

Florida Department of Education (DOE)  
Division of Public Schools (DPS)  
Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services (BEESS)

**State Advisory Committee  
for the Education of Exceptional Students**

**June 25–26, 2009  
Clearwater, Florida**

**Meeting Report**

**Wednesday, June 24**

State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Students (SAC) Co-Chairs Penny Collins and Joni Harris met with Bambi J. Lockman, Chief, and Michele Polland, Educational Policy Analyst, BEESS; and Tonya Milton, Program Planner/Analyst, BEESS; to review the agenda and materials in preparation for the Committee meeting.

**Thursday, June 25**

The State Advisory Committee met in regular session with the following persons in attendance:

Members

(See SAC Membership List 2009, SAC Designee List, and SAC Representation Chart, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 2.)

Dr. Brian Abrams  
Laurie Blades  
Penny Collins  
Susan Davidson  
J. T. Davis  
Lileana de Moya  
Terri Eggers  
Carin Floyd  
Ranee Gabriel (June 24<sup>th</sup> only)  
Angela Gilbert  
Dr. Rosalind Hall  
Joni Harris  
Johana Hatcher

Approved 12-4-09

John Howle  
Leah Kelly  
Dr. Kathryn Krudwig  
Michele Love  
Judy Miller  
Joanne Nelson  
Bill Palmer  
Kelly Purvis  
Calley Ronso  
Ann Siegel  
Tracy Stevens  
Charlotte Temple  
Bryan Vaughan  
Dr. Bill Vogel  
Robyn Walker

Mary Ellen Byrne as designee for Gayle Zavala  
René Johnson as designee for Denise Arnold

DOE/DPS/BEES Representatives

(See BEES Staff List, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 10.)

Bambi J. Lockman, Chief (SAC Member)  
Michele Polland, Educational Policy Analyst, Administration/Policy (SAC Liaison)  
Cathy Bishop, Senior Educational Program Director, Exceptional Student Education  
(ESE) Program Development and Services  
Karen Denbroeder, Administrator, Special Programs Information and Evaluation  
Dr. Kim Komisar, Senior Educational Program Director, Program Administration and  
Quality Assurance  
Tonya Milton, Program Planner/Analyst, Administration/Policy

Other

April Katine, Florida Developmental Disabilities Council  
Juli Kempner, Advocacy Center for Persons with Disabilities, Inc.  
Calvester Anderson, Justice -2-Jesus  
Dr. Brian Pitts, Justice-2-Jesus  
Dr. Brian Gaunt, University of South Florida  
Dr. Kristine Webb, University of North Florida (UNF)  
Moirá Arossi, UNF student  
Trey Henderson, UNF student  
Tawski Frazier, UNF student  
Christian Van Schoor, UNF student  
Marvin Espinade, parent

## **Welcome, Overview of Agenda, Introductions, Roles and Responsibilities**

(See Agenda, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 1; SAC Way of Work and Ground Rules and Roles and Responsibilities; IDEA State Advisory Panel Requirements; Issues Related to Government in the Sunshine, Public Records, and Code of Ethics; SAC Membership List 2009; SAC Designee List 2009; SAC Representation Chart, Tab 2; SAC Business Session Materials, Tab 9; Evaluation Form, Tab 9; Bureau Staff List, Bureau Calendar, List of Acronyms, Tab 10.)

Joni Harris and Penny Collins, SAC Co-Chairs, opened the regular meeting by welcoming members and providing the opportunity for brief self-introductions. Michele Polland thanked the group for being there, addressed Committee membership and roles and responsibilities, and emphasized that, as an advisory board to a state agency, the Committee is subject to state laws and requirements concerning "Government in the Sunshine," public records, and Florida's Code of Ethics, as detailed in their materials. Ms. Polland walked through the agenda, pointing out that the agenda was developed in response to Committee input, and correlated each item with resource materials in the *SAC Member Notebook*. She informed members of the Rules presentation change of order and the slight time change for the Scaling Up Response to Intervention Florida presentation. She stated that the Bureau provided the members with *Florida Statutes and State Board of Education Rules, Volume I-B* and *2007 State Advisory Committee Annual Report*. She discussed the process for selecting an official designee.

