of the regular education  
3 world and the special education world as match.  
4 So it's really a win-win for everybody, but it  
5 will require DMA to change some of their  
6 structures and to do a little -- I don't mean this  
7 sarcastically, but to do a little bit of work  
8 inside their structure to change a few things.  
9 But that's really the only holdup, is that piece.

10 So that's why I'm going back to talk  
11 to the head of DMA to basically say we understand  
12 what this is going to do, but he also knows and  
13 I've basically said we're going to push to have  
14 the rest of what you didn't accept done, and  
15 hopefully, we can do that without legislative  
16 intervention. But we are working on legislative  
17 strategies as we move forward.

18 The other thing is the funding  
19 piece -- I'm just thinking about having to get out  
20 of here, but we met yesterday with the Friday  
21 Institute, and we're looking at the funding model.  
22 We will be able to report to you-all the next time  
23 we meet what the funding model will look like,  
24 what the report around the funding model will look  
25 like. We're going to push for a long-term

1 solution, which is a fairly drastic and  
2 significant change in how we do our allotment. We  
3 don't necessarily assume that we'll get that the  
4 first time out, but we do have support in the  
5 legislature now to address the cap. And so we do  
6 need to address the cap, and it looks like we have  
7 support to address the cap.

8 The concern is, if we address the cap  
9 and we don't do anything else with the allotment,  
10 then some of the districts who are under cap are  
11 actually going to get hurt while some of the  
12 districts who are over cap obviously will benefit  
13 because they will get monies for however much that  
14 expansion is, whether we completely do away with  
15 it or we move it to 13 and a half, 14 percent,  
16 somewhere in that neighborhood verses 12 and a  
17 half.

18 So our short-term goal if we are --  
19 is to negotiate not only the cap but to also  
20 negotiate the multipliers, and so right now, we do  
21 ADM and then times 1.9. That's how we get to our  
22 \$3,900 and now it's a little over 4,000 because of  
23 the two percent -- we get a two percent increase  
24 for inflation each year. So we're right at 4,000,  
25 but that was what was asked for -- that's what was



1 set in 1993 with a five-year growth to 2.3. We  
2 never moved. We've stayed with the 1.9 as the  
3 multiplier. We never moved to 2.3.

4 So our negotiation points right now  
5 are, can we move towards 2.3, and actually in  
6 reality from '93 to '16, it's really 2.6, the  
7 multiplier, and so we're pulling data to get that  
8 there, and we're looking at how we can negotiate  
9 from a 2.6 position as well as with the cap so  
10 that we can benefit. An example is right now, if  
11 we just did nothing but remove the cap,  
12 Charlotte/Meck and Winston-Salem, Greensboro, the  
13 big districts who are under, would get hit because  
14 they would actually potentially -- they wouldn't  
15 get anything. They'd lose the cap, but they  
16 wouldn't get any benefit because they are already  
17 under 12 and a half percent so they'll just get  
18 what they've got.

19 For a smaller district, you know,  
20 they could go -- at 17 percent, you know, they  
21 could end up getting money for every one of those  
22 kids because they've not gotten anything from  
23 those kids that were 12 and a half to 17, no money  
24 at all. So obviously that would be a benefit to  
25 them, but we've got to find some way to kind of

1 put this in so that we're benefitting everyone.  
2 We're doing away with the cap and we're doing  
3 something -- or we're adjusting the cap and we're  
4 doing something with that multiplier. So that's  
5 the other thing that's going on right now, and I  
6 think we've got a real good chance to do a  
7 short-term playing with the multiplier and playing  
8 with the cap.

9 We went over to an Oversight  
10 Committee meeting, and they had already done the  
11 projections at 13 and a half percent, 14 and a  
12 half percent, 15 and a half percent, no cap. So  
13 they're looking. We had to answer questions about  
14 the cap. We brought school districts there to  
15 report out what it looked like when you're over  
16 cap and what happens. And so we do have support  
17 for that, and I do think there will be support  
18 around the multiplier as well.

19 So now I'm truly done. I'm sorry.  
20 Yeah.

21 MS. SIMMONS: Would you mind sharing  
22 with us what you perceive will be the new world of  
23 students with disabilities based on the recent  
24 elections?

25 MR. HUSSEY: Well, I think inside of

1 North Carolina there won't be a dramatic change at  
2 least in the short-term. Our new  
3 superintendent -- he has no real idea what he's  
4 walking into, and I don't mean that in a  
5 derogatory sense. I just mean that he really --  
6 he really doesn't know. And so he's going to come  
7 in, and I think he's going to have to basically  
8 get a sense of what this place is, what that  
9 means. He's going to have to meet with all of us,  
10 both collectively and individually.

11           You know, I think there can be some  
12 advantages with the new person coming on. I  
13 think, you know, there is always an opportunity  
14 for change when change occurs and to look at some  
15 positive pieces here. So I am going to reach out  
16 to him and include him in some of these things  
17 that we're doing and also acknowledge, you know,  
18 that we will certainly be glad to help him in any  
19 way possible. But I don't think anything here  
20 will change dramatically for a while until he gets  
21 his feet under him and moves forward.

22           At the federal level, I'm going to DC  
23 this weekend. I have a board meeting with NASDSE  
24 on the weekend, and then I meet with the federal  
25 people on Monday and Tuesday and it's all federal

1 agencies. So it's not only EC; it's Title I,  
2 Title II, Title III, all the titles. We're all  
3 meeting. It's in the context of ESSA, which  
4 basically we've now extended. We're not going to  
5 try to do it by March. We're going to wait till  
6 September to present a plan. We were given an  
7 extension. That will give us some sense of  
8 understanding what DOE will look like.

9           The person coming in is a charter  
10 school voucher person. There had been a long  
11 history of wanting to block grant monies. All  
12 those things are out there. We don't know what's  
13 going to happen. Block granting would be bad  
14 because what happens is you usually get less  
15 money, not more money when you block grant, and it  
16 comes to the state with no conditions, and it will  
17 certainly make our role even more essential  
18 because somebody's got to figure out how to get  
19 that money out in some sort of fashion.

20           But we really don't know. We  
21 certainly know that they will do something to the  
22 regulations because they don't like them, and so  
23 they will -- you know, so we'll just have to wait  
24 and see. It's going to be an interesting next  
25 year. You know, I have a lot of feelings about it

1 and a lot of ideas, but they're all mine. So I  
2 really don't have any real sense more than that,  
3 but tell you we're going to have to wait and see,  
4 and it's kind of scary at some level, but the  
5 bottom line is, we've just got to keep our heads  
6 down and keep going. We're doing what we're  
7 doing. We're doing a good job.

8 Carol Ann was just at a meeting, and  
9 what we're doing with our monitoring pieces,  
10 people want to figure out how we're doing it,  
11 understand our rationale behind it. Our LEA  
12 self-assessment is a model across the country.  
13 Our monitoring piece is a model. We're doing good  
14 things. We just need to keep our heads down, keep  
15 pushing, and focusing on outcomes, and we'll be  
16 okay.

17 I mean if we get less money, we get  
18 less money. We're just going to have to figure  
19 out how to deal with it. It's hard to believe we  
20 could get less money, but we could. So I mean  
21 that's just the reality of what could come down  
22 the road.

23 MS. SIMMONS: What could the Council  
24 do to help build those bridges and make  
25 partnerships?

1 MR. HUSSEY: Inside of North  
2 Carolina?

3 MS. SIMMONS: (Nods head up and  
4 down.)

5 MR. HUSSEY: I think to have a clear  
6 message as to what you guys think are essential  
7 pieces, things that we could collaborate and work  
8 with you, things that you are already in support  
9 of that we're doing, conversations with us, and  
10 then projecting those to the public around things  
11 that we could, you know, expand in the way of  
12 cooperation or support. I think right now as much  
13 as we can be united in what we're trying to say  
14 and do, the better off we're going to be, but you  
15 know, we also need for you-all to be reflective of  
16 you-all's concerns and issues and also be  
17 presenting them.

18 We don't want to look as if we're a  
19 monolith, that we're all in this big thing  
20 together. We want them to see us as a working  
21 body. So, again, issues are issues and we've  
22 worked them out over time, and we'll work them out  
23 again, you know, making sure that they understand  
24 that that relationship is here, that we can talk,  
25 we can work things through. I think just talking

1 about what we're doing and being truthful about it  
2 and just keep going.

3           There's a buzz in the Department  
4 because all of us, including myself, are exempt,  
5 so at any point in time, this guy could come in  
6 here and say you're out of here, and there is  
7 no -- you know, that's it. You're out. And  
8 that's true of the entire administration  
9 throughout this building. There are 25 or 30 of  
10 us who are directors who could go at any moment.  
11 We serve at the will of the Superintendent. So  
12 that's the other side.

13           Personally, I'm not worried about  
14 that. I think June's leaving, Rebecca Garland is  
15 leaving, several other senior leadership are  
16 leaving, and the institutional history is going  
17 out the door because these folks have been around  
18 a long time. So I think it would be not a good  
19 idea on the part of the new Superintendent to come  
20 in and remove the next layer of history and  
21 understanding of the culture, but that is -- you  
22 know, so you'll hear that out there and you'll  
23 here that in here. So that's just kind of what's  
24 happening right now.

25           So I think, you know, the more people

1 that can support -- there's an internal transition  
2 team. There's an external transition team right  
3 now, so people are being called. So you guys  
4 probably are going to get called at some point to  
5 say who is Bill Hussey, you know, and that very  
6 easily could happen. That's what's happening  
7 right now. He's got people out who are checking  
8 on people in here who are there. So, certainly, I  
9 would appreciate your support, but you know, say  
10 what you need to say. But, you know, that's  
11 just -- that's what's happening. You know, it's  
12 disconcerting, but it's just what it is.

13 MS. SIMMONS: Thank you.

14 MS. HUDGENS: Bill, could I add  
15 something?

16 MR. HUSSEY: Sure.

17 MS. HUDGENS: Certainly as an  
18 organized body and council, you could write a  
19 letter of welcome and explain what you -- what  
20 your function is as a state advisory panel and the  
21 initiatives that we have collaborated on and  
22 received your input on. If those are very  
23 valuable from your perspective, that could be  
24 included in your letter, just to express the hope  
25 that that work will continue and move forward



1 because that's definitely something, and your  
2 collective voice and your role in this state is  
3 very important. It is also a federal requirement.  
4 And so a letter of welcome and explanation about  
5 your role and your interest in the state, I think  
6 could be an option that you could consider.

7 MR. HUSSEY: And I would invite him  
8 to come. The word on the street is he's a good  
9 guy. He's an attorney. He's an agenda-driven  
10 person which will -- personally, I think that's a  
11 good thing because that may help us get an  
12 internal plan relative to implementation that  
13 would be helpful to the whole Department. I think  
14 there are some things that are positive that could  
15 happen here, and so I'm -- again, you know,  
16 there's nothing we can do about it, so the issue  
17 is, now we need to figure out how we leverage the  
18 change to benefit us, and so we'll keep working  
19 towards that.

