

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

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

**October 5-7, 2008  
Tallahassee, Florida**

**Meeting Report**

**Sunday, October 5**

State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Students (SAC) Co-Chairs Penny Collins and Joni Harris, along with Vice-Chair Lily de Moya, met with Bambi Lockman, Chief, and Michele Polland, Educational Policy Analyst, BEES; and Doris Nabi, Consultant; to review the agenda and materials in preparation for the Committee meeting. The preliminary agenda was revised to accommodate Ms. Lockman's absence on the second day due to a death in her family, and the process for bringing forward Committee actions was reviewed.

**Monday, October 6**

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

Members

(See SAC Membership List 2008, SAC Designee List, and SAC Representation Chart, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 2.)

Denise Arnold (Day 2)  
Laurie Blades  
Penny Collins  
Susan Davidson  
J.T. Davis (Day 1)  
Lileana de Moya  
Jacqueline Egli  
Enrique Escallon  
Carin Floyd  
Randee Gabriel

Dr. Rosalind Hall  
Joni Harris  
Johana Hatcher  
John Howle  
Bob Jacobs  
Janice Kane (Day 1)  
Leah Kelly (by telephone Day 1)  
Dr. Kathryn Krudwig  
Judy Miller  
Joanne Nelson  
Kelly Purvis  
Calley Ronso  
Tracy Stevens (Day 2)  
Charlotte Temple  
Bryan Vaughan  
Dr. Bill Vogel (by telephone Day 1)  
Gayle Zavala

Kirk Hall as designee for Bill Palmer  
Kristina Hartman as designee for John Howle  
Michael Lindsey as designee for Terri Eggers

#### DOE/DPS/BEES Representatives

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

Bambi 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  
Heather Diamond, Program Specialist, ESE Program Development  
Jenny Harry, Program Specialist, Clearinghouse Information Center  
Dr. Kim Komisar, Senior Educational Program Director, Program Administration and  
Quality Assurance  
Marie Lacap, Program Specialist, Special Programs Information and Evaluation  
Joyce Lubbers, Program Supervisor, ESE Program Development  
Tonya Milton, Program Specialist, Administration/Policy  
Sheryl Sandvoss, Program Specialist, ESE Program Development  
Doris Nabi, Consultant

#### Other

Martha Asbury, Chief, Bureau of Contracts, Grants, and Procurement; Management  
Services; DOE  
Tom McDowell, Guest

By Conference Call

Office of Special Education Programs, U. S. Department of Education

Sheila Friedman  
Nancy Treusch

(Additional district personnel participated on the call.)

### **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 2008; SAC Designee List 2008; SAC Representation Chart, Tab 2; SAC Business Session Materials, Tab 8; Evaluation Form, Tab 9; Resources, Tab 10; Brochures, *Notebook Pocket*; and separate manual, *School-Based Enterprise Development: Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating*.)

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 and 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 revised agenda, noting that the morning session would address critical elements of general supervision, in anticipation of an afternoon conference call with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), U.S. Department of Education. She reviewed the changes to the remaining schedule, pointing out that the agenda was developed in response to Committee input, and correlating each item with resource materials in the *SAC Member Notebook*. She highlighted the Bureau’s publication, *Disability History and Awareness: A Resource Guide (Notebook, Tab 6)*, and commended SAC member J.T. Davis for his role in the implementation of 2008 legislation for the “reaffirmation of the local, state, and federal commitment to the full inclusion in society of, and the equal opportunity for, all individuals with disabilities.”

She 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 *BEESS Weekly Memo* and the Bureau Web site as ongoing sources of information, and the important role of the Committee in sharing information with their respective constituent groups, and representing statewide needs. She concluded with a brief update on actions taken by the Committee in its prior meeting regarding reasonable force and local education agency (LEA) determinations, indicating that these would be discussed more fully during the Bureau update.

Ms. Harris reviewed the Committee's way of work and ground rules. She then presented Kelly Purvis with a gavel in recognition of her service as co-chair of the Committee during the prior year.

### **Critical Elements of General Supervision/Overview**

(See PowerPoint presentation, SAC Memorandum regarding OSEP Conference Call, AMM 2008 Databook, 2008 SEA Profile, and Calculation Guide for Florida's Annual Performance Report, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 3.)

Bambi Lockman introduced the general supervision requirement of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004, emphasizing that an integrated system must be an ongoing process accountable for improving educational results and functional outcomes, and for ensuring that public agencies meet program requirements.

She briefly addressed the eight interlocking components or "puzzle pieces" of the integrated system (see PowerPoint presentation for more detailed information).

- State Performance Plan (SPP)—the blueprint for systems change and the foundation for Bureau's work toward improved results, utilizes stakeholder involvement, ensures public accountability.
- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation—rules and policies are aligned with IDEA, implemented by local programs, include methods to detect and correct noncompliance, include interagency agreements and memoranda of understanding.
- Data on Processes and Results—include collection and verification, examination and analyses, reporting (through state and local performance reports), status determination, and improvement; making sure right questions are being asked.
- Integrated Monitoring Activities—utilize multiple methods and data sources to monitor every program, every year; utilize stakeholder involvement; investigations for compliance and program improvement.
- Effective Dispute Resolution—informs monitoring activities, effectiveness is periodically evaluated, essential to ensure that students and families understand their rights.
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions—explicit state authority to enforce rules, policies, and procedures; range of formalized strategies and/or sanctions for enforcement with written timelines; determine the status of local programs annually.
  - State Education Agency (SEA) Determination—along with the majority of states, Florida is assessed as "needs assistance" (second year)

- Local Education Agency Determinations—for 2008, based on selected performance indicators, 41 Florida districts met requirements, 32 districts need assistance (17 for second year), and 1 needs intervention.
- Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development—internal and external technical assistance and professional development support improvement and correction directly linked to SPP and Annual Performance Report (APR); discretionary projects are important component.
- Fiscal Management—IDEA funds are distributed in accordance with federal requirements and are aligned to the SPP/APR (Part B, \$598,437,209., Part B Preschool, \$18,170,242.).
  - Coordinated Early Intervening Services (EIS)—districts are required to set aside 15% of IDEA funds for early intervening services if certain criteria related to identification, placement, and suspension and expulsion are met, and must track by student those non-disabled children who received these services and whether or not they ultimately were found eligible for special education and related services.