Ms. Polland noted items for consideration in anticipation of the Committee business session as well as the availability for review of due process hearing orders. She emphasized the importance of the *BEESS Weekly Memo* and the Bureau Web site as ongoing sources of information and the role of the Committee in sharing information with their respective constituent groups and in representing statewide needs.

Ms. Polland highlighted the new SAC home page located on the Bureau Web site. The page features the list of members, by-laws, and meeting and annual reports. She concluded with a brief update on data requests made in a prior SAC meeting regarding Post School Outcomes by District for Students with Disabilities and State Performance Plan Indicator #8, Parent Survey Results, indicating that these data would be discussed more fully during the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report update.

Ms. Harris reviewed the Committee's ground rules. Ms. Collins reviewed the Committee's Way of Work and thanked the committee for observing the rules.

## **Bureau Update**

(See PowerPoint presentation, Letter from Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), Letter from the Department of Education, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2008 (ARRA) IDEA Recovery Funds for Services to Children and youths with Disabilities and Part B, Preschool Entitlement June 2009, IDEA Part B, Part B Preschool Entitlement Non-ARRA and ARRA Funds for FY 2009-10, *2009 Legislative Review*, SAC Member Notebook, Tab 3.)

Ms. Lockman began her update themed “Shifting Sands” by congratulating members for one year of service to the Committee. She addressed the following topics (see PowerPoint presentation and related materials for more detailed information):

### **Celebrations**

- OSEP Visit—week on November 17, 2008
- IDEA ARRA—IDEA Part B and Part B Preschool funds to districts
- SLD Rule—became effective March 23, 2008, and includes emphasis on implementation of Response to Intervention (RtI)
- ESE Legislation—aligns to IDEA requirement regarding due process
- Part B Entitlement—no special conditions

### **2009–10 Education Budget and Finance-related Legislation**

- K-20 Budget Highlights—budget includes stimulus funds
- 2009–10 Operating Budget—local funds have decrease, state funds have decreased, federal funds have increased
- Enrollment Changes for 2009–10—student enrollment is declining in Florida
- ESE Guaranteed Allocation for 2009–10—funds provide for educational programs and services for exceptional students
- Student Transportation—funds decreased, districts are using ARRA funds
- Virtual School—100% funding cut, district supported
- VPK—Early Learning was cut 75%
- Department of Education—eliminated three sections and reduced two

### **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, IDEA Recovery Funds for Services to Children and Youths with Disabilities**

- Four Principles—funds follow IDEA requirements
- IDEA Requirement Overview—districts are working to build capacity
- IDEA Recovery Funds—outlines IDEA Part B, Part B Preschool, and ARRA for Florida

### 2009 Florida Legislative Update

- SB 1128—establishes educational guidelines for students in Foster Care
- HB 807—requires OPPGA to conduct a study of the effectiveness of outreach efforts of the Florida KidCare program for uninsured children
- SB 1540—revises the requirements for zero tolerance policies
- SB 1660—creates a study group and designates membership including the Commissioner of Education
- HB 991—establishes a state system of school improvement, Differentiated Accountability

### Implementation of 2008 Legislation

- Governor's Commission on Disabilities—focus on implementation of recommendations, Statewide transition program at each college in Florida
- Governor's Task Force on Autism Spectrum Disorders—April 2nd is Autism Awareness Day
- Revising High School Grading Requirement—Graduation rate method of calculation indicates that GEDs and Special Diploma would be counted as non-graduates

*The committee discussed the revised graduation rate, not including Special Diplomas. Discussion ranged from impact on districts, schools, juvenile justice system, work force, and students. Penny Collins suggested that the committee member complete a Committee Action Form (SAC Member Notebook Tab 9) at the SAC Business Meeting.*

Ms. Lockman resumed her presentation.