20 But, you know, I think that's a good  
21 suggestion to get a letter out to welcome him.  
22 I'm going to do that through e-mail. So I think  
23 that would be helpful. You know, I wish I could  
24 tell you -- you know, give you a better picture.  
25 I got asked that by the superintendents the other

1 day, and you know, there's really nothing that we  
2 can say at this point until we see what happens.  
3 There will be change all the way down, and I think  
4 we just need to be prepared to move when it  
5 happens and do what we have to do.

6 All right. I've got to leave you  
7 guys to head to Durham, so have a good rest of the  
8 meeting.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Bill.

10 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. On that note,  
11 back to the Annual Performance Report and data and  
12 all the good things that we do. Our second  
13 indicator is also a results' indicator. It's our  
14 dropout rates for students in grades nine through  
15 12, and as you can see over time, we used to have  
16 pretty high rates and then we started dropping and  
17 now we're slowly increasing. If you can look from  
18 2012-13 where it was 3.4 to 2013-14 at 3.82. In  
19 2014-15, it's is 4.9. So we've seen a small  
20 steady increase from year to year.

21 Our hypothesis about that is related  
22 to the fact that three years ago, our state  
23 curriculum changed. It became more rigorous and  
24 all of the testing related to that became much  
25 more rigorous, and when I go to talk about

1 Indicator 3, which is our proficiency rates, I  
2 will be talking about those areas where we have  
3 significant -- significantly low scores, and it  
4 kind of leads right into kids are struggling  
5 academically and that that may be one of the  
6 reasons they're dropping out of school. So that  
7 is something we'll have to pursue more. This is  
8 in comparison to the fact that the overall state  
9 dropout rate has decreased to about 2.45 percent.  
10 So that is a concern that we widen that gap a  
11 little bit for students with disabilities.

12 All right. Indicator 3 is three  
13 parts. There was an A which was about annual  
14 measurable outcomes under -- this used to be under  
15 No Child Left Behind. This is no longer  
16 applicable because of the Every Student Succeeds  
17 Act, but they've left it in our report as a  
18 placeholder in case they want us to report  
19 something in that area related to statewide  
20 assessments.

21 Now Bill told you I was going to be  
22 giving you data. He probably forgot that we don't  
23 submit our data until December 20th of each year  
24 as a state, not just students with disabilities  
25 but all of the assessment data for all students,

1 and the data folks who deal with that won't  
2 release it to me until after that submission so  
3 that we're using the verified data that was  
4 submitted to the federal government. So I don't  
5 have that yet, although I have some kind of ideas.

6 B is participation rate, and our  
7 target has always been 95 percent like it is for  
8 all students, and we have been at 95 percent for  
9 all grade levels. So I am not anticipating that  
10 that's going to change, that we'll be at 95  
11 percent or above at each of the grade levels.

12 Proficiency rates, which is Indicator  
13 3C, is a different story. We have to report by  
14 each grade level where we do assessments -- grades  
15 three, four, five, six, seven, and eight and high  
16 school, which is kind of a mix of where kids take  
17 reading and math assessments, whether they be in  
18 tenth through eleventh grade, and then it's  
19 combined. When our state curriculum changed, our  
20 targets and baseline changed, but just so you'll  
21 know, our targets for reading for this year are  
22 about 39 percent. They're a little bit different  
23 at grade ten, just a little bit lower, and then  
24 about the same, a little bit less than the 39  
25 percent, for math, and those are our targets.

1                   But I just want to share briefly a  
2 little bit about our data from last year. Our  
3 data in the early grades -- three, four, and  
4 five -- while they started out low, that first  
5 year baseline, we started making some real  
6 progress there, and we're up in the twenty-  
7 something percentiles for those grade levels.

8                   But we did see, as we move up the  
9 grade levels, grade six, seven, and eight, the  
10 percentage of proficiency started dropping, and  
11 for reading, it did not drop as much as it did for  
12 math. For math, last year our proficiency rates  
13 in grades six, seven, and eight were less than ten  
14 percent. They were eight-something for grades six  
15 and seven and 7.35 or 39 percent for math. So  
16 that's really pretty low, and so we really do need  
17 to lessen that gap for proficiency rates for  
18 students with disabilities.

19                   But I'm sharing that with you again  
20 because once kids start struggling in middle  
21 school in sixth, seventh, and eighth grade, and  
22 particularly eighth grade when they keep getting a  
23 little bit lower, that's when they start thinking  
24 about dropping out. It's not when they turn 16.  
25 Those are the years where they are already, in

1 their mind, thinking about the possibility of  
2 dropping out. So we do think that that correlates  
3 to our dropout rates.

4 Now the good thing to know is that  
5 when I talk about Indicator 17, I am going to talk  
6 briefly about a lot of things we're doing in that  
7 area to encourage better results with our  
8 graduation rates related to what folks are doing  
9 through their LEA self-assessments in the areas of  
10 reading and math and our State Systemic  
11 Improvement Grant that we have in that area. But  
12 these scores will not be out until after December.  
13 I'll have to take a look at those once they're  
14 available, and then we will update this for you  
15 and send it out so that you'll see what our actual  
16 proficiency rates are.

17 MS. GRADY: Is the data posted  
18 publicly?

19 MS. JOHNSON: It will be -- the data  
20 right now is posted publicly when they do the  
21 school report cards by schools, but some of the  
22 data we have to submit to the federal government,  
23 there's a few different business rules so it's not  
24 exactly what's posted. People will look and say,  
25 "That's not what my district had" or "That's not

1 what it says the state rate is." So to use  
2 that -- we can't use that for this report, what's  
3 public information, but there is data available  
4 publicly.

5 The other thing I did want to let you  
6 know, what we have to report in the Annual  
7 Performance Report is based on -- we have five  
8 levels of possible scoring on our state  
9 assessment. Levels 4 and 5 are college and career  
10 ready. Those are the highest levels, and that's  
11 what we report, but we also have a Level 3, which  
12 is considered state-level proficiency, that the  
13 kids have actually done enough to be proficient on  
14 the state-level requirements.

15 And so we report this data too  
16 because it does add in approximately ten percent  
17 of the kids, and those are kids who -- they are  
18 kind of on the bubble, so if we do more work with  
19 them, they could push up into Levels 4 and 5. So  
20 we will be reporting that data as well, and that  
21 was one of the changes with our federal reporting.

22 Carol Ann and I were at that same  
23 meeting last week, and we talked to a state that  
24 keeps getting accolades for how well they're  
25 doing, and they start showing us their data, and

1 they were less than ten percent in reading for  
2 their kids with disabilities. And it was like,  
3 wow, we thought we were doing poorly, so not that  
4 that's anything to truly get excited about because  
5 our scores are low, and we're hoping that when we  
6 see them this year that we will see some  
7 improvement.

8 Indicators 4A -- and I'm going to  
9 talk about 4A and 4B together -- are related to  
10 suspensions and expulsions for students with IEPs,  
11 and this one, again, is on a year data lag, so  
12 it's 2014-15 data instead of '15-16 data. In  
13 essence, what we're looking at are LEAs that have  
14 identified a significant discrepancy in rates of  
15 suspensions that are greater than ten days for  
16 children with disabilities. These are long-term  
17 suspensions. In other words, we're looking at  
18 individual kids that have gotten a suspension that  
19 is 11 or more days -- an individual suspension of  
20 11 or more days.

21 And our definition right now is that  
22 a significant discrepancy is defined as anything  
23 greater than or equal to twice the state average  
24 rate for the same suspensions. So what we do is  
25 look at an average rate for students with



1 disabilities, what the state rate is. And if the  
2 state rate is one percent, then anything greater  
3 than two percent would be considered a significant  
4 discrepancy.

5 We have out of -- in 2014, we had 252  
6 LEAs and that included traditional school  
7 districts, charter schools, state-operated  
8 programs. We had one district that had -- was  
9 greater than twice the state rate, and that  
10 district was new to the list that year. And that  
11 same district is in Indicator 4B, and it's broken  
12 out by race, and that same district is on the list  
13 for long-term suspensions as it relates to  
14 African-American students. That is greater than  
15 twice the state rate.

16 It is a small district, and I want to  
17 share with you that when you've got small  
18 districts, one or two students could push the  
19 district over the threshold or below the  
20 threshold. One student taken off the list and  
21 they would be back down -- of the percentage rate.

22 DR. CARPENTER: Is this a traditional  
23 school district?

24 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, this one is a  
25 traditional school district. It is a small

1 traditional school district. So in this instance,  
2 what we have to look at when it's by race is, is  
3 the discrepancy a result of the district not  
4 meeting regulatory requirements or any  
5 noncompliant findings. We didn't have any of that  
6 with this district. We do have districts looking  
7 at this kind of data, their discipline data, in  
8 their LEA self-assessments, and so a district that  
9 has issues related to suspensions and expulsions,  
10 they will be addressing those possibly through  
11 improvement plans in their LEA self-assessment.

12 I will share with you, though, that  
13 this is not the area that we really have a concern  
14 about. In North Carolina, we don't have a lot of  
15 students who get greater than ten-day suspensions  
16 in North Carolina. Where our area of concern is  
17 in North Carolina are short-term suspensions that  
18 accumulate to more than ten days in a school year,  
19 and I see you-all shaking your heads yes. That is  
20 not addressed in the Annual Performance Report.  
21 That is addressed in our data regarding  
22 significant disproportionality.

23 And those regulations are changing,  
24 and if I have time this morning -- I know Heather  
25 and some other folks updated you on those changing

1 regulations back in March, and I will give you a  
2 brief update related to that if I have time when I  
3 finish this. But just keep that in mind, that we  
4 are focused on those short-term suspensions that  
5 accumulate to more than ten days in a school year.

6 Least restrictive environment,  
7 Indicator 5, there are three areas, those kids who  
8 are in regular ed 80 percent of the day -- and  
9 that's on the left side of your screen -- and  
10 we're up to 66.8 percent. It is a slight  
11 increase. You can see we've kind of plateaued the  
12 last few years. The next one is those students  
13 who are in a regular class less than 40 percent of  
14 the day, and that's at a low of 13.9 percent.  
15 We've kind of plateaued there. And then separate  
16 schools includes kids who are on homebound,  
17 separate school placements, private school  
18 placements, residential appointments. We're down  
19 to 1.8 percent.

20 And, again, we've kind of plateaued.  
21 We've talked a lot to the federal government.  
22 We've made improvement from the very beginning of  
23 this, which was the initial requirement, but at  
24 some point, we do have a continuum of services  
25 that we have to offer to kids if they need it, and

1 at some point, we're asking when is maintaining  
2 those rates enough, that kids should have access  
3 to these other placement options if they need them  
4 to receive the type of instruction that they need.  
5 One other thing about this -- and they've never  
6 explained this to us exactly, although we do  
7 report this data to the federal government but not  
8 through the APR.

9           There is a gap there. You can see if  
10 you added up 66.8 percent, 13.9 percent, and 1.8  
11 percent, you wouldn't equal 100 percent, and  
12 you're like where are the other kids. There is a  
13 placement option called regular education with  
14 resource placement, and that is in between regular  
15 ed 80 percent or more of the day and regular ed  
16 less than 40 percent of the day. It's that  
17 placement option between 41 percent of the day and  
18 79 percent of the day.