#### OSEP's Continuous Improvement and Focused Monitoring System

OSEP will conduct a verification visit in Florida on November 17-21, 2008 that examines its general supervision system, its data system, and fiscal management, and conducts focused monitoring of its early childhood transition (Part C to Part B). SPP Indicator 12 requires that 100% of children served and referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. While progress has been made through huge improvement efforts, including partnering and data matches between DOE and the Department of Health (DOH), the timeline still poses problems, especially given funding and staffing issues in districts. Current activities include piloting by five districts/Early Steps offices of a problem-solving process, implementation by districts of new strategies/procedures to verify more timely transition, and pilot activity facilitated by national projects.

Prior to its verification/monitoring visit, OSEP will conduct a stakeholders' conference call (scheduled during the afternoon session of this SAC meeting), and continue regular conference calls with DOE staff on critical elements. Onsite activities will include meetings with state staff, verification of data submitted in the SPP/APR, document reviews, and focused monitoring at 3 LEA sites—Marion, Flagler, and Leon. Following the visit, Florida will receive a letter describing the analysis, any findings of noncompliance, and required next steps.

## **Critical Elements of General Supervision: Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation; Integrated Monitoring Activities; and Effective Dispute Resolution**

(See PowerPoint presentation, distributed as handout, for more detailed information specific to each of the following topics.)

Dr. Kim Komisar continued the presentation on general supervision with information related to the following three components:

- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- Integrated Monitoring Activities
- Effective Dispute Resolution

### **Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation**

Policies and procedures include ESE administrative rules, ESE program rules, additional rules, and Policies and Procedures for the Provision of Specially Designed Instruction and Related Services to Exceptional Education Students (SP&Ps). Dr. Komisar gave an extensive history of the revision of Florida's ESE administrative rules in compliance with IDEA 2004 regulations effective December 2006, noting that these rules should be effective pending clarification on selected requirements requested by the Joint Administrative Procedures Committee of the legislature. She provided an update on ESE program eligibility rules, indicating those scheduled for consideration by the State Board of Education in October 2008 (intellectual disabilities, specific learning disabilities), those already revised which would require technical revision following adoption of the administrative rules (physically impaired/orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, traumatic brain injury; autism spectrum disorder; deaf or hard-of-hearing; emotional/behavioral disabilities), those in development and proposed to go before the Board in May/June 2009 (speech impairments, language impairments), and other rules to be developed in 2009 (dual sensory impairments, developmental delays). Additional rules will be proposed for statewide assessment and Center for Autism and Related Disabilities (CARD) regional centers. SP&Ps are submitted by districts for approval by DOE every three years; the deadline is extended for 2008-09 pending adoption of ESE administrative rules.

### **Integrated Monitoring Activities**

Dr. Komisar provided an overview of the integrated monitoring system, noting that the system:

- Addresses major areas of compliance
- Ensures timely correction of noncompliance

- Draws upon all available state and district data
- Supports districts' general supervision plans for program improvement and correction of noncompliance
- Drives decision-making regarding monitoring and system improvement, including incentives and sanctions
- Incorporates SPP indicator team activities, dispute resolution corrective actions, monitoring processes and, as appropriate, other state level initiatives or areas of concern

She elaborated on the 2008-09 system, which includes ESE compliance self-assessment, and onsite monitoring and technical assistance as required (Level 1, all districts; Level 2, targeted districts; Level 3, selected districts). General supervision plans include expansion of a Web-based system for monitoring self-assessment.

#### Effective Dispute Resolution

Dr. Komisar emphasized that effective dispute resolution facilitates resolution at the local level; supports child-centered, non-adversarial problem solving; and ensures timely resolution and meaningful correction. She reviewed the major topics of parent/district requests for assistance, intervention, or information. Mediation is provided at no cost by the Bureau and is confidential and voluntary for both parties. State complaints may be filed in writing by any individual or organization on behalf of one or more students and resulting investigations must be completed within 60 days; state complaints may be addressed through voluntary early resolution agreements. Corrective actions are required for noncompliance. Due process hearings are conducted on DOE's behalf by the Division of Administrative Hearings, with a 45-day timeline for completion.

#### **Critical Elements of General Supervision: Fiscal Management**

(See PowerPoint presentation, distributed as handout, for more detailed information specific to each of the following topics.)

Martha Asbury continued the presentation on critical elements of supervision with an extensive presentation on fiscal management of federal grant programs. She reviewed the variety of sources for federal and state requirements, and identified as infrastructure requirements fiscal, property, contracts and grants, program, and records management. Systems management involves three major systems: financial management, inventory, and procurement. Ms. Asbury reviewed in detail the seven basic requirements of financial management:

- Financial Reporting
- Accounting Records

- Internal Controls
- Budget Control
- Allowable Cost
- Source Documentation
- Cash Management

She emphasized the importance of documentation and internal controls in safeguarding the compliance and integrity of programs, and examined principles that costs must be necessary, reasonable, allocable, and legal, noting examples of questionable expenditures, such as cell phones for personal use. She examined cash management, procurement, the role of cost/price, and contract administration. She concluded with information regarding inventory management, including equipment location, custody, and security, and records and systems necessary to prevent loss, damage, theft, and unauthorized use, and to provide for appropriate disposition.