### Monitoring and Dispute Resolution

- 2009–10 Proposed Monitoring
- State Summary—Postsecondary goals based on age-appropriate transition assessment(s); reason for Florida's "needs assistance"; Chancellor will send a memo out to Superintendents

### Rules

(See PowerPoint presentation, Draft of 6A-6.05271, *Standards for Use of Reasonable Force to Maintain a Safe and Orderly Learning Environment*, Florida Developmental Disabilities Council, Inc. Restraint and Seclusion statement, The Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders Position Summary on Physical Restraint and Seclusion Procedures in School Settings, Draft 6A-1.0943 Statewide Assessment for Students with Disabilities, National Center on Educational Outcomes *Revisiting Graduation Requirements and Diploma Options for Youth with Disabilities: A National Study*, SAC Member Notebook, Tab 4.)

Cathy Bishop began her presentation with Rule 6A-1.09961, F.A.C., *Graduation Requirements for Certain Students with Disabilities*. She outlined the types of participants represented on the workgroup. There were two meetings held in October. The concerns identified by the workgroups for the current rule were: the term “special diploma” is stigmatizing; the name of the diploma needs to be meaningful to the community; there is a need for more diploma options in order to provide districts with flexibility; the options should have clear requirements, should be flexible enough to allow students to change diploma options, and continue to keep expectations high.

The workgroup recommended that the rule address options that meet the needs of students who currently receive a special diploma, significantly cognitively impaired students participating in alternate assessment, students with disabilities participating in FCAT, yet taking ESE courses (or a combination of ESE and General Education courses), and students with disabilities receiving instruction in general education classes who have not met all requirements by the time they age out (GPA, course, requirements, etc.).

Ms. Bishop divided the committee up into five groups and assigned each group one of the following guiding questions:

1. What options should be available? How many options?
  - a. Modified/Alternate Diploma
  - b. Occupational Diploma (with Major Area of Interest)
  - c. Life skills Diploma
2. What are the outcomes for the diploma? (What is the value?)
3. Should there be statewide requirements for each diploma? (Consistency among districts?)

Group 1 (addressed question 2) – The value is “priceless.” The outcomes should depend on the student and their needs (college, Life skills, etc.).

Group 2 (addressed question 1) – They would like schools to be as inclusive as possible for the student. They suggested a performance diploma with an annotation, such as “cum laude.” Schools should focus on a student’s abilities.

Group 3 (addressed question 3) – They thought there should be consistency across the state.

Group 4 (addressed question 2) – They recommended that the diploma be counted in the graduation rate.

Group 5 (addressed question 1) – They recommended one diploma for all students. Employers and/or university will be able to review transcripts for more specific information. Some students are not eligible for jobs that specify a standard diploma though they may have job skills required for the position.

### **Sponsored Networking Luncheon**

Meeting participants enjoyed a networking luncheon sponsored by the Florida Council of Administrators of Special Education (CASE).

### **Rules**

Ms. Bishop continued her presentation with Rule 6A-1.0943, *Statewide Assessment for Students with Disabilities*. She outlined the types of participants represented on the workgroup. There were two meetings held in February. The concerns identified by the workgroup regarding the current rule were: the language appeared to excluded some students from participation; lack of clarity in acknowledging the Florida Alternate Assessment as part of the statewide assessment program; accommodations addressed at the end of the rule; ambiguous wording pertaining to who is eligible to participate in Florida Alternate Assessment; and the need for a special exemption in unique circumstances.

The recommendations from the workgroup included: address accommodations at the beginning of the rule; include accommodations by reference to the FCAT Administration Manuals; identify ways students can access FCAT; and clarify language related to participation in Florida Alternate Assessment.

Ms. Bishop presented the draft rule language in the PowerPoint. The committee discussed test accommodations and time restraints within a given class.

### **Reasonable Force**

Ms. Bishop outlined the authority and history of reasonable force. She presented the draft rule language in PowerPoint. The committee discussed concerns regarding rule language that would allow school personnel to stop a crime in progress. This would require training for staff. The committee also discussed the concerns regarding use of prone restraint. Penny Collins requested that the committee complete *Committee Actions Form* for Board Meeting on Friday.

### **Scaling Up Response to Intervention (Rtl) in Florida**

(See PowerPoint, *Florida's PS/Rtl, Bridging the gap between policy and practice*, SAC Notebook, Tab 5.)