19           We don't have to report that in this  
20 APR, and not only do we not have to report it,  
21 there's no -- we do this electronically and there  
22 is no place for us to report it, but we do have  
23 that group of kids. So the remainder of our  
24 percentages are those kids who are in resource  
25 types of placements. But we are considered okay

1 with this. We're above the national average in  
2 these areas.

3 Indicator 6 is our preschool LRE  
4 placements, and we look at two options here:  
5 those kids who are in education programs receiving  
6 services either ten or more hours or less than ten  
7 hours and then those kids who are in separate  
8 special education placements, separate schools,  
9 residential. Again, that middle group of kids who  
10 might be in between are not reflected here. I do  
11 have a number to give you for the to be  
12 determined. We had a glitch in our data when they  
13 pulled it for me, and it was pulling more kids  
14 into that than they should have. But our number  
15 for this year for A, those kids who are early  
16 childhood should be 36.9, if you want to write  
17 that in where it says "TBD," 36.9.

18 So we did increase by two-tenths of a  
19 percentage point which is what -- we want to  
20 increase A and we want to decrease B, which are  
21 more separate programs, and our B decreased by  
22 three-tenths of a point and our A increased by  
23 two-tenths of a point. So we are moving slowly in  
24 the right direction in both of those.

25 Just a comment -- and I don't have it

1 written on the slide, but I'm adding it into the  
2 slides when I finalize these -- that back in  
3 2014-15, the data that we started with, we had a  
4 change in definitions and how we worked kids who  
5 are five years old in kindergarten into this  
6 preschool data. So our -- the change in  
7 definitions that the federal government had  
8 required us to do and our training that helped  
9 people understand how they were making placements  
10 and including it in the IEP changed, so that's why  
11 you see that significant drop in Indicator A from  
12 50.3 percent to 36.7 percent. Now we're back on  
13 track for what that kind of looks like.

14 And related to that, I did want to  
15 say -- and I forgot to mention early -- all of  
16 this data right now is the best that we have at  
17 this moment, but we're still verifying data for  
18 all of our indicators, we're still analyzing data,  
19 and we do that right up until we submit February  
20 1st. So some of this data could change slightly,  
21 and I'll show you where one just changed last  
22 night, and I will be telling you about that in  
23 just a second.

24 Another outcome indicator, our  
25 preschool outcome is Indicator 7, and what it

1 looks at is three different areas, again three  
2 indicators -- positive social interaction,  
3 acquiring knowledge and skills, and self-help  
4 skills -- and each of those areas look at two  
5 summary statements. Summary Statement 1 for each  
6 of those areas is, did the child make substantial  
7 progress. Summary Statement 2 is, did the  
8 progress they made help them to be back on grade  
9 level or the age-appropriate level like all kids.

10 Okay. As you can see, for most of  
11 them, we did have -- well, for a couple of them,  
12 we did have an increase in those where they made  
13 progress in the positive social interaction and  
14 acquiring knowledge and skills for just a  
15 substantial increase. For those summary  
16 statements where -- are the kids performing back  
17 on grade level; in other words, if they're at  
18 grade level, we're going to think about them no  
19 longer possibly being eligible for special  
20 education, and we did have a drop in those areas.

21 Our preschool coordinators Vivian  
22 James and Kelly Pleasant are still analyzing---  
23 Pull it back?

24 MS. OUZTS: You were just walking  
25 away.

1 MS. JOHNSON: Oh. I was walking away  
2 from it. I'm sorry. I tend to move. It's hard  
3 for me to stand at a podium. ---that they are  
4 analyzing that data to see why we had the more  
5 significant drops in those areas where kids are  
6 not maybe making as much progress in order to be  
7 back on level with their nondisabled peers.

8 Parent involvement. This is one that  
9 we do by a sample. We don't do every district  
10 every year. Every district is included in a  
11 five-year sample except for our large school  
12 districts. Our large school districts are  
13 included every year but different parents and how  
14 it works out, and we do contract this out.

15 We are working -- I'm working with  
16 Heather and Bill Elvey and Carol Ann's section to  
17 look at possible ways to reduce our 25-question  
18 survey. That makes it very hard when people have  
19 25 questions to answer. A lot of states are using  
20 five-question answers to get to this same thing --  
21 or five-question surveys to get this same thing,  
22 and we're taking a look at that to see if we can  
23 make this a more accessible process for folks and  
24 possibly in the future looking at doing more of a  
25 consensus where we're having districts be involved



1 in this, not maybe with every parent in their  
2 district, but with every district each year so  
3 that they'll have more usable data.

4 But we did increase this data for  
5 this past year from about 44 percent to 46  
6 percent, but the last several years, we have been  
7 in that same -- anywhere from 44 to 46 percent of  
8 the parents who were surveyed have reported that  
9 schools facilitate parent involvement as a means  
10 for improving services and results for children  
11 with disabilities.

12 We also have data within there to  
13 show that the rates are a little bit higher when  
14 we desegregate by preschool -- parents of  
15 preschool children ages three to five and then  
16 parents of school-age children -- and that's maybe  
17 not unusual because parents of children who are  
18 three to five tend to be a little more involved in  
19 what's happening at the beginning process for  
20 their kids.

21 MS. LaCORTE: Nancy?

22 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

23 MS. LaCORTE: Hey. This is Mary  
24 LaCorte. I just wanted to ask something about the  
25 parent involvement and the five questions versus

1 25 versus the original 100, which was outrageous.

2 MS. JOHNSON: Yes.

3 MS. LaCORTE: So are there other --  
4 of the five questions you-all are working on, are  
5 there other states similar in maybe size and  
6 demographics or something that maybe you're  
7 looking to their questions as models? Or are you  
8 able to completely come out of the box -- I know  
9 that when Al Colter and his group originally  
10 designed those questions, there was -- there was  
11 an awful lot around what happens when you revise  
12 questions and being able to compare data from  
13 state to state so you probably only have some  
14 level of degree of customization, or is this just  
15 simply about selecting fewer questions?

16 MS. JOHNSON: Mary LaCorte's question  
17 is related to how we're going about looking at the  
18 five -- when I said five questions, we might do  
19 six questions or we might cut our 25-question  
20 survey to ten questions depending on---

21 MS. LaCORTE: Sure.

22 MS. JOHNSON: ---what our group looks  
23 at, and we will be seeking stakeholder input, and  
24 we've sought a little bit of input now from  
25 districts who have been doing these surveys to

1 tell us what questions they think are most  
2 important and which ones they continue to follow  
3 up on. We're looking at -- kind of twofold. We  
4 are looking at what other states are doing and  
5 states that have -- there's one state that uses  
6 one question. I'm not quite sure how they meet  
7 this requirement, but OSEP has let them do that.

8 But there are several states that are  
9 using five questions or somewhere between five and  
10 ten questions. We are looking at those states,  
11 and I know Heather and Bill have also met with  
12 some districts or gotten input from local  
13 districts here in North Carolina about if we are  
14 going to reduce the number of questions, to answer  
15 this question that we have to in the APR, which  
16 questions are you finding most important.

17 We are also going back and looking at  
18 our reports that are submitted to us from the  
19 contract group who does our -- who handles this  
20 data for us to look at which items they have  
21 identified that are most related to answering this  
22 question for the APR. Some we're kind of doing --  
23 looking at a variety of things so that we can come  
24 up with what would be appropriate questions to  
25 make sure, though, that we're able to answer this

1 question in the APR. Does that make sense?

2 MS. LaCORTE: Yes, it does. I just  
3 know that early on there was a lot of angst around  
4 not being able to reword but select only. Thank  
5 you.

6 MS. JOHNSON: What Mary was saying  
7 was that there was some discussion, I guess, about  
8 not being able to reword questions but only select  
9 questions out of that survey, but some states have  
10 not even used that survey and they've developed  
11 their own questions. So OSEP has accepted  
12 different things from different states as long as  
13 you can justify and explain why you're doing it  
14 the way you are doing it, and one of our intents  
15 is to get -- to make this data more useful to  
16 districts.

17 Right now, at least to the districts  
18 that are not part of our big five districts, they  
19 only do this once every five years unless they do  
20 it on their own, and so when we report data back  
21 to them, it's -- they get it once every five  
22 years -- it's not particularly helpful. So it's  
23 not -- they can't really get any trend data, if  
24 you will.

25 MS. LaCORTE: Okay. Great. This

1 sounds like a great opportunity.

2 MS. JOHNSON: And we will be talking  
3 with your folks, Mary, and other parent  
4 organizations and things as we consider this.  
5 This is something we're thinking about right now.  
6 We haven't been able to -- because we're making  
7 some changes in some other areas, we haven't had  
8 as much time to focus on this right now. So it  
9 will probably be next year before we really get  
10 more active in this one -- on this indicator.  
11 Yes, ma'am.

12 MS. HALL: One of the goals for our  
13 public comment procedure is to have a means to  
14 give further comment or answer some type of  
15 survey. Is it possible that this survey could be  
16 linked to our public comment opportunity? For  
17 example, we have now the opportunity through our  
18 e-mail address to comment -- to make a comment.  
19 That comment receives a standardized message of  
20 "Your comment has been received. You will not  
21 receive, you know, an answer back." We would like  
22 for that -- for that standardized response  
23 eventually to have a link to a survey that could  
24 give additional information, you know, that  
25 further questions could be answered.

1                   So would this survey that you're  
2 discussing be that possible link, or should we  
3 still be considering developing our own?

4                   MS. JOHNSON: This survey is specific  
5 to LEAs reporting that schools facilitated parent  
6 involvement as a means for improving their  
7 services for children with disabilities, so there  
8 are questions related to their IEP meetings and  
9 things like that, and then we do have to report  
10 publicly the data for each district. So I'm not  
11 sure. Maybe we could discuss that further, but  
12 I'm not sure that tying those two together would  
13 meet the requirement for this piece of it.

14                   MS. HALL: Okay. Thank you.

15                   MS. JOHNSON: But it is something  
16 that we could certainly explore further.

17                   MS. HALL: Okay. Thank you.

18                   MS. JOHNSON: Okay. This one -- this  
19 one is really hard to see, but I can give you kind  
20 of a brief update. This is Indicators 9 and 10,  
21 and what Indicators 9 and 10 are about are our  
22 identification process for students with  
23 disabilities and whether or not that there is  
24 disproportionate representation of students in  
25 special education -- that's Indicator 9 -- or

1 disproportionate representation by race in one of  
2 the six major disability categories.

3 And when I say "major disability  
4 categories," the federal government refers to  
5 those as specific learning disabilities, autism,  
6 mild mental disabilities, serious emotional  
7 disabilities, speech/language impaired. I don't  
8 have them all right on the top of my head, but we  
9 look at all six areas by race, and then not only  
10 do we have to look at is there disproportionate  
11 representation -- and what we use for that is a  
12 risk ratio of 3.0.