### **Sponsored Networking Luncheon**

Meeting participants enjoyed a networking luncheon sponsored by the Southeast Regional Resource Center (SERRC).

### **Critical Elements of General Supervision: State Performance Plan, Data on Processes and Results**

(See PowerPoint presentation, Critical Element Data Collection Systems, and Projected Timelines for Annual Performance Report Data, distributed as handouts, for more detailed information specific to each of the following topics.)

Marie Lacap 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 Calculation Guide, AMM Databook, and SEA Profile included in the *SAC Member Notebook* (Tab 3), Ms. Lacap provided a status report on each of the following indicators, including targets, methods of calculation, and changes, comparative data across years, and whether or not the target was met:

- Indicator 1: Graduation Rate (target of 39.8% met)
- Indicator 2: Dropout Rate (target of 4.25% not met)

- 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 4: Suspension/Expulsion (target: 11.9% districts with significant risk ratio, met)

*There was significant Committee discussion of the suspension/expulsion data, including the need for disaggregated data by district and type incident, as well as the impact of zero tolerance policies. Members were referred to district reports available online on the DOE Web site.*

- 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, met)
- Indicators 6 and 7: LRE Ages 3-5, Pre-K Performance (baselines to be established)
- Indicator 8: Parent Involvement (targets being revised; percent of survey respondents who report that schools facilitate parent involvement as means of improving services and results for children with disabilities)

*There was significant Committee discussion of the parent survey data, including a request for disaggregated response rate/results data by district for the next meeting. Barriers to responses, including Web site access and parent fears of lack of confidentiality and possible consequences, were discussed, along with suggestions for improved response rates.*

- Indicators 9 and 10: Disproportionate Representation (target: 0% of districts, met)
- Indicator 11: 60-Day Timeline (Target: 100% of referred students evaluated within timeline, not met)
- Indicator 12: Part C to Part B data (100% of eligible children have an IEP by age 3, not met)
- Indicator 13: Transition IEPs (target, 100% have IEP with measurable annual goals and transition services to reasonably enable attainment of postsecondary goals, not met)

*In consideration of declining compliance, Committee discussion addressed the expanded data base, with all districts now reporting on this item as part of their self-assessment, and the fact that 76% of reviewed IEPs were found noncompliant with the requirement for measurable annual IEP goals. Training and assistance are being directed to improvement in this area.*

- Indicator 14: Postschool Outcomes (target 56.5% of youth are employed/continuing education within one year of leaving school, new baseline established)

### **Conference Call with the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education**

The conference call was facilitated by Sheila Friedman and Nancy Treusch of OSEP, with SAC members Dr. Bill Vogel and Leah Kelly; Anne Chartrand of SERRC; and representatives of Flagler, Leon, and Marion Counties, joining the meeting by telephone.

Ms. Friedman introduced the verification visit, noting that Florida is one of twelve states being visited on the basis of historical performance and compliance and SEA determination under IDEA Parts B and C.

She indicated that the visit is designed to verify the effectiveness of the state's systems for general supervision, data collection, and fiscal management, as well as systems for improving child and family outcomes and protecting their rights. The visit will verify information in the SPP and APR, and will also conduct focused monitoring activities at the LEA/school district level related to early childhood transition. Verification will also utilize other information obtained through weekly calls with Bureau staff.

She indicated that the purpose of the conference call is to obtain input regarding these designated "big systems" from the perspective of Florida's State Advisory Committee, including strengths and challenges, and invited comments on the following topics.

#### **General Supervision System**

(Identification and correction of noncompliance, dispute resolution, etc.)

Co-chair Harris, representing parents of students with disabilities (Miami-Dade), commented on the extensive data collection activities of the DOE—the amount of data, including information for parents, and how open the state is to disseminating that data.

Dr. Vogel, superintendent of Seminole County Schools, one of Florida's largest school districts (65,000 students), commented that districts feel very positive regarding the communication and resolution of matters between BEESS and the districts. Tom McDowell, former ESE director in Seminole, spoke to clear and concise reporting procedures, data requested in a timely fashion, the opportunity to review data reports for errors, opportunities for related inservice through regional and state meetings, ongoing opportunities for input to BEESS which is always well-received, and—most importantly—established policies and procedures and cooperation in ensuring timely and accurate reports.

Ms. Friedman acknowledged comments regarding the strengths of Florida's data system, and asked for comments regarding identification and correction of

noncompliance and challenges for LEAs, as well as dispute resolution and handling of complaints.

Co-chair Collins, representing ESE directors in large districts (Osceola), noted that the SPP indicators were introduced to districts with lots of staff development, meetings, and telephone conferences. Expectations were shared and districts' five-year plans were returned with suggestions; each year these are being monitored and BEESS staff are working with districts on the collection and review of data. There were huge efforts to meet the indicators and to give guidance to districts in this regard. BEESS staff with specialized expertise are assigned to provide assistance on specific indicators. There have been lots of effort and support toward improvement, and staff have been wonderful and responsive.

Dr. Kathryn Krudwig, University of North Florida, representing the state university system and personnel development programs, spoke to the way BEESS had focused discretionary projects as a seamless, thorough way to support districts in meeting indicators. She also addressed the solution-oriented alliance across projects which looks at data for each region—efforts are driven by district needs and districts can't "fall through the cracks." These efforts represent increased capacity to work with districts on meeting indicators.