Dr. Brian Gaunt, Central Florida Regional Coordinator, Florida Statewide Problem Solving/Response to Intervention (PS/Rtl) State Pilot Project, University of South Florida, presented on scaling up of Rtl in Florida. His presentation included an overview of Rtl framework. Through the PS/Rtl frame, existing and new initiatives can be supported. Dr. Gaunt reviewed the rule (6A-6.0331) that states Rtl is an intervention in the general education environment and supports No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The infrastructure for Rtl must be present at the state, district, and building level. The focus of the PS/Rtl Project is to build district and building level infrastructure. Currently, there

are six demonstration district/pilot schools. The purpose of the PS/Rtl demonstration sites is to evaluate the impact of PS/Rtl on educator, student, and systemic outcomes. He shared some of the data from the pilot sites.

PS/Rti is collaborating with Florida Statewide Positive Behavior Support Project, Rtl – Teaching, Institute for Small and Rural Districts (ISRD) and Learning Connections, and the Florida Department of Education (Office of Early Learning, Differentiated Accountability). Dr. Gaunt stated that Florida is becoming a national leader in the PS/Rtl. Training is conducted at the state level, regional level, and train the trainers. The regional meetings focus on Rtl implementation plans, policy and procedure review and modification, resource mapping, and examination of infrastructure to support PS/Rtl at the building level. The train the trainers is scheduled for August 2009 in north, central and south Florida. The goal is allow schools and districts to become independent and successful in PS/Rti implementation.

*The committee briefly discussed the idea of including Rtl implementation skills as part of college education.*

Dr. Gaunt concluded his presentation by providing a list of resources to support PS/Rtl implementation.

### **On-Campus Transition Program**

(See PowerPoint, *A Potpourri of Transition Information!* SAC Notebook, Tab 6.)

A panel including Charlotte Temple, Jacksonville ARC; Dr. Kristine Webb, University of North Florida (UNF); and four UNF students, Tawski Frazier, Moira Rossi, Christian Van Schoor, and Trey Henderson, presented on secondary transition. The presentation included information on three distinct projects *Florida Talks Transition*, *Project SOURCE*, and *On Campus Transition*.

Dr. Webb began the presentation with preliminary data from the survey, *Florida Talks Transition*. The survey was administered in six locations—ChIPLEY, Jacksonville, Viera, Tampa, Ft. Myers, and Miami—with participation from students, parents, teachers, school personnel, agency personnel, and caretakers. The preliminary data yielded the following:

- Concern from all groups that students had little or no opportunity for career exploration or electives due to FCAT remediation
- FCAT remediation = higher dropout likelihood
- Transition preparation must begin in elementary school
- Constituents would like transition information via Web sites and presentations
- Parents expressed needs for a consolidated or centralized approach to transition—One-Stop for transition
- All groups wanted more information earlier about employment and postsecondary education opportunities

- More opportunities for students to learn skills in self-determination
- While greater numbers are attending IEP meetings, few students voice their ideas or direct the meeting

Dr. Webb continued the presentation by providing an overview of *Project Status of University/Community College Resources for College Experiences (SOURCE)—Florida* in partnership with the Florida Developmental Disabilities Council. The project premise for the need for transition programs is as follows:

- Students with disabilities remain in high school for seven to eight years.
- Many high school students with disabilities are significantly older than their fellow students without disabilities.
- Students repeatedly receive the same curriculum and become disinterested in continuing their education.

A successful transition program should include the following:

- Exposure to appropriate student-age culture for students with developmental disabilities (ages 18-21)
- Increase life enriching opportunities for students by providing an “on campus” experience
- Facilitate independence and inclusion in the community through: life skills and socialization training, peer mentoring, and job placement services
- Collaborative Partnerships

Charlotte Temple, SAC Member provided an overview of the On-Campus Transition (OCT) project at UNF. She reviewed the initial thought, the research, the vision, funding and steering committee. The OCT objectives for OCT students include the following:

- Participate in college classes and clubs
- Participate in recreational and social activities on a college campus
- Improve communication and social skills
- Have opportunities to share the experience of living with a disability
- Develop friendships with people of similar age
- Develop age-appropriate leisure and recreation interests
- Develop and use self advocacy skills.
- Obtain integrated employment within the community, paid or unpaid
- Increase independence and integration in the community

The OCT objectives for UNF students:

- College students will have the opportunity to engage in transformational learning activities.
- Students will learn that adults with intellectual disabilities make considerable contributions to the UNF campus and community.