13 In other words, if in special  
14 education for Indicator 9, or by race for  
15 Indicator 10, in those disability categories --  
16 and I'm going to use race as an example -- if  
17 Hispanic students in district X are three or more  
18 times more likely to be identified in specific  
19 learning disabilities than all other students in  
20 special education, they would be considered to  
21 have disproportionate representation in our state.

22 Then we have to look at, though, is  
23 that disproportionate representation due to the  
24 district inappropriately identifying kids. In  
25 other words, are they not following the

1 regulations for eligibility determination, is  
2 their data improving or not. We look at a variety  
3 of things when we look at was that due to  
4 inappropriate identification.

5 What we have found is -- you can look  
6 back in 2005-06 when we first reported this, we  
7 didn't have any districts in Indicator 9 for  
8 overall and special ed, but we did have a lot of  
9 districts for identification by race in specific  
10 disability categories, particularly in serious  
11 emotional disabilities, mild mental  
12 disabilities -- in those two categories.

13 We have significantly reduced those  
14 number of districts. Districts have brought their  
15 data down, and most districts are less than a 3.0  
16 risk ratio in those areas. You can see for this  
17 year 2015-16, we had one LEA in Indicator 9, and  
18 you can see that fluctuates. We had zero, then  
19 maybe two, back to one, back to zero, and now one  
20 again. This one is a new charter school, and what  
21 we've seen happen when charter schools come on  
22 board, again, they have low numbers of students  
23 with disabilities, and one student could put them  
24 over that 3.0 and less than one student could  
25 knock them -- or one student removed could knock



1 them down to below 2.0, which they wouldn't even  
2 be on the list.

3 Then our -- for Indicator 10, our  
4 districts that had a risk ratio of 3.0 or above  
5 were 25 LEAs, but all of those LEAs that are on  
6 that list have reduced their risk ratio. Even  
7 though they're still above 3.0, they've met a lot  
8 of criteria for it not being due to inappropriate  
9 identification. They're following our regulations  
10 for eligibility. They're improving their numbers,  
11 and because of that, they are not in that column  
12 that it is due to inappropriate identification.

13 So we're in a good place in this one;  
14 that is, again, I'm not alarmed that we have a  
15 district occasionally show up in Indicator 9  
16 because of the nature of our charter schools with  
17 low numbers of students with disabilities.

18 DR. CARPENTER: We're still using --  
19 as you did for the other tables, you were  
20 reporting 252 LEAs. Is the same total used for  
21 these?

22 MS. JOHNSON: No. There is about --  
23 for this group, there were about two hundred  
24 and -- I would have to go back and look -- 267  
25 maybe. This is -- this indicator is 2015-16 data.

1 Indicator 1, graduation rate, Indicator 2, dropout  
2 rate, and Indicator 4A and 4B are on a year data  
3 lag. So we're reporting in this report 2014-15  
4 data, but all the other indicators, we're  
5 reporting 2015-16 data.

6 DR. CARPENTER: So those were out of  
7 252. These are out of how many?

8 MS. JOHNSON: I think 267, but I'll  
9 have to go back and calculate that, but we do  
10 have -- because we have more charter schools in  
11 2015-16.

12 DR. CARPENTER: That's fine.

13 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. Placement  
14 timelines. Our Indicator 11 -- I had mentioned  
15 this earlier -- is a compliance indicator. It is  
16 our 90-day timeline that kids who are referred --  
17 that they are placed within the 90-day timeline.  
18 We dropped slightly in percentage points to 91.89  
19 percent. Our target for all compliance indicators  
20 is 100 percent for these types of compliance  
21 indicators, so we have not met our target. We  
22 have never met our target. I don't know that we  
23 would ever go out into any district -- this is one  
24 we collect through a database -- that any district  
25 will ever be -- well, some districts are at 100

1 percent compliance, but not all districts, all the  
2 time are at 100 percent compliance because things  
3 do happen and they go over the 90-day timeline.

4 What we did look at, though -- Bill  
5 mentioned our determinations and different things  
6 where we came in good. As long as our compliance  
7 indicators are at 90 percent and above, we get all  
8 of our points when they do our determinations. So  
9 we have -- even though we've dropped slightly,  
10 they will not consider this real slippage because  
11 we were still above our 90 percent -- their 90  
12 percent rate where they've kind of used that as a  
13 threshold.

14 Indicator 12 are those children who  
15 were in Part C, early intervention, and are  
16 referred to Part B and have an IEP in place by  
17 their third birthday, and this is 97.3 percent.  
18 That is a slight drop, a 1.11-percentage-point  
19 drop. It was very high last year, 98 percent, but  
20 again, it's still way above our 90 percent that  
21 OSEP looks at for determination purposes. And  
22 this is the indicator that way back when in  
23 2005-2006 was below 50 percent. So we've done a  
24 lot of work with our districts to bring it up to  
25 this level, and they continue to do work in that

1 area.

2 Indicator 13, transition. This is a  
3 compliance indicator again, so we're supposed to  
4 be at 100 percent, and this is -- through our  
5 monitoring system is how we look at this indicator  
6 and collect this data. Our districts, including  
7 all the required components in a compliant manner  
8 for transition, and this is postsecondary  
9 transition from school to postsecondary goals and  
10 those kinds of things. This is to be determined.  
11 We have our data, but there are some issues with  
12 our data, as we're looking at it, between what is  
13 actually required for compliance and what are more  
14 best practices in terms of results.

15 And we are -- Carol Ann and I are  
16 meeting with the monitors who collect all this  
17 data, and we're going to be reviewing with them a  
18 new rubric that we just received in the meeting we  
19 were in last week that looks at this same data.  
20 We'll kind of apply it and take a look at our data  
21 and how all this works together, and we'll be  
22 coming up with a percentage for that. Our  
23 percentage last year was at 88 percent, and it was  
24 an improvement from the previous year, just so you  
25 know.

1 Transition was an issue for us in our  
2 state when we went from districts self-monitoring  
3 themselves versus us doing the monitoring in this  
4 area. Our data dropped, and we've had some  
5 specific improvement activities. We've done a lot  
6 of that transition training throughout our state  
7 this past year. Districts are starting to employ  
8 those strategies and things, and we are seeing  
9 improvements, but I don't think our data is going  
10 to be above that 88 percent this year.

11 It takes a couple of years to get  
12 changes to occur. Where districts were trained  
13 this past school year, they're going to start  
14 applying those to the IEPs moving forward, and  
15 we're seeing some of that as we go out on  
16 monitoring teams. I was just on a monitoring team  
17 two weeks -- the week before Thanksgiving, and we  
18 were seeing a lot of good things as it relates to  
19 transition plans based on that training.

20 Indicator 14, postsecondary outcome.  
21 In this one, we look at students who are in higher  
22 education one year after exiting school for  
23 whatever reason: dropout, graduation, anything  
24 like that. We do this, again, by a sampling of  
25 districts. We have an approved sampling plan by

1 the US Office of Special Education Programs, and  
2 so every district, except the large districts, are  
3 included once every five years.

4 A looks at are those students one  
5 year out, and we do a survey/interview process  
6 with them. Are they in higher ed, which is A. B  
7 is a combination of A and/or competitively  
8 employed. C is a combination of A, B, and other  
9 postsecondary training or some other type of  
10 employment. Okay. So our C is always higher than  
11 our B or A because they all kind of add in  
12 together.

13 These past several years, we have  
14 contracted with UNC Charlotte, and a national  
15 group that has done our interview process for us.  
16 They're the ones who have called -- we've given  
17 them the students' name for the districts that are  
18 involved. They've called the students, done the  
19 data, and collected it -- collected the data. We  
20 have noticed over the last few years our response  
21 rates have dropped, and we've been very concerned  
22 about that, and we've been looking at, again, what  
23 other states are doing and have wanted to make a  
24 change where we're doing -- having our school  
25 districts do those interviews themselves because

1 they know their students the best.

2           There are things like when the  
3 students get a call from an 800-number or a number  
4 from New York that they're not familiar with,  
5 they're not answering their phones, which I don't  
6 either. When I get a number from some unknown  
7 caller, I don't often answer my phone and I'll let  
8 them leave a message. So we have piloted this  
9 last year in collecting our data -- we have  
10 piloted with several school districts to do their  
11 own interviews and the same survey information.  
12 One of our districts got 100 percent response rate  
13 or a 99-point-something response rate because they  
14 know their students. The students recognized that  
15 it was the school district calling them. They  
16 prepared them that we're going to be calling you a  
17 year out, all of those kinds of things.

18           So as we looked at the different  
19 districts that were involved, they all got better  
20 response rates than they had the previous year.  
21 Some of them were our large districts. So we are  
22 anticipating that our data is going to be better.  
23 I don't have the data yet. UNC Charlotte is our  
24 contractor, and they're the one who is compiling  
25 all the data for us from the surveys and will be

1 submitting that to me by the end of December, but  
2 we, again, are anticipating that our data will --  
3 from a response perspective. Now whether kids are  
4 in higher ed more or competitively employed more,  
5 I won't know until I see the data, but we do  
6 believe our response rate will go up and so that  
7 we'll have better data for districts to use  
8 because we'll have more responders.

9 Indicators 15 and 16 are related more  
10 to our dispute resolution process. Indicator 15  
11 is related to those hearing requests that went to  
12 a resolution session and were resolved with  
13 settlement agreements. Indicator 16 are those  
14 disputes where mediations were held and they  
15 reached an agreement before it went on to due  
16 process. You can see in Indicator 15 we increased  
17 significantly. That number was -- that percentage  
18 rate was very low.

19 We had a 32-point percentage rate  
20 increase to 48.84 percent. In mediations, it  
21 dropped slightly to 61.54 percent. We did not  
22 meet our targets in that area. Our targets --  
23 OSEP lets us use a range, and the low-end of our  
24 range is at 75 percent for both of those. However,  
25 we also understand we don't have a lot of control



1 about how those things go. Oftentimes when  
2 districts and parents are having some kind of a  
3 dispute and the communication has broken down and  
4 a hearing is requested, they've already done a lot  
5 of things to try to avoid going to that hearing or  
6 they may want to go to a due process hearing so  
7 they're just going through the motions to hold the  
8 mediation or do the resolution session.

9 And so it really is hard to get to  
10 that point where you are resolving and getting  
11 settlement agreements, but we will be looking at  
12 that data to see are there other things we can do  
13 as a state to help facilitate those processes in  
14 terms of encouraging people to try to resolve  
15 their disagreements prior to going to due process.  
16 And these are -- in Indicator 15, it is all --  
17 these are agreements that have happened after a  
18 due process has been requested. In Indicator 16,  
19 the mediations is a combination of mediations  
20 after a due process has been requested and before  
21 a due process has been requested. Those  
22 mediations are combined.

23 Lastly, our Indicator 17, the State  
24 Systemic Improvement Plan. And Bill talked to you  
25 a little bit about that. And this really is about

1 results, and we were required to be ambitious yet  
2 achievable. We have a large stakeholder group who  
3 works with us on this. Some of you -- I think  
4 Mary LaCorte is on our stakeholder group. Some of  
5 you have been on the stakeholder group maybe in  
6 the past. And it really is looking at our general  
7 supervision systems to improve IDEA requirements,  
8 but really looking at results and outcomes for  
9 children with disabilities.