Ward Spisso, ESE Director in Leon County, asked for specifics regarding the district visits and was advised that OSEP staff would be in touch with him individually within the week.

Leah Kelly, representing ESE directors in very large districts (Broward), responded to Ms. Friedman's request that members share any challenges, by noting the diversity in Florida districts in terms of size and population. There are concerns about the establishment of accountability and compliance thresholds—for example, dispute resolution or disproportionality—that are equitable across districts. There are different ways of "drawing the line," and many different factors that may have an impact (such as a large population of autistic students) and make it more difficult for larger districts to attain such thresholds.

Enrique Escallon, representing parents (Miami-Dade), spoke to the challenges of reduced services imposed by funding cuts—for example, with psychologists reduced from 12 to 10 months, children are waiting for identification. Resources have to be optimized.

Dr. Vogel addressed two additional challenges. First, the federal government's decision that the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) did not meet standards (when some students had already been assessed) imposed a very short timeline for correction. That mandate and change in direction caused a huge burden on all districts.

Second, the tremendous increase in the number of autistic students in Florida. IDEA has not responded with appropriate funding support for this fastest-growing population.

IDEA funding is not following student needs. While the state is providing support, district funding cuts (estimated at 6.5%) are very much an issue. Classes for autistic students may serve only 3-4 students, and behavior analysts are needed. Lack of resources may affect student outcomes. IDEA money is needed to provide support for autistic students.

Ms. Friedman asked members to consider comments related to other areas of interest, such as fiscal management or early childhood transition. She noted that OSEP's tracking of parent and other constituent calls from Florida would also provide them with some insight into dispute resolution or other areas of concern.

Dr. Rosalind Hall, representing ESE directors in small and rural districts (Levy), addressed parent calls in Florida. She stated that DOE was always supportive, listening to parent concerns and then contacting the district, and working with the parent and the district in a collaborative effort to resolve concerns. Mediation is a critical focal point, and the outcome is always to better meet the needs of students.

Ms. Friedman acknowledged that its mediation system is a strength in Florida, and noted that resolution of parent issues is taking place at the local level.

Co-chair Harris (noting that "our meetings don't usually sound like this") shared with OSEP staff a recent evaluation of the State Advisory Committee in which members rated as "excellent" their opportunity to provide input to the Bureau regarding the needs of children with disabilities, feeling that issues important to them are discussed and that everyone has a chance to be heard. They also rated the BEESS chief and staff as excellent in terms of expertise and leadership of Florida's programs, accessibility, and responsiveness to program needs and member issues and concerns. Members felt that, to a high degree, SAC is making a positive difference for students with disabilities. Ms. Harris commented on DOE's efforts to bring issues to the Committee, to reach out, to solicit input, citing as an excellent example SAC input into the rulemaking process.

Co-chair Collins spoke to timeliness and management of IDEA grants to the districts, commenting on the availability of specific application guidelines, procedures, and directions, as well as the assistance of BEESS staff, to ensure that funds are distributed in a timely manner and services to students are not delayed. Districts are well informed regarding the appropriate use of funds and effective fiscal management, and DOE staff "make sure they follow the rules" as programs are thoroughly monitored by knowledgeable auditors. She concluded that, "we can always use more funds, but BEESS helps us make effective use of the monies we have."

Ms. Collins also commented positively about the "unbelievable" amount of information and data given to SAC members, as well as to district directors, parents, and agencies. She observed that the Committee is very active in terms of information gathering and exploring issues, as well as providing input into proposed legislation and rules.

Ms. Friedman directed the conversation to the SPP as the basis for state and local efforts, especially those indicators focused on student performance, graduation, dropout, postschool outcomes, least restrictive environment, and preschool outcomes. She asked for comments on how the Bureau has helped improve performance in those areas, or what persisting challenges there might be.

Judy Miller, representing ESE directors in medium-sized districts (Lake County), responded that education in Florida has long had a focus on student achievement, as measured by the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) and the FAA. She thanked the Bureau for efforts in sharing the indicators and communicating “what we’re measured against.” Similarly, districts and schools also share these with teachers and parents. While graduation and dropout rates may be more important to high schools, people at all levels are interested in increased student achievement regardless of how it is measured. Districts are always looking for supportive educational activities that will help each one of the areas in the performance indicators.

Transition from Part C to Part B has caused some consternation, especially when, although appropriate programs are available, some parents don’t keep scheduled appointments which would ensure that children are served by their third birthday, or elect not to enroll their children.

Ms. Miller also addressed the structure of the State Advisory Committee. Recalling some committees that were much more adversarial, she noted that SAC members don’t always agree but, through the leadership of the Bureau and the committee structure, they do work collegially toward solutions. It is a diverse committee, and members certainly don’t hold the same opinions, but can come together in a forum that allows them to disagree and still like and respect each other. She also noted that the unique requirement that a parent and an ESE director co-chair the Committee had been very successful, and helped ensure the opportunity for everyone to be heard.

Ms. Miller also commented on dispute resolution. She indicated that, while there will always be differences of opinion as to how a dispute should be resolved, it is important to go through all the steps because, in the end, the school system still has to provide educational services to the child and the parents. It is imperative that the school and the family be able to continue a relationship and communicate in the interests of the best education for the child. She noted the role of the DOE in working with the district and with parents to understand what is being provided and to look at all issues; all parties are listened to, and if this resolution fails, then other procedures are available.

In terms of data collection, Ms. Miller spoke to “gathering tons of data,” but the frustration of always being one year behind. Since “data are only as good as what we enter,” districts must continue to work with programs and with information systems people to make sure all are up-to-date on requirements, just as they must work with auditors on the resolution of any data problems.