- Students will recognize that adults with intellectual disabilities have the same characteristics as their non-disabled peers.
- Students will assist in removing attitudinal barriers that face students with intellectual disabilities.

Dr. Webb provided examples of how OCT students were active members of the UNF student body. She facilitated the panel of UNF OCT students. The students provided information regarding their experience on campus and answered questions for the SAC committee members. The presentation closed with pictures of the students participating in classes and activities.

With reminders from the co-chairs regarding preparation for the next day's sessions, the meeting was adjourned for the day.

## **Friday, June 26**

### **Portal to Exceptional Education Resources (PEER) Demonstration**

(See PowerPoint, *Portal Exceptional Education Resources*, SAC Notebook, Tab 7.)

Dr. Kim Komisar, Administrator, Program Administration and Quality Assurance, presented a demonstration of the electronic IEP system, Portal to Exceptional Education Resources (PEER). She reported that 13 districts are currently deployed and 3 districts are preparing for deployment. PEER offers the following:

- Professional development and technical assistance built into the system
- Environment that allows for timely updating of ESE procedures as state and federal requirements change
- Electronic transmission and storage of student records
- Reinforcement of a process-based approach to educational planning

Dr. Komisar demonstrated the current functionality of the site.

### **State Performance Plan (SPP) / Annual Performance Report (APR)**

(See PowerPoint, *Portal Exceptional Education Resources*, SAC Notebook, Tab 8.)

Karen Denbroeder, Administrator, Special Programs Information and Evaluation, began the presentation by reviewing the Tree of Influence (Tab 8). She addressed Florida's use of data to determine progress in achieving SPP targets, to provide districts with tools for improvement planning, and for public reporting. She stressed SAC's important role in providing input on measurements, SPP targets, and criteria for district determinations.

She reviewed the SPP as a six-year plan and the Annual Performance Report as an annual report on progress toward meeting SPP targets; based on these, the U.S. DOE makes state-level determinations, and the Florida DOE makes district-level

determinations. Referencing as materials the session handouts as well as the SEA Profile included in the *SAC Member Notebook* (Tab 8), Ms. Denbroeder provided a status report on each of the following indicators, including targets, methods of calculation, changes, comparative data across years, and whether or not the target was met:

- Indicator 11: 60-Day Timeline (Target: 100% of referred students evaluated within timeline, not met) Data collection will change slightly.
- Indicators 9 and 10: Disproportionate Representation (target: 0% of districts) will have no changes.
- Indicator 12: Part C to Part B data (100% of eligible children have an IEP by age 3) Data collection will change slightly.
- Indicators 6 and 7: LRE Ages 3–5, Pre-K Performance: baselines and targets will be SPP in February 2019.
- Indicator 3: Assessment (targets: participation rate, 96%, met; proficient in reading, 38%, not met; proficient in math, 40%, not met); encouraging trends in increased proficiency were noted.
- Indicator 5: LRE Ages 6–21 (targets: 56.9% removed from regular class less than 21% of day, met; 22.3% removed for greater than 60% of day, met; 2.7% served in separate environment, not met) No changes.
- Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion (target: 7.5% or fewer districts with significant discrepancy, not met) No change.
- Indicator 8: Parent Involvement (32% of parents report schools facilitate parent involvement, met)

*There was significant Committee discussion of the parent survey data. Ms. Denbroeder asked the Committee for guidance regarding a Web based survey.*

*Committee Members recommended Web based survey and discussed barriers, including Web site access and parent fears of lack of confidentiality and possible consequences.*

- Indicator 1: Graduation Rate (target of 40.3% met) Calculation change.

*Committee members discussed how special diplomas and GEDs counting as non-graduates will impact this indicator. They discussed the possibility of Florida providing flexibility to a variety of diplomas, similar to some other states.*

- Indicator 2: Dropout Rate (target of 4.0% not met) No change.