10 This is just some other information  
11 that talks about what we had to do to select our  
12 State Identified Measurable Result in looking at  
13 baseline data and targets, and I won't get into  
14 all that. That's all been done. But I'm going to  
15 flip to this one. Our SIMR, our State Identified  
16 Measurable Result, is related to -- is about  
17 improving our five-year cohort graduation rate,  
18 which is our red line, and you can see that we  
19 have continued to show improvement, that for this  
20 last group of ninth graders entering in 2011-12,  
21 if they graduated with a standard high school  
22 diploma in five years or less, they are included  
23 in that 72.3 percent. That is an improvement, and  
24 we did meet our target for this Indicator 17 this  
25 time.

1 Bill mentioned our target down the  
2 road in the next few years is 77 percent, and OSEP  
3 did accept that even though it is below our  
4 overall state target of 80 percent, that for the  
5 years of this plan, it's reasonably calculated.  
6 We showed how we did that calculation. But our  
7 plan -- well, I'm going to talk about the  
8 components of the plan and then talk about the  
9 plan briefly again.

10 There were three phases. Our first  
11 phase was submitted three years ago, and we had to  
12 do an in-depth data analysis and come up with our  
13 SIMR. Then phase 2, we had to talk more about our  
14 infrastructure and how we were going to support  
15 Local Education Agencies in doing -- implementing  
16 evidence-based practices, and then our third year,  
17 which we're in now and then this will be a  
18 continual kind of thing, we have to continually  
19 evaluate and look at our evaluation data and make  
20 any revisions and updates to our State Systemic  
21 Improvement Plan.

22 So we're in the first year of the  
23 evaluation phase this year, and Bill talked about  
24 the fact that we have contracted with UNC  
25 Charlotte because we have so much data related to

1 all these indicators and other data related to  
2 children's proficiency related to our state  
3 improvement grant and other things going on in our  
4 state. They're kind of collecting all that data  
5 for us and analyzing it and correlating it with is  
6 this having an impact on your graduation rate. So  
7 it's not just looking at the graduation data.

8 One thing I want to say about  
9 this -- a couple of things that we looked at here.  
10 First of all, this past year, we spent a whole  
11 year working with our LEAs -- including charter  
12 schools, traditional schools, and our  
13 state-operated programs -- in doing an LEA  
14 self-assessment where we had them drill down into  
15 their own data in all of these areas and analyze  
16 their data and then identify some priority areas  
17 they felt they needed to work on, keeping that  
18 graduation goal in mind.

19 Several of our districts have  
20 selected things like priority areas of really  
21 looking at specially designed instruction and  
22 progress monitoring, the MTSS process, Multitiered  
23 System of Support process, looking at their math  
24 achievement scores, looking at their reading  
25 achievement scores. So we have -- in that LEA

1 self-assessment process and through our State  
2 Systemic Improvement Plan, we identified what Bill  
3 referred to as buckets, but three kind of big  
4 chunks of areas: academics, behavior, and then  
5 transitions, postsecondary transition, as we know  
6 it and defined, but also transitions along the way  
7 from early on when a child is coming into the  
8 system at age 3 through other transitions,  
9 transition into kindergarten, transition into  
10 third grade when assessments start, transition  
11 from fifth to sixth grade, that elementary to  
12 middle school. And so we have a lot of  
13 initiatives going on right now in those areas as  
14 they relate to improving our overall goal of  
15 graduation for these students with a high school  
16 diploma.

17           So our achievement scores, our  
18 dropout rates, our suspension and expulsion rates,  
19 all of those things are data that our districts  
20 have looked at, and they all in some way relate to  
21 and impact whether students are successful in  
22 school and do come out graduating with a standard  
23 high school diploma. Whether it takes them four  
24 years, five years, and in some instances six  
25 years, our ultimate goal is to help them be

1 successful.

2 So this plan is a huge plan within  
3 the Annual Performance Report plan, and it really  
4 has shifted our focus to being more of a balance  
5 between compliance and results, and when I say a  
6 balance -- just to use an example because  
7 sometimes people say, "What do you mean by that?  
8 We have that compliance indicator, Indicator 11,  
9 the 90-day timeline, and I've heard people say  
10 that doesn't really make a difference. If I make  
11 a difference in that area getting people to do  
12 that in a timely manner, that's really not  
13 impacting outcomes. My reading scores are still  
14 low."

15 But if people are out of compliance  
16 significantly with our 90-day timeline, children  
17 could go for a long period of time and need  
18 special education services in order to achieve and  
19 they're not getting those services they need to  
20 have good results in reading and math. So we are  
21 looking at a balanced approach to this in how  
22 we're ensuring that through our LEA  
23 self-assessments, districts are having to look at  
24 all of their compliance kinds of things and  
25 whether or not they have an impact on results.

1 Now it is one thing if somebody  
2 misses the 90-day timeline by one day, that might  
3 not really impact. We still have to find them out  
4 of compliance, but if somebody is missing that  
5 90-day timeline by 100 days, that's 100 days that  
6 that child might have needed services that they  
7 didn't get to help them get direct instruction in  
8 reading, that they might need to supplement what  
9 they're getting in the regular classroom as an  
10 example. Does that make sense?

11 MS. VLASATY: Nancy, this is Jennine  
12 Vlasaty. Two questions. One, when you look at  
13 the graduation rates, the OCS is considered a  
14 regular diploma?

15 MS. JOHNSON: Yes, it is considered a  
16 regular high school diploma. The occupational  
17 course of study, the students who complete that,  
18 they do get a standard diploma and they would be  
19 included in this data.

20 MS. VLASATY: And then my question is  
21 in regards to the LEA self-assessment. Was there  
22 anybody that worked with the LEAs on that if they  
23 came up with an initiative -- a couple of  
24 initiatives that they wanted to work on but one  
25 really wasn't meaningful enough, was there any,

1 you know, dialogue back and forth from DPI or  
2 anybody to say, "Oh, you know, you selected this,  
3 but you know, maybe you could have looked at  
4 another area"?

5 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. We -- and I'll  
6 let Carol Ann kind of chime in here too. We did  
7 not evaluate their plans, so to speak. We did not  
8 want them to think we were judging what they were  
9 doing, but we did, all along the way -- every  
10 quarter we meet regionally with our exceptional  
11 children's directors, and for the last year, every  
12 one of those meetings was related to developing  
13 this LEA self-assessment. So we did a lot of  
14 training.

15 We also asked questions to get them  
16 to think about their data and what their issues  
17 might be. We did try to help them look at how you  
18 might prioritize because you might have more than  
19 one area and need to decide we need to work on  
20 this area first before we can make -- because we  
21 can have the most impact over here before we can  
22 have impact in this other area. So we did a lot  
23 of things like that.

24 When those LEA self-assessment were  
25 submitted, each one of them was reviewed by three



1 persons on our staff to go back and see what they  
2 said and what they identified as their priority  
3 areas and what kind of professional development  
4 and technical assistance they needed moving  
5 forward. In some instances, it wasn't clear to  
6 us. We did follow up with them to ask more  
7 questions to drill down more to get them to think  
8 differently, and they had opportunities during all  
9 of those times -- even if we didn't have questions  
10 for them at our last meeting -- they had  
11 opportunities to say, "You know, this is how  
12 you-all interpreted this. This isn't what we  
13 really meant. We might need to add this" or "We  
14 really were wanting to focus in this area."

15 So there was a lot of dialogue and  
16 support and technical assistance, but we didn't  
17 tell anybody that the area they chose to look at  
18 for improvement was an area they couldn't do, but  
19 their improvement areas did have to reflect back  
20 to their data. So it was based on -- we're really  
21 trying to get them to look at their data and have  
22 good problem-solving processes for making  
23 decisions.

24 Carol Ann, is there anything you want  
25 to add?

1 MS. VLASATY: What I was specifically  
2 referring to is, like, our county, we actually  
3 have an advisory council with our county, and one  
4 of the things that they had proposed was  
5 postsecondary so they could, you know, put one of  
6 their initiatives as okay, well, we're going to  
7 start calling these students and our Council, you  
8 know, kind of looking at the different data, and  
9 then the other initiative was the progress  
10 monitoring.

11 But we had felt really, you know,  
12 looking at that data, there were more important or  
13 more areas that could have been a higher priority  
14 than calling to see where students were after  
15 graduation.

16 MS. HUDGENS: Sure. So to kind of  
17 go -- to go back to the initial question and just  
18 elaborate a little bit on what Nancy offered, yes,  
19 this is not necessarily a compliance indicator  
20 because we want to make sure that we are  
21 partnering with the LEAs, leveraging the resources  
22 that they have available, and the unique needs of  
23 their LEA in terms of working towards really  
24 meaningful activities to improve outcomes for  
25 students.

1                   And so just as Nancy mentioned, there  
2 was a series of guiding questions, there was a  
3 review by our staff, and so we consider this an  
4 opportunity for really targeted technical  
5 assistance, and then the follow-up support, we  
6 looked at needs that were in common across the  
7 state and then needs that became more and more  
8 unique as you moved along, and so we developed our  
9 tiers of response in a universal response of what  
10 does all the state need, what are the needs that  
11 are in common, what are some basic process needs  
12 that everybody needs, and then as those unique  
13 needs get more and more specific, then they become  
14 more targeted based on groups of LEAs who have  
15 common needs and then more customized based on  
16 individual LEAs that have particular needs that  
17 may need either focused technical assistance or  
18 focused professional development opportunities.

19                   And then if you lift out of this in  
20 the broader picture, this one indicator is  
21 certainly focused on improving graduation rates  
22 for our students with disabilities, and it is  
23 utilizing all of the other data sets that Nancy  
24 mentioned, things that we are doing through our  
25 program monitoring and other factors. This past

1 year has been their first year to develop their  
2 plan.

3 This coming year or this current year  
4 is while they're in the implementation of their  
5 plan, and as we all know, we do need  
6 implementation time to have an impact on the data  
7 results to see it moving forward, but at some  
8 point in time, despite all of the implementation  
9 efforts of the LEA in conjunction with multiple  
10 data sets and things we have to do through  
11 monitoring, we might eventually have to do some  
12 targeted type of focused monitoring that might  
13 have more directive corrective action because,  
14 despite your best efforts in looking at root cause  
15 and working on improvement strategies, we're still  
16 not making a difference for outcomes over time for  
17 students with disabilities.

18 So that focused monitoring might go  
19 into help look at those root causes to make sure  
20 that the LEA has, in fact, identified a targeted  
21 area to focus their attention on appropriately.

22 MS. VLASATY: Okay. Perfect. Thank  
23 you.

24 MS. JOHNSON: And just one last  
25 thing. We did not -- if they picked an area of

1 results that they were looking at -- a district --  
2 we would not have told them that that might not be  
3 appropriate. Different people, I guess, look at  
4 things a little bit differently, and I don't want  
5 to -- Indicator 14 and postsecondary outcomes is  
6 very important. We don't just want to graduate  
7 students from high school; we want to graduate  
8 them so that they -- we want them to graduate and  
9 go on beyond that and be successful at life, at  
10 getting work, being employable, being able to go  
11 onto school and get the training they need for  
12 future jobs or whatever.