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 the Governor is very excited about the opportunity to maximize the potential of each student in this way, and commended the Bureau for working diligently with the Commission on this initiative. He said he would "echo the others" in terms of the work of the Committee; as all agencies are doing more with less, new ideas will help kids across the spectrum.

Ms. Friedman requested additional information, and Ms. Lockman indicated that a copy of the Commission's report would be available in OSEP's materials.

As the time allocated for the conference call ended, Ms. Friedman thanked Committee members for their participation and invited them to share any additional thoughts with her via email ([sheila.friedman@ed.gov](mailto:sheila.friedman@ed.gov)), telephone (202) 245-7349, or FAX (202) 245-7614. She wished the Committee luck as it continued to move forward.

Ms. Lockman concluded this session by thanking the Committee and indicating she was "definitely humbled" by their comments.

## Bureau Update

(See PowerPoint presentation, Disability History and Awareness: A Resource Guide, Certification Requirements for Teachers of Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders, Federal and State General Revenue: 2008-09 Discretionary Projects, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 6; Bureau Staff List, Bureau Calendar, List of Acronyms, and Publications Index, Tab 10; Brochures—Clearinghouse Information Center and Florida's Assistive Technology Assessment Competencies Web Site—*Notebook* pocket).

The meeting resumed with Ms. Lockman's update, themed "It's a Jungle Out There." She addressed the following topics (see PowerPoint presentation and related materials for more detailed information):

### Federal Legislation

- Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEA)—has several provisions which expand opportunities for students with disabilities
- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) amendment—expands the definition of "disability" and expands civil rights and inclusion of persons with disabilities

### 2008 Florida Legislative Update (discussed at length in prior meeting)

- HB 1313—updates ESE terminology and "people-first" language.
- SB 856—establishes first weeks of October as "Disability History and Awareness Weeks" (J.T. Davis and the Florida Youth Council were instrumental in passage of legislation; see resource guide in materials)
- SB 988—establishes a DOH statewide Health Care Transition Task Force for Youth and Young Adults with Disabilities; report is due January 1, 2009
- SB 2654—creates "Windows of Opportunity Act," seeking expanded services for persons with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) or developmental disabilities, and establishes an insurance compact for such persons

For 2009, legislative hot topics will include gifted, "one stop" access to services for persons with autism, and the right to appeal under IDEA.

### State Initiatives

- Commissioner's K-12 Priorities—include standards, early learning, differentiated accountability, college readiness, science, articulation, college system transition, resource alignment, school grades, supplemental educational services, bullying, ethics, grading, alternative credit, teacher quality, school leadership, physical education, and Next Generation High School.

- Florida’s Differentiated Accountability Pilot Program—aligns and integrates Florida’s “school grading” accountability with No Child Left Behind accountability; delivers support to schools through five regions.
- Support to Low-Performing Schools—major funding sources will be redirected to such schools, including IDEA funds for regional Response to Intervention (Rtl) and Positive Behavioral Support (PBS) facilitators.
- Bright Beginnings—will provide a strong foundation in reading and math for children in voluntary prekindergarten education through third grade through child expectations/standards, assessment tools, personalizing instruction, and parental involvement; Project Scope will provide support.
- Assessment (SB 1908)—college readiness will be assessed and remediation provided; end-of-course assessments are being developed (these are stressful for exceptional education students); norm-referenced tests are eliminated at the state level; FCAT Writing will be revised; concordant study of High School Competency Test is in progress; computer-based FCAT will be mandatory by summer 2010, with implications for IEP teams and appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities.

*Committee discussion of provisions regarding whom should be tested generated questions regarding McKay Scholarship Program students, on which Ms. Lockman will seek clarification.*

- Florida Alternate Assessment—related activities include training of trainers, content/bias review, item specifications for new development, accommodations recommendations, Web-based ordering, practice materials, booklets (test, passage, response), administration manuals, a science field test, a discretionary project to support alternate assessment and related instruction, and peer review. The 2009 administration is scheduled for January 12—February 27, 2009.
- Task Forces and Commissions—Governor’s Task Force on Autism Spectrum Disorders will recommend a “unified and coordinated agenda for addressing autism in Florida” (report by March 20, 2009); Governor’s Commission on Disabilities recommends ways to overcome barriers faced by persons with disabilities and the elderly in the areas of education, employment, independent living, and transportation (report June 2008); Florida’s Children and Youth Cabinet is charged to “ensure that public policy promotes interdepartmental collaboration and program implementation in order for services to be planned, managed, and delivered in a holistic and integrated manner to improve the self-sufficiency, safety, economic stability, health and quality of life of all children and youth in Florida” (ongoing reports). Ms. Lockman represents exceptional education on all of these. See respective Web sites for additional information.

## Bureau Initiatives

Ms. Lockman continued her presentation with an update on ESE administrative rules and program rules, SP&Ps, and other rules (see PowerPoint presentation and Komisar presentation above), highlighting the following:

- Eligibility for Visually Impaired Rule—major changes effective March 1, 2008.
- Challenge Grant Rule—aligned with statutory language; proposed for October 2008 consideration by State Board of Education.
- Speech/Language Rule—work renewed with new staff member; anticipate action in winter/spring 2009.
- Eligibility for Gifted—under review; significant DOE interest; potential legislation.
- Special Diploma, Statewide Assessment of Students with Disabilities—rule development anticipated this fall/winter.
- Other Program Rules—will require revision based on new administrative rules.
- Prekindergarten Disabilities, Developmental Delay 3-5, Dual Sensory Impaired, Center for Autism and Related Disabilities (CARD)—rule development “on the horizon.”