- Indicator 13: Transition IEPs (target: 100% have IEP with measurable annual goals and transition services to reasonably enable attainment of postsecondary goals, not met)
- Indicator 14: Postschool Outcomes (target: 56.5% of youth are employed/continuing education within one year of leaving school, new baseline established) Ms. Denbroeder referred to the postschool data request by the Committee at the October 2008 meeting (Tab 3).

*The Committee discussed postschool outcomes and requested employment data distinguishing full-time and part-time employment.*

- Indicator 14: Postschool Outcomes (target: 56.5% of youth are employed/continuing education within one year of leaving school, new baseline established) Ms. Denbroeder referred to the postschool data request by the Committee at the October 2008 meeting (Tab 3).

### **Florida Alternate Assessment – Access Points – Curriculum, Learning and Assessment Support Project (CLASP)**

(See PowerPoint presentation and attachments, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 8.)

Ms. Denbroeder provided an update of the Florida Alternate Assessment. She discussed the studies (teacher rating, video scoring and checklist, and test, re-test), new developments, and teacher administration manual.

#### **Studies**

The purpose of the Teacher Rating Study was to determine if the Florida Alternate Assessment is a reliable instrument. There should be a strong correspondence between teacher ratings and students' performance of the assessment. Teachers were asked to use the performance level descriptions to rate their students based on daily classroom performance. The ratings provided by the teachers will be compared to actual student performance on the 2009 assessment. A total of 6883 students were rated. Measured Progress received the data. They will perform an analysis of the information and provide a report.

The purpose of the Video Scoring Study was to evaluate whether scores assigned by teachers administering the assessment are consistent with scoring protocols for the assessment program. This would determine the validity of the assessment. Feedback will be incorporated into revisions of the administration manual and training provided to teachers. About 60 total videos were submitted (grade 5 mathematics or grade 10 writing). Each video was second scored by two second scorers, with 18 Florida teachers acting as second scorers.

The purpose of the Video Checklist Study was to evaluate whether the assessment is being administered consistent with test administration protocols, which would determine the administration validity of the assessment. Feedback will be incorporated into revisions of the administration manual and training provided to teachers. Three items per video were observed and then checklists were completed. A debrief occurred with teachers after the use of each checklist. The checklist will be revised based on feedback.

The purpose of the Test, Re-Test Study is to provide empirical information on whether the test administration model allows access to the items appropriately, or whether students who are unable to answer the supported items can actually answer the independent items. This information will be used as needed to inform the administration design. Fifty students in grade 5 and 50 students in grade 8 were selected to participate. All re-test materials were sent to Alternate Assessment Coordinators. Schools have until June 15 to return re-tests to Measured Progress. An analysis and report will be provided.

### **Public Comment**

The meeting was opened for public comment as scheduled. Calvester Anderson, Justice-2-Jesus, stated that she appreciated the presentation by the University of North Florida. She shared her experience, as well as daughter's, regarding labeling and discouraged the use of labeling students with disabilities.

### **SAC Business Meeting**

(See SAC Meeting Report [October 5–7, 2008]; SAC By-laws, Committee Action Form, and Committee Designee Form; *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 2; and SAC Meeting Evaluation Form, Tab 9.)

Co-chairs Collins and Harris conducted the business session, in which the Committee took action as follows:

- Approved the report of the October 5–7, 2008, meeting with no changes
- Reviewed the "Committee Action Forms" submitted prior to meeting.

### **Secondary Transition**

Dr. Vogel stated that he would like the UNF Experiential Transition Program to exist at all universities across the state. Bryan Vaughan, Executive Director of the Governor's Commission on Disabilities, noted the Commission's recommendation to the Governor that a secondary transition program for students with disabilities be based in community colleges.

See below for an excerpt from the Commission's report of the complete recommendation.

Governor's Commission on Disabilities  
Recommendation A-2

*The Commission recommends that the Governor consider the issuance of an Executive Order that requires the Commissioner of Education to initiate the following: Have the Florida Department of Education, Division of Public Schools, and the Division of Community Colleges develop a strategic plan for implementation of a comprehensive research-based statewide transition program at each community college that offers (1) inclusive educational opportunities for students with disabilities in a degree-seeking program; (2) inclusive educational, vocational, and community-based living training opportunities for students with disabilities who are not eligible for acceptance into degree programs; and (3) educational and clinical opportunities for college-level students interested in careers devoted to working with persons with disabilities.*

Such a transition program would address the lack of uniformity of services available across the state, and the lack of a standardized curriculum for 18–22-year-old students with more severe disabilities. He reported that there are six potential pilot sites. Bambi Lockman added that Project 10 is involved with this initiative and has one pilot site.