13 So some people do look at that as the  
14 ultimate outcome and might want to look at that  
15 and work backwards. I am glad to know that we  
16 had -- almost all of our districts wanted more  
17 related to specially designed instruction and  
18 progress monitoring with the IEP in terms of our  
19 children making progress on the IEP goals and how  
20 is that impacting things.

21 So we are doing a lot of training  
22 efforts through this year in those areas, but we  
23 would not have said to somebody, if they picked  
24 one of those outcome goals -- we would just ask --  
25 get them to look at the guiding questions to see

1 if their data supported that area, but how they  
2 prioritized that, we would not have questioned  
3 necessarily.

4 Okay. With that, are there any other  
5 questions, before I get briefly into the Notice of  
6 Proposed Rulemaking about our Annual Performance  
7 Report? And just so you know, as we finalize the  
8 data and submit it on February 1st, about that  
9 time, soon right after that or right before that,  
10 I will get it to Heather and Tish so that they can  
11 get a new updated PowerPoint out to you so that  
12 you'll have the most current data that we actually  
13 submitted.

14 And just a bit more about the  
15 process. Even though we submit on February 1st,  
16 as long as we get it in on time, in April -- and,  
17 generally, it's the first week in April -- we get  
18 a week of clarification -- a week for a  
19 clarification period, and OSEP will contact us and  
20 say, "Here are things we have questions about.  
21 Did you mean this? This data doesn't look right."

22 If we have any changes to our data --  
23 and we last year did have a change in our  
24 Indicator 11 data after February 1st from a glitch  
25 we found in the program -- we -- in that week in

1 April, by a given date that they give us, we're  
2 allowed to update our data, submit any changes  
3 they ask us for, and that's considered still  
4 submitted on time.

5 So it is possible, again, that our  
6 data might even change after February 1st. That's  
7 unusual, but we have -- like I said, last year our  
8 Indicator 11 data improved because of the glitch  
9 that we found in the program that it was pulling  
10 in -- it was doubling in some of our districts for  
11 some reason, and it was an issue with our  
12 contractor who pulls that data.

13 So with that, though, just so you'll  
14 know that process after April 1st, if there are  
15 any changes, we would certainly inform you of that  
16 process. And then our LEA public reports that  
17 related to this have to be up on our public Web  
18 site by June 1st, and so we have always met that  
19 deadline, and we plan to do that this year as  
20 well. Okay.

21 All right. If you could take out  
22 your yellow sheet just for a minute, I just wanted  
23 to update you briefly. Heather had mentioned to  
24 me or somebody had mentioned that you-all might  
25 want a little bit more information about the

1 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that's out to  
2 promote equity in IDEA, and this is related to how  
3 we determine significant disproportionality in our  
4 state.

5 And we have to, in special education,  
6 look at three different areas. We have to look at  
7 significant disproportionality in identification.  
8 We have to look at significant disproportionality  
9 in placement, and when I say "placement," I'm  
10 talking about is the child in a regular ed class  
11 80 percent of the day, are they pulled out for  
12 more than 60 percent of the day, are they in  
13 separate classes, residential programs. We have  
14 to look at those areas, both identification and  
15 placement, by not only race but by the six, again,  
16 major categories of disabilities, and then we have  
17 to look at discipline.

18 And in this area, we have to look at  
19 discipline, not just the long-term suspensions  
20 that we look at in 4A and B on the indicators, but  
21 we have to look at short-term suspensions and in  
22 the future, based on this, we're probably going to  
23 have to look more closely at in-school  
24 suspensions. And when I say "short-term  
25 suspensions," I'm referring to short-term



1 suspensions that accumulate to more than ten days  
2 in a school year, and I mentioned that's our issue  
3 in North Carolina and we are going to have to  
4 start looking more closely at in-school  
5 suspensions, so we may see that we have a similar  
6 issue there. I don't know.

7           What this goldenrod sheet does that I  
8 had developed for your March meeting, it looks at  
9 what the proposed regulations say on the left side  
10 and what our current requirements are. Now I'm  
11 not going to go through each of these, but I just  
12 want to point out a couple of things. First of  
13 all, we were monitored by the federal government  
14 back in 2011, and at that time, they found some  
15 issues with how we were doing significant  
16 disproportionality particularly with discipline,  
17 but some other things related to identification  
18 and those kinds of things.

19           So at that time, we had to make some  
20 changes, and some of those changes included --  
21 like with our risk ratio with identification, our  
22 risk ratio is at 3.0, but we -- when we looked at  
23 three consecutive years, if a district was making  
24 any kind of improvement, we accepted that as  
25 improvement. What they told us was we needed to

1 put in a threshold. So with input from folks, we  
2 put in a threshold of a risk ratio of 5.0. So if  
3 a district was over a 3.0 but had brought their  
4 risk ratio down below 5.0, that extra threshold,  
5 and was showing improvement still, then we could  
6 say that they did not have significant  
7 disproportionality, as an example. So some things  
8 like that.

9 With that said, almost everything  
10 that's in the new proposed regulations, we have  
11 already made changes for because they were  
12 identified back in our monitoring system. So  
13 we're going to have fewer changes based on  
14 whatever comes out of the proposed regulations  
15 than other states -- some other states will have.  
16 But where we will have some changes, if the  
17 proposed regulations go through as they said they  
18 were going to go through, we will have to change  
19 our discipline definition because, as allowed, we  
20 use a greater than twice -- greater or equal to  
21 twice the state average rate. We will have to go  
22 to a risk ratio and, more than likely, will go to  
23 that same risk ratio that we use for  
24 identification, that 3.0 with a -- looking for  
25 improvement at the 5.0 threshold or less. But

1 that's still something that would be up for  
2 discussion if these go through.

3 A couple of the other areas that are  
4 of concern to us are, in the proposed regulations,  
5 they propose looking at a cell size and N size of  
6 ten students or more. Right now in North  
7 Carolina, we use what's in our -- was in our --  
8 had gotten revised in our new Child Left Behind  
9 waiver process, and what they're looking at in the  
10 Every Student Succeeds Act of 30 students for a  
11 subgroup or less, and that 30 students -- some  
12 states are using 40, some states are using 50, and  
13 I know OSEP is trying to get us to -- so they can  
14 kind of compare things.

15 But we have to run numbers. Other  
16 states have run numbers. That cell size of ten is  
17 so small that some of our small districts with  
18 tiny numbers, one student, again, will push them  
19 over or drop them down depending on if you add the  
20 student or remove the student. So we have shared  
21 with OSEP that even of our subgroup of 30, when  
22 they don't meet that number, we don't do the risk  
23 ratio calculation or the greater than twice the  
24 state rate, but we still look at the raw numbers.

25 And an example of that would be that

1 if they had small numbers and they didn't have the  
2 30 size, but they had ten students who had ongoing  
3 suspensions that accumulated to more than ten days  
4 and they were all of one racial group but their  
5 population isn't all of one racial group, we would  
6 flag that as we need to dig deeper into this, and  
7 we would make a decision, based on the factors  
8 that we're looking at, to see if we would consider  
9 that to be significant disproportionality.

10 So it's not that we weren't looking  
11 at those groups that are less than 30, but we're  
12 just looking at them a little bit differently  
13 because the small number of N size can affect data  
14 negatively or positively. So that is a concern,  
15 and that's not only a concern for North Carolina.  
16 That is an area where they got a lot of comments  
17 on, so we'll see how they come out on that.

18 The other area is in preschool.  
19 Preschool -- they want us to look at preschool  
20 particularly in the area of discipline. Now  
21 they're asking us to look at other of areas and  
22 other areas will be okay, but if they're going to  
23 require us to use a risk ratio, risk ratios  
24 typically are looking at that category of students  
25 in question and how that compares to your overall

1 population in that area.

2 Well, there are comparable  
3 populations in all of our districts for three- and  
4 four-year-olds. When they say preschool at OSEP,  
5 it includes five-year-olds, so it's five-year-olds  
6 in preschool and five-year-olds in kindergarten,  
7 and it gets confusing in how we're going to -- and  
8 we do have other five-year-olds in kindergarten  
9 that you can compare them to, but you can't just  
10 compare them to part of a group. So not all  
11 districts have three- and four-year-old regular  
12 kids in their district to compare to.

13 So we've asked a lot of questions at  
14 different national meetings along the way, and  
15 they haven't really answered how they're going to  
16 respond, but we know that they have proposed what  
17 they are proposing as final regulations. At the  
18 meeting Carol Ann and I were in last week, they  
19 had OSEP on the phone, and they did respond to us  
20 that these regulations are at OMB right now for --  
21 and that's the Office of Management and Business,  
22 I believe is what that's for -- for final review  
23 before they become public.

24 Now I know Ruth Rider, who is the  
25 assistant director over OSEP, was hoping that

1 these would be out by the end of this year, and we  
2 still have a couple of weeks to go. So maybe OMB  
3 will get them done before and get them out, but  
4 also, with the holidays and everything else, it  
5 possibly will be after the first of the year.

6 MS. GRADY: How long have they been  
7 at OMB?

8 MS. JOHNSON: Huh? How long have  
9 they been---

10 MS. GRADY: They have, what, 90 days?

11 MS. JOHNSON: Yeah, I think. And I'm  
12 not sure how long they have been there. The  
13 last -- I'm trying to think -- when was the last  
14 meeting, Carol Ann, when we were in Milwaukee?  
15 That was in when? September?

16 MS. HUDGENS: October.

17 MS. JOHNSON: October. And they were  
18 not at OMB yet, I don't believe. At that point,  
19 they were in the process of getting them ready to  
20 go to OMB. So between October and the end of  
21 year, that's maybe about 90 days, but they could  
22 still push it into the first the year, I think.

23 What will probably happen -- we did  
24 ask this question when we were in Milwaukee in  
25 October of Ruth when these regulations come out,

1 are we going to be required to implement right  
2 away because, a lot of times, they make  
3 regulations effective within the first 60 days or  
4 whatever, and we'll be doing our calculations for  
5 significant disproportionality starting in  
6 February. It will be hard for us to shift all our  
7 data collection and how we do things if they come  
8 out and then we're required to use them.

9 And she said, "Well, it likely would  
10 be required to implement right away, but we would  
11 give states opportunities to -- to set up their  
12 new systems and apply it to the next go-round."  
13 So that is likely what we would do. Once they come  
14 out, we'll look at it and see what changes we have  
15 to make and make those changes for the next --  
16 next year. So it would be not this spring, but  
17 the following spring, if that makes sense.

18 I don't you if you had -- when  
19 somebody -- when Tish and Heather had mentioned  
20 that you-all might be interested in an update on  
21 this -- if there were specific questions you had  
22 about this that I could answer.

23 (No audible response.)