Of special note was the proposed rule, “Standards for the Use of Reasonable Force.” The Committee reviewed this rule at its last meeting and provided input to the Department, expressing support for the Bureau’s Technical Assistance Paper (TAP), “Guidelines for the Use of Manual Physical Restraint in Special Education Programs,” and recommending that the proposed rule be revised to align with the guidelines. Ms. Lockman reported that the Committee’s action had significant impact, bringing to the table issues related to students with disabilities, many of which were also discussed during a public hearing on August 26, 2008. BEESS proposed rule revisions aligned with the TAP, and the proposed rule is currently under legal review.

*Committee discussion continued as to whether there should be a separate rule and/or legislation for students with disabilities, and J.T. Davis offered to share additional information with the Committee based on extensive research in Florida.*

Ms. Lockman reviewed the guidance contained in the TAP, and spoke to ongoing technical assistance activities.

Other topics addressed in the Bureau update included:

- FCAT Waiver—TAP, forms, and technical assistance are being revised.

- Course Descriptions—these are being revised to align with access points and changes to Sunshine State Standards.
- Certification Endorsements—
  - ASD is being revised to update terminology. When to require the endorsement is an issue for both ESE and general education personnel. Endorsement options are available for teachers, and BEESS is working with districts in developing add-on programs.
  - Severe/Profound Disabilities endorsement will be required by 2011. This is a big issue with consideration being given to whether to suspend the requirement or to rewrite the rule, especially regarding curriculum and standards/access points.

### Project Activities

- BEESS Project Tracking System (PTS) for Discretionary Projects—integrated system will track performance/activities and provide improved accountability for results.
- Response to Intervention (RtI)—key findings of a national survey indicate that implementation is primarily a joint effort of general and special education; the majority of districts use it for all students, primarily at the elementary level and in reading, although it is being expanded to other areas and grade levels; most districts indicate no additional staff. (See subsequent presentation on Florida's State RtI Implementation Plan.)

*Committee comments centered on the need to incorporate appropriate training into preservice programs for education personnel.*

- Secondary Transition—SPP transition indicators are being used to improve what we do; Project 10 (Transition Education Network) will support effective transition practices statewide. (See subsequent presentation.)
- Portal to Exceptional Education Resources (PEER)—the “computerized IEP” project is currently deployed in 8 districts/lab schools with 4 additional sites in process; it continues to be a challenging process.
- Florida Medicaid Tracking System—Internet-based system is nearing completion and has many advantages for districts.
- Accessible Instructional Materials (AIM)—required under both IDEA and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), to provide access to the general curriculum and accountability for the academic progress of all students.
- Technology Services—IDEA 2004 focuses on technology, including accommodations, assistive and instructional technology, and universal design for

learning. BEESS supports an extensive statewide technology network which includes a Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS) Technology Coordinating Unit (FDLRS/TECH), FDLRS Regional and Associate Center Technology and Assistive Technology Specialists, a statewide loan library, and specialized resource centers for the hearing impaired and the visually impaired.

- National Instructional Materials Accessibility Standard (NIMAS) and National Instructional Materials Access Center (NIMAC)—provide a standardized file format for use by publishers in creating accessible materials and house the collection; materials may be accessed through the Florida Instructional Materials Center for Visually Impaired (FIMC).
- Personnel Development Partnerships—part-time personnel in each of 9 university regions will refocus and consolidate activities to address most critical shortages statewide.

### Student Services

- Medicaid Reimbursement—federal legislation adversely affects reimbursement for schools; other provisions are unchanged
- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)—U. S. DOE has proposed clarifying regulations which defer more discretion to local officials in evaluating threats and require districts to have policies and procedures to protect educational records; TAP is being revised

Ms. Lockman concluded her presentation with her regret that she could not stay through the remainder of the meeting due to a family emergency. She again stated her appreciation for the Committee's hard work and continued support as exceptional education moves forward.

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

## Tuesday, October 7

### Transition Update

(See PowerPoint presentation and Increasing Family Involvement in Transition Focus Groups Survey, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 7; Guidance for Implementing Secondary Transition: Core Beliefs, Vision, and Mission, and *School-Based Enterprise Development: Planning, Implementing, and Evaluating* [handouts].)

Joyce Lubbers provided a transition update which included the context for transition in terms of federal, state, and local policy and effective practices, as well as IDEA 2004

accountability mandates. She reviewed SPP and APR requirements, and each of the following transition indicators (see PowerPoint presentation for additional detail):

- Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma (target met).
- Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school (target not met).
- One hundred percent of youth aged 16 and above have an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals (target not met).
- Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school, and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in postsecondary education, or both, within one year of leaving high school (new baseline being established).

*Discussion again centered on the fact that failure to meet the IEP indicator was not necessarily a lack of transition services, but an issue with the way IEP goals are written and assessed. Training and follow-up are anticipated to correct this situation.*

In regard to post-high school outcomes, it was noted that Florida is unique in having the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP). It was requested that more disaggregated data be brought to the next meeting (such data are also available on the FETPIP Web site).

Ms. Lubbers addressed the use of transition indicators to improve services, and a model for extending transition research. She noted that the challenge is to link what is learned from transition research with practices in schools and communities. She presented *Guidance for Implementing Secondary Transition* (GIST) as a resource (process, model, structure, system) for secondary educators to facilitate continuous improvement of secondary transition education and services, noting that SAC members had been involved in its conceptual development, and that topical workgroups were developing content. SAC members were requested to respond to a survey related to GIST core beliefs, vision, and mission, which was included in their materials, and apprised of GIST rollout and implementation plans.