*Motion was passed to send a letter to the Commissioner of Education supporting the Governor's Commission on Disabilities recommendation for an 18–22-year-old (student) program in Florida's State College System.*

#### Special Diploma

1. High School Graduation rate should be modified to include all students graduating with a special diploma.
2. There should only be one type of diploma, and employers or colleges could review transcripts for more information.
3. State Rule 6A.1.09961, *Graduation Requirements for Certain Students with Disabilities*, both options should be offered by every district.

Dr. Vogel referred to *Revisiting Graduation Requirement and Diploma Options for Youth with Disabilities: A National Study* (SAC Member Notebook, Tab 4). Thirty-four states have a diploma without any distinction for students with disabilities.

Michele Love stated that blind students do not have the option of receiving the special diploma.

Bambi Lockman suggested that SAC create a bulleted list of concerns for the special diploma workgroup to review.

Susan Davison stated that her son graduated with a special diploma, but most important to them was the fact that he participated in the graduation ceremony with his peers.

Lileana de Moya stated that in order for her son to receive a special diploma, she had to un-enroll him then re-enroll him after graduation to receive services until age 22.

*Motion was passed for GED, special diploma, and standard diploma to be included in the graduation rate and for students to participate in the graduation ceremony with their peers.*

Charlotte Temple stated that standards for students with disabilities had been raised and would not want them to be lower than they are as students are achieving at higher levels than ever before. She asked if students with disabilities are issued a standard diploma at age 18, will they lose FAPE until they are 22?

*Motion passed to have FDOE, BEESS staff research current rules in place regarding standard diplomas and the effect on FAPE, with the recommendation that laws in others states be considered.*

Lileana de Moya offered her assistance with this motion.

Judy Miller provided an overview on the history of the special diploma. Students were graduating with a diploma and were unprepared to participate in the workforce.

#### Restraint Seclusion

Two versions of a good Samaritan clause were distributed for discussion.

##### Version 1

It is not the intent of this rule to discourage school district personnel from intervening to assist with crisis situations. School district employees who have not received formal training by the school district but are intervening as a "good Samaritan" to physically restrain a student to prevent potential further harm shall be held harmless from prosecution or disciplinary action under this rule.

##### Version 2

Notwithstanding any language herein to the contrary, a person who uses force to deal with a situation shall not be deemed to be acting in violation of this policy if they acted in good faith and used only that degree of force reasonably necessary to resolve a situation or student behavior in question.

Ann Siegel stated that restraint and seclusion requires a high level of training and can cause injury as manifestation of a disability.

*Motion passed to provide the rule committee with a list of concerns and the recommendation to include a good Samaritan clause with exemption of disciplinary action for teacher or staff. The concerns included the following:*

- 1. Evaluate the use of prone*
- 2. Define training levels and length of training*
- 3. Expand reporting requirements to include*
  - a. same day attempt to contact parent*
  - b. timely report to parent*
  - c. a standardize report to FDOE for collection, analysis, and monitoring.*
- 4. Review seclusion process and monitor, (usually trained personnel with magnetic door). Include students' trauma history.*

*Motion passed for Reasonable Force Committee to conduct a through and complete examination of rule and include SAC's comments.*

Zero Tolerance

*Motion passed to work with DJJ on Zero Tolerance efforts.*

### **Closing Comments**

Co-chairs Harris and Collins made final announcements, thanked the members for their participation, and wished them safe travels home. They reminded members to complete the meeting evaluation form. Ms. Polland closed the meeting by reminding members of reimbursement procedures and to forward to her any materials intended for distribution to the Committee. She thanked the members and officers, especially the co-chairs, as well as BEESS staff, for a very productive meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.

Note: All materials referenced in this report are available on request through the Bureau of Exceptional Education and Student Services, Florida Department of Education, 614 Turlington Building, 325 West Gaines Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400.