24 MS. JOHNSON: Okay. We will let you  
25 know when they -- when we get the final

1 regulations and what changes we're going to have  
2 to make. Again, ours will not be as significant.  
3 One other thing -- I just looked down at my  
4 paper -- that I did want to mention. One of the  
5 good things about this if it goes through -- and I  
6 think it will because they got a lot of positive  
7 comments -- in the past, if a district was  
8 determined to have significant disproportionality,  
9 they would have to spend -- they would have to  
10 spend 15 percent of their funds for Coordinated  
11 Early Intervening Services, and how that was  
12 defined in the federal regulations meant that that  
13 had to be spent on kids who were not identified as  
14 disabled and in special education, and sometimes  
15 districts were like, okay, that makes sense with  
16 identification, but when it comes to discipline if  
17 it's our kids that are causing us to be  
18 significantly disproportionate but then we can't  
19 use that money to fix what the issue is with how  
20 we're disciplining kids with disabilities, that  
21 doesn't really make sense.

22 The proposed regulations look at  
23 allowing us to use the money for coordinated early  
24 intervening services for all kids, including kids  
25 with disabilities. So that will be something that



1 the districts will look forward to because they  
2 really will be able to then target whatever the  
3 issue is.

4 Okay. If there are no questions,  
5 with that, I am done for the day. I know this  
6 time typically for our APR, we are making some  
7 kind of change, like last year it was changes to  
8 our targets for Indicator 6 and you-all gave us a  
9 lot of input. We accepted your input and  
10 increased our targets based on the input from the  
11 Council, but this year, we don't really have any  
12 changes. We're just reporting data to OSEP, and  
13 it's kind of a good place to be for a change. Our  
14 biggest changes will be in the area of Indicator  
15 17, and that will be our evaluation piece which is  
16 new.

17 So with that, I thank you all very  
18 much for letting me spend the morning with you.  
19 Carol Ann, do you have any closing comments before  
20 lunch?

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think all I can  
22 really say is thank you for all the effort and the  
23 work on this. I appreciate it. A lot of things  
24 to consider as we move into our afternoon  
25 committee sessions and -- but very good work.

1 Thank you.

2 Any comments from the telephone  
3 world? I heard a beep so---

4 MS. OUZTS: Leanna, when we--- Oh,  
5 I'm sorry. Go ahead.

6 MS. LaCORTE: No, no. Please  
7 [inaudible].

8 MS. OUZTS: I was just going to say,  
9 when we adjourn for lunch, then I will put us on  
10 mute in here, and then if you could just tell  
11 everybody what time you'd like for them to be back  
12 on if they're going to join us for the afternoon.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think I'll try to  
14 stick with what the schedule says. About twelve  
15 forty-five. Sounds good. All right. Enjoy your  
16 lunch.

17 MS. OUZTS: Thank you.

18 (At 12:00 p.m., a luncheon recess was  
19 taken.)

20 - - - - -

21 AFTERNOON SESSION

22 12:47 P.M.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think next on the  
24 agenda was to pretty well break into our  
25 committees. Is there anybody on the phones with

1 us?

2 (No audible response.)

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Oh, yeah. We have  
4 public comment first. Are there any public  
5 comments today?

6 MS. OUZTS: There was nobody on the  
7 sign-in.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, there was  
9 none given.

10 MS. HALL: I can give an outline of  
11 what the public -- about what the public comment  
12 policy that our Unmet Needs Committee is doing---

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. That sounds  
14 good.

15 MS. HALL: ---in regards to that. So  
16 the e-mail is up on the Web site so that  
17 individuals -- this is Laura Hall -- so  
18 individuals can make public comment by written  
19 e-mail communication, and there is also, as  
20 approved on the public comment policy document, an  
21 address for written comment and the procedure for  
22 how to make public comment at our meeting.

23 We have three primary goals through  
24 June. Those are to create an internal document  
25 with which we can measure public comments and

1 categorize them in order to give a report. The  
2 other is to create some type of external survey  
3 that when somebody makes a public comment, they  
4 can give additional feedback through the survey,  
5 and so the survey needs to be created  
6 and then to roll out the e-mail address to the  
7 stakeholders. So those are the three primary  
8 areas of focus.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. So what  
10 committees do we have? I know we have Unmet Needs  
11 here to work today. I know Cindy is out sick.  
12 Susan, do you have any needs for your committee?

13 MS. HUMBERT: (Shakes head from side  
14 to side.)

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: No. Okay. So,  
16 then, I propose that when everyone's here for your  
17 committee that you guys can meet, and in the  
18 meantime, we can begin work on a draft letter to  
19 the Superintendent of Schools for North Carolina  
20 and see where we want to go from there. Does that  
21 sound good?

22 (No audible response.)

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

24 MS. OUZTS: Leanna, is there a time  
25 that we'll restart for the end of -- for the end

1 of the meeting?

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Since it's one  
3 o'clock now -- do you know what time Jennine was  
4 to be back from her lunch meeting.

5 MS. HALL: She just communicated that  
6 she had a lunch appointment and would be close-by  
7 and that she would be back for the afternoon  
8 session.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. So I'm  
10 thinking possibly about two-thirty. Does that  
11 sound good?

12 (No audible response.)

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. That might  
14 put us out a few minutes early. That's always  
15 good, right?

16 MS. OUZTS: Right.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Thank  
18 you, everybody.

19 MS. OUZTS: Okay. We will be  
20 stopping the audio during the committee time and  
21 restart it by at least two-thirty. Thank you.

22 (A recess for committee work was  
23 taken from 12:51 p.m. to 2:10 p.m.)

24 MS. HUDGENS: Leanna, is it okay if I  
25 go ahead and get the callers back on the line?

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, that's fine.

2 MS. HUDGENS: Okay. Hello, callers.

3 We are now coming back for our closing activities  
4 on the agenda. Can you guys hear us?

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: I know we're coming  
6 back early, but---

7 MS. OUZTS: There's probably nobody  
8 left but Jacqui.

9 MS. HUDGENS: We do have Jacqui on  
10 the Webinar.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Hi, Jacqui, even  
12 though she can't talk.

13 MS. OUZTS: I don't think she has a  
14 mike today.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: I know, but she can  
16 say hi back, right?

17 MS. OUZTS: Yes, she can. She can.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. I know I  
19 just heard that Laura has a report back from the  
20 Unmet Needs Committee.

21 MS. HALL: Yes. So we wanted to ask  
22 everyone to promote the CESEC e-mail which is now  
23 on the Web page.

24 MS. SIMMONS: Can you tell us what it  
25 is?

1 MS. HALL: CESEC@dpi.nc.gov.

2 MS. OUZTS: It's on the Web page.

3 MS. HALL: It's on the Web page.

4 MS. SIMMONS: I want to write it  
5 down.

6 MS. HALL: CESEC@dpi.nc.gov.

7 MS. SIMMONS: Got it.

8 MS. HALL: So that can be promoted to  
9 stakeholders, and we are also working on a blurb  
10 for the Listserv to go out in the new year, but  
11 anybody on this Council, please go ahead and  
12 promote the e-mail address for public comment.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. So we should  
14 be able to have public comment starting in March?

15 MS. HALL: Public comments---

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Starting today  
17 possibly.

18 MS. HALL: It was possible---

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Today. Okay.

20 MS. HUDGENS: And one thing that I  
21 can offer to you that might change after the new  
22 year, but I'll explore it right now, is the  
23 Superintendent's message goes out to all the  
24 superintendents of schools, and then from that  
25 point on, we don't know who might access that. So

1 it could be appropriate that we put a blurb in the  
2 Superintendent's message relative to this  
3 opportunity also. I'll see what requirements or  
4 what are the guidelines for doing that, but I feel  
5 like we may have an option to help do that through  
6 that venue.

7 MS. HALL: Wonderful. Jennine is---

8 MS. VLASATY: I'll add a note to  
9 that.

10 MS. HALL: ---taking lead on the  
11 blurb.

12 MS. VLASATY: And that will go out in  
13 January probably?

14 MS. HUDGENS: Uh-huh. And I think --  
15 let me look at our notes. We had a leadership  
16 meeting yesterday so there may be a deadline  
17 within a couple of days that I can meet to get it  
18 out in a timely fashion. We would assume that the  
19 new Superintendent would have similar messaging,  
20 but regardless, that's something I'm happy to  
21 explore if you guys would want me to have that go  
22 out on the Listserv.

23 MS. HALL: Tish, is that in line with  
24 what you need to do as far as---

25 MS. OUZTS: She needs time to make



1 sure the automatic reply and all that is  
2 corrected.

3 MS. BYNUM: Yeah. There's just two  
4 little IT things they've got to work on before  
5 we're ready to go statewide with the blurb.

6 MS. OUZTS: The e-mail works, but  
7 it's -- yeah, it just has a couple of glitches we  
8 need to fix. You want them to get that automatic  
9 message, and it wasn't turned on today, so we need  
10 to make sure they fix that.

11 MS. HUDGENS: But if we have the  
12 Council's permission and request to explore the  
13 Superintendent's message, then I'll just go ahead  
14 and work on that, and then if we don't have any  
15 barriers to the requirement, we'll just go ahead  
16 and make it happen. If it is able to be taking  
17 place, then I'll work with Tish to send a  
18 complimentary copy of that to you-all so you know  
19 what that looks like.

20 MS. HALL: Okay. So can the same  
21 messaging go out through Bill?

22 MS. BYNUM: Probably -- in reality,  
23 the exact same message is probably going to be in  
24 all those different places -- the exact same.

25 MS. OUZTS: Because Jennine was going

1 to work on that, so---

2 MS. HUDGENS: If you'll give me the  
3 statement of what you would like to have in the  
4 link, then it will be easy.

5 MS. VLASATY: It will save time.

6 MS. HALL: Okay. Wonderful. So in  
7 following up with that, I did -- I did forget that  
8 we had those two IT issues. So January 1 would  
9 be -- probably a good time. Tish, is that -- or  
10 would say before then or January 1 would be for  
11 sure?

12 MS. BYNUM: Let's stay with January 1  
13 just to be on the safe side.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: One thing that some  
15 of the executive council discussed over the  
16 break -- or committee -- was the potential of  
17 starting a public relations ad hoc committee to  
18 start working toward a pamphlet or brochure.  
19 Maybe eventually a long-term goal is, like, a  
20 quarterly newsletter coming out of this meeting or  
21 something like that, just a little blurb that we  
22 can tell people what's going on here, what we  
23 learned, different things, just a synopsis of the  
24 minutes maybe. I don't know.

25 But I was wondering if anybody else

1 would like to join me on the ad hoc committee to  
2 hopefully get the brochure ready by the March  
3 meeting, if not sooner.

4 MS. GRADY: Who would be the intended  
5 audience?

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Probably initially  
7 the parent liaisons from the different districts,  
8 from the LEAs. Eventually, hopefully, also  
9 advocacy groups, parents that are personal  
10 advocates for our children like Jennine and I are  
11 quite a bit. But anyone that might be a  
12 stakeholder or have a vested interest in special  
13 education or citizens of North Carolina.

14 MS. GRADY: I was just wondering if  
15 you would want to also have, like, a social media  
16 component to that PR.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Maybe eventually.  
18 Baby steps as we start trying to -- we might bite  
19 off more than we can chew and have a really  
20 interesting social media group. Social media can  
21 be fun. Not trying to turn down that idea, but I  
22 think just to get started right now. So is there  
23 any volunteers for that?