*Committee comments addressed the valuable resources available through prior projects, the need for home-school collaboration, and an emphasis on attainable goals. Also discussed were the need for a process to prepare students for transition by knowing how to make real choices in terms of possibilities and their strengths, and the need for support for families in the transition process.*

Ms. Lubbers also provided an update on the Transition Steering Committee, again noting SAC involvement, and restructuring of transition projects, including Project 10. This new project will support initiatives for capacity building, interagency collaboration, transition legislation and policy, and student development and outcomes. It will feature

a regional network, Web-based training and ongoing electronic communication, and increased collaboration and accountability.

Ms. Lubbers concluded with information on the OSEP grant, “Increasing Family Involvement in Transition,” which would conduct focus groups in six Florida regions with diverse representation. She requested members’ input on both the most important questions to be addressed in the focus groups (see survey, Tab 7), and persons recommended to participate.

*Members were very interested in these, and requested that followup information from the focus groups be provided to the Committee.*

See PowerPoint presentation for contact information.

### **Intellectual Disabilities Rule**

(See PowerPoint presentation and Notice of Proposed Rule, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 5.)

Sheryl Sandvoss reviewed activities in the development of the ESE Eligibility for Students with Intellectual Disabilities (InD) Rule, which will be presented to the State Board of Education in October 2008. The rule is changed from Special Programs for Students Who Are Mentally Handicapped, and combines the established distinct eligibility categories of educable mentally handicapped, trainable mentally handicapped, and profoundly mentally handicapped into the single category of “intellectual disabilities.” This change is to encourage schools to focus on the individual strengths and needs of the student while diminishing the effect the student’s “label” may have on educational decisions, and is consistent with currently accepted terminology and practice and conforms the rule language to statutory changes in the 2008 legislative session.

Ms. Sandvoss addressed the proposed definition of intellectual disabilities, evaluation procedures, criteria for eligibility, and documentation of determination of eligibility. She indicated that next steps would include technical assistance on parental involvement for adaptive behavior, academic functioning commiserate with comparable intellectual functioning, documentation of determination of eligibility, and other implementation issues, especially as these relate to no longer using the “educable,” “trainable,” and “profound” classifications.

*Committee comments indicated that some are excited about the change in the rule and greater flexibility in addressing students’ needs and functioning levels and placing them for appropriate instruction and services; others felt that the change is a move in the right direction but still not the most appropriate designation for this population of students. It was noted that services don’t change, only the labels. It was also noted that terminology could be a major issue in educating parents, and might also create confusion in eligibility for services across state and federal agencies, especially where*

*“mental retardation” is used as a designation. The new rule will necessitate changes in IEP forms and data systems.*

### **SAC Business Meeting**

(See SAC Meeting Report [July 16 and 17-18, 2008], SAC By-laws, Committee Action Form, and Committee Designee Form, SAC Member Notebook, Tab 8, 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 with no changes the report of the July 16-18, 2008, meeting
- Approved proposed changes in by-laws, Article IV.C, Term of Membership, as proposed in the prior meeting
- Proposed a 2009 meeting schedule to include a meeting the last week of June (St. Petersburg or other similar location) and the first week of November (Tallahassee), with meeting travel scheduled in consideration of school schedules (i.e., weekday travel to the summer meeting, but Sunday travel for the fall one)

Committee members proposed the following as topics for subsequent meetings and additional information:

- OSEP Visit Update
- Legislative Update
- SPP/APR—data on transition and suspension and expulsion rates
- Budget Status and Related Fiscal/Program Issues
- Reasonable Force/Restraint Rule and Issues
- Assessment Update—Senate Bill 1908, end-of-course assessments and their impact on students with disabilities, FCAT waiver, why “either” FCAT “or” FAA?
- Transition Follow-up and Updates—including presentations by adult services agencies (Vocational Rehabilitation, Agency for Persons with Disabilities, Blind Services, Mental Health, etc.), compliant IEPs, FETPIP and information regarding students with disabilities in postsecondary education and employment, the Higher Education Opportunity Act and its provisions, GIST work group updates
- Special Diploma Rules

- Response to Intervention

In anticipation of a quick adjournment following the afternoon presentations, the co-chairs then conducted a “plus/delta” evaluation. Members noted as positives the hotel location and accommodations, including wireless access in the meeting room; the knowledge, organization, and work of BEESS staff, and the wealth of data and other resources provided to the Committee. Negatives included the lack of public transit to the hotel location and nearby restaurant facilities and the accessibility of microphones for member comments; the suggestion was made for BEESS to pre-arrange dinner plans based on member responses to the meeting announcement.

The meeting then broke for a networking luncheon sponsored by SERRC.

### **Public Comment**

The meeting was opened for public comment as scheduled, but there was none.

### **Response to Intervention in Florida**

(See PowerPoint presentation and Statewide Response to Instruction/Intervention [Rtl] Implementation Plan, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 4.)

Heather Diamond gave a “tour” of the Rtl Implementation Plan as follows:

#### Purpose

- Facilitate successful implementation of Problem-Solving/Rtl
- Formalize and coordinate statewide efforts
- Build upon the successes of Reading First (RF) and Positive Behavior Support (PBS) implementation which have reduced special education referral rates and office discipline referrals
- Provide districts with the critical components to support the development of district plans

#### Alignment with Existing Initiatives

- The basic elements of Rtl, required by NCLB and IDEA, are included in all broad-based initiatives for schools striving to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

#### Parent Involvement

- Meaningful and effective involvement is critical
- Parents must understand that Rtl is relevant and beneficial to all students, regardless of placement; it seeks to find out what specific instruction and interventions work best for their child; it is not a categorical system that students

must progress through laterally to become eligible for special education; it does not override other rights under IDEA

#### Foundation Beliefs/Maximum Benefits to Students

- Scientific, research-based instruction is delivered by highly qualified personnel
- Reliable, valid, and instructionally relevant assessments are used
- The problem-solving method is used to make decisions based on a continuum of student need
- Data are used to guide instructional decisions
- Professional development and follow-up modeling and coaching are provided to ensure effective instruction at all levels
- Leadership is vital
- All students and their families are part of one proactive and seamless system

#### Impact of Rtl Implementation

- Maximum effect of core instruction for all students
- Targeted instruction and interventions for at-risk learners
- Significant improvements in pro-social behaviors
- Reduction in over-representation of diverse student groups in low academic performance, special education, suspension/expulsion, and alternative education
- Reduction in referrals for special education
- Overall improvement in achievement rates

#### State Responsibilities

- Establish and facilitate teams to obtain ongoing stakeholder input and build capacity to sustain implementation over time
- Align terminology and requirements across related initiatives: reading, math, behavior, school improvement, and student progression
- Provide online training courses
- Collaborate with parent centers to disseminate resources for families

- Revise statutes, rules, and policies to support implementation
- Develop and disseminate technical assistance regarding gifted, English Language Learners (ELL), assessment accommodations, preservice efforts and teacher qualifications, secondary implementation, and special education eligibility
- Provide Web-based self-assessment and planning tools for districts
- Evaluate and report the effects of Rtl

#### District Responsibilities

- Based on self-assessment results, and in conjunction with the student progression plan and K-12 comprehensive reading plan, develop an Rtl implementation plan organized around building consensus, infrastructure, and implementation
- Ensure that plans also address how current resources will be used, additional resources needed, and how stakeholders will be involved and educated

#### Current Activities

- Dissemination of State Plan
- Statewide projects funded through the DOE
- Collaborative partnerships
- Technical assistance and tools
- Professional development activities

#### Tools to Support Districts, Schools, and Preservice Institutions/State Infrastructure

- State Management Team—provide leadership and facilitate policy-level changes to support implementation of effective educational practice.
- State Transformation Team—analyze progress toward statewide efforts, recommend actions for improvement, and support District Based Leadership Teams to build the capacity of districts to implement evidence-based practices and to establish integrated Rtl academic and behavior systems in each school.
- District Based Leadership Team—provide leadership, advisement, and training at the district level and assist schools in their implementation efforts.
- School Based Leadership Team—develop a school implementation plan. The school based team will become “trainers” and “coaches” for the school staff and will be responsible for schoolwide implementation.
- Advisory Group—provide on-going stakeholder input.

#### Future Activities

- Laws and rules related to student progression and school improvement
- Policies related to student progression, reading plans, compliance with IDEA, alternative education, ELL, juvenile justice, gifted education, district assistance and intervention plans, district improvement plans, charter school requirements, private school collaboration, and data management

#### Funding Considerations

- Consideration of fiscal needs (release time, substitutes, registration fees, etc.)
- District responsibilities and flexibility
- Potential funding sources:
  - Title I, Title II, Title III
  - Reading First Grants
  - IDEA
  - Research-based Reading Instruction Allocation
  - Annual School Improvement Allocations

#### Application of Rtl to ELL

- Current research is promising that Rtl will decrease the number of ELLs who are inappropriately referred to and placed in special education

#### Application of Rtl to Special Education Eligibility

- School teams use student progress data as part of the evaluation process to determine eligibility

#### National Resources to Support District and School Implementation

- [www.nasdse.org](http://www.nasdse.org)
  - Building and District Implementation Blueprints
  - Current research (evidence-based practices) that support use of Rtl
- [www.rtinetwork.org](http://www.rtinetwork.org)
  - Blueprints to support implementation
  - Monthly Rtl Talks
  - Virtual visits to schools implementing Rtl
  - Webinars

*Committee comments addressed the need for collaboration with private schools in the implementation of Rtl.*

## Specific Learning Disabilities Rule

(See PowerPoint presentation, Managing Complex Change, SLD—Survey of Technical Assistance Questions, and Notice of Proposed Rule, *SAC Member Notebook*, Tab 5.)

Ms. Diamond continued her presentation with a review of activities in the development of the Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD) Rule, which will be presented to the State Board of Education in October 2008. The rule is revised to change the procedures related to the identification and determination of eligibility for students with SLD. Eligibility will no longer be based on a formula-based discrepancy between the student's intelligence quotient (IQ) score and achievement test scores. Instead, districts will be required to provide interventions via a problem-solving method and measure the student's response to those interventions in order to make instructionally-relevant decisions and match resources, services, and interventions to student needs. Eligibility decisions will be based on the Rtl process.

She addressed the organization of the rule, which includes:

- Definition
- General Education Intervention Procedures and Activities
- Evaluation
- Criteria for Eligibility
- Documentation of Criteria of Eligibility
- Implementation

### Definition

- Manifests in difficulties affecting ability to listen, speak, read, write, and/or do mathematics
- Associated conditions may include but are not limited to...perceptual disabilities ...dyslexia, dyscalculia, dysgraphia...
- Not primarily the result of ...environmental, cultural, or economic factors

### General Education Intervention Procedures and Activities

- To ensure that lack of progress is not due to lack of appropriate instruction...
- Data that demonstrate that the student was provided appropriate instruction delivered by qualified personnel in general education settings
- Data-based documentation, provided to parent, of repeated measures of achievement at reasonable intervals, graphically reflecting student's Rtl during instruction

### Parent Consent for Evaluation Requested

- Student has not had adequate response to intervention (or)

- Effective interventions require