24 MS. OUZTS: There's not many people  
25 left.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: I know. There's  
2 like five of us.

3 MS. HUDGENS: I think, Leanna, if  
4 people choose to leave early, they are subject  
5 to---

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: They're drafted  
7 into it. Okay. I'll work, in the next week or  
8 two and over the holidays, to put something  
9 together, and e-mail it out to everyone. If  
10 anyone has any edits, you know, we can kind of go  
11 from there. If you want to participate, great; if  
12 you don't, well, fine.

13 MS. OUZTS: You might want to invite  
14 the whole Council via e-mail.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, that's what  
16 I'm thinking.

17 MS. HUDGENS: And just kind of  
18 another thought too, the introductory to the  
19 Council PowerPoint that Vicki used as orientation  
20 might give you the subject matter for just your  
21 first brochure because you don't have to have only  
22 one. I mean eventually -- and talking about  
23 moving forward, you could eventually have  
24 topical-specific ones.

25 But if your goal is just to message

1 to people why you're here, what your purpose is,  
2 and that we need to hear from you, you may have  
3 enough subject matter that has already been agreed  
4 upon by your Council to provide a basis for your  
5 very first one.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: You're right about  
7 that. We probably need to just go back and look  
8 through everything because I can see, you know,  
9 doing a pamphlet based on dispute resolution,  
10 effective IEPs. My primary target would probably  
11 be parents because this is their parent liaison,  
12 but anyone that might be interested or be able to  
13 contribute would be helpful.

14 MS. HUDGENS: And, Leanna, actually,  
15 we are working on a dispute resolution one for  
16 parents, so if you would like for us -- we're  
17 still working on that. We will be happy to share  
18 that at our next meeting so you guys could give us  
19 some feedback about whether it's detailed enough  
20 that parents would understand how to navigate that  
21 process.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Uh-huh.

23 MS. HUDGENS: Again, it's meant to be  
24 just some basic information to let parents know  
25 that they have other options when they're in

1 conflict with the LEA and contact information back  
2 to us.

3 So we'll be happy to get feedback and  
4 reciprocate with what we're thinking so that we  
5 can make that resource available to you-all when  
6 you're out and about as well as the general  
7 counsel.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: What are the  
9 current parent-focused initiatives or efforts that  
10 are being taken by the EC Department here? I know  
11 you mentioned one or two during the break. I  
12 don't know what you're at liberty to share with or  
13 what have you, so---

14 MS. HUDGENS: Well, we still believe  
15 in transparency, so I'll share all I've got.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Awesome. We love  
17 transparency.

18 MS. HUDGENS: So right now, in  
19 leveraging Heather's position, we certainly --  
20 this past year having Heather on board has mostly  
21 been about getting her out in front of people, so  
22 she's been in a multitude of stakeholder groups.  
23 So what we have initiated -- and we shared this at  
24 our last Council meeting -- is we had sent out a  
25 survey for LEAs who might be interested in joining

1 a parent liaison network, and we have gotten  
2 information back from those participants.

3 The follow-up activity was at the  
4 November conference, and they could attend our  
5 pre-institute and get more information about the  
6 rollout of how we would help support LEAs in  
7 establishing those parent vehicles at the local  
8 level. So we've identified---

9 MS. OUZTS: They're getting their  
10 notification next week.

11 MS. HUDGENS: How many?

12 MS. OUZTS: The survey is open -- I  
13 mean the confirmation is open still so -- till  
14 Friday, I want to say. But we had 34 interested,  
15 but confirming, I know we'll be close to at least  
16 20 from what I've looked at, but they were still  
17 coming in.

18 MS. HUDGENS: Well, what we were kind  
19 of excited about is about ten percent of the state  
20 was interested in establishing this mechanism. So  
21 we wanted to take all of those who were interested  
22 and establish that cohort together so that maybe  
23 by the end of the year, which is what our cohort  
24 is designed for, we would have ten percent of the  
25 state with these options available, in addition to

1 those LEAs that already have that service. So  
2 that's kind of what I was alluding to when we  
3 talked at break.

4 If you get your PR campaign, your  
5 materials, your Listservs or your social media  
6 opportunities planned for over this next little  
7 while, while we are getting our cohort in place,  
8 we are going to end up at the same place at the  
9 same time. So that when you're developed for your  
10 messaging campaign, we have the avenue to push  
11 that out.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

13 MS. HUDGENS: And then there might be  
14 some opportunities for you guys, if interested, to  
15 have an opportunity to share information to that  
16 cohort because we're going to try to design it  
17 with a balance of face-to-face meeting and  
18 GoToWebinars because this will be people all over  
19 the state and we don't want to make participation  
20 prohibitive. So you could dial in and contribute  
21 to that session or listen in on it as we're  
22 working with that cohort.

23 MS. HALL: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

24 MS. HUDGENS: So the network is one  
25 thing, but the other thing is maintaining current



1 relevant, subject-specific resources on the Web  
2 site, if it needs to be in brochure format, do we  
3 have stuff that can be given to parents who may  
4 not be able to access social media, electronic  
5 devices, can we look at a combination of materials  
6 focused on particular things but broad enough to  
7 let parents know of options.

8 MS. HALL: Your final comment brought  
9 into clarity what I was -- but one of the things  
10 that I noticed on other like councils in other  
11 states is that several of them had links on their  
12 Web page to large resources like, you know, if you  
13 are looking for additional resources and  
14 information, click here, and it's a resource list  
15 of the Autism Society, you know, Association for  
16 Deaf/Blind, you know, the different links so that  
17 CESEC is able to be a resource, a place where  
18 people can go to also find more resources, just as  
19 we would want CESEC's e-mail address or Web page  
20 to be on somebody else's. But that was -- that  
21 was relatively common on the state councils.

22 MS. HUDGENS: Yeah. And what I was  
23 trying to do while you were speaking was to bring  
24 up our DPI Web site because Heather has made some  
25 changes to our parent resources tab that parallels

1 what you're talking about, and another partnership  
2 that we could look at is, based on this Council's  
3 expertise, we can make that list of resources even  
4 more richer, that you may be aware of some really  
5 good sites that we need to add to our Web page.  
6 So that's a partnership as well, that along in the  
7 PR campaign and messaging, that we look at that  
8 concurrently.

9 MS. OUZTS: Yeah. If you haven't  
10 looked at the parent resources tab, it is quite a  
11 bit more options available on that now.

12 MS. HALL: Might I suggest the  
13 possibility of in looking to fill positions going  
14 forward on the Council, as they become available,  
15 that the Council be proactive and intentional in  
16 looking for individuals with some specific skill  
17 sets such PR or -- you know, obviously, you need  
18 to look at individuals with disabilities, parents  
19 of children with disabilities, service providers,  
20 but who would have some specific skill sets in  
21 moving forward because I feel like, going forward  
22 this year, it's so important that this piece get  
23 married and really be -- that's a lot for you to  
24 take on, you know. You're supposed to be the  
25 face, you know.

1 MS. HUDGENS: Yeah. So it's always  
2 helpful when we know of individuals who are  
3 wanting to serve on this Council.

4 (Pause.)

5 MS. HUDGENS: So one of the things  
6 that we can do is, we can offer the resumes of  
7 those individuals to the State Board, but it will  
8 be the State Board's official recommendation.  
9 But, typically, they've been amenable to the  
10 opportunity to have folks that are interested,  
11 they'll review those resumes, and based on the  
12 criteria of the composition of the Council, will  
13 make a decision about whether they want to put  
14 that person forward.

15 MS. SIMMONS: Carol Ann, I see we  
16 have two vacancies already.

17 MS. HUDGENS: Yes.

18 MS. SIMMONS: Do they need to be  
19 certain regions or---

20 MS. HUDGENS: I think that the most  
21 important thing is that we have the percentage of  
22 parents with students with disabilities in the  
23 majority. We've already put that item forward to  
24 the State Board for recommendations, but I am not  
25 aware that it has to be specific to region. I

1 think Tish has some information she'd like to add.

2 MS. BYNUM: It doesn't have to be  
3 region-specific, but in general, the Council would  
4 seek membership with diversity in region, race,  
5 gender, the whole nine yards. I know the  
6 Sandhills is missing, and I was working on that  
7 earlier today. I should know. Let me see which  
8 regions are missing. Sandhills and Northwest.

9 MS. OUZTS: There will be some  
10 vacancies coming open at the end of June as well,  
11 and so that's why we'll be putting it forward so  
12 they can be ready for June.

13 MS. HUDGENS: And, quite simply, you  
14 guys may consider that as your personal terms come  
15 to an end, how will you pay it forward by someone  
16 in your LEA or region who might be interested,  
17 that you help us, also, in filling your position  
18 as you leave, and that might be a little bit more  
19 manageable than Leanna and Vicki trying to recruit  
20 consistently. But if you get a panel that's  
21 diverse enough across the whole state and,  
22 ideally, as those people rotate off, one of their  
23 gifts back to the Council would be to recommend  
24 someone to replace them.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: I might put

1 together -- send out through e-mail just basically  
2 a knowledge and skills -- I don't know what the  
3 word I'm looking for is, but just find out what  
4 each one has special interest or skills in because  
5 you might be a Web designer and I have no clue,  
6 you know. Yeah, Greg's a Web designer, and he's  
7 not even here. I don't know. Because there might  
8 be a skill that we don't know about that's here in  
9 the room already or virtually that are here today  
10 that we could tap into. So that might something  
11 worthwhile doing as well, and I can do that.  
12 That's no problem.

13 MS. HUDGENS: It would just be real  
14 nice, as we were talking about during the break,  
15 that if we can coordinate your efforts to be more  
16 a message to parents with our efforts to get the  
17 structures in place locally for parents, that's  
18 going to be very nice and complimentary over the  
19 next little period of time.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. Sounds  
21 good. I'll work on that brochure and invite  
22 everybody else to work on it. Is there anybody  
23 who has anything before we move to make a motion  
24 to adjourn?

25 (Pause.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

THE CHAIRPERSON: Hearing no other comments, is there a motion to adjourn?

MS. HALL: I motion to adjourn.  
Laura Hall.

MS. VLASATY: I'll second. Jennine Vlasaty.

THE CHAIRPERSON: The motion was heard and seconded. All in favor?

(Multiple members responded aye, and at 2:30 p.m., the quarterly meeting was adjourned.)

- - - - -

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, REBECCA P. SCOTT, State-Certified  
Verbatim Reporter and Notary Public, duly  
appointed and qualified in and for the State of  
North Carolina at large, do hereby certify:

That said proceeding was reported by  
me and the foregoing pages, numbered 4 through  
118, are a true record of the proceeding to the  
best of my knowledge and belief;

That I am neither related to nor  
employed by any of the parties or counsel employed  
by the parties hereto, nor interested directly or  
indirectly in the matter in controversy, and am  
not financially or otherwise interested in the  
outcome of the action.

Certified this 8th day of February,  
2017.



Rebecca P. Scott

Notary Number: 19940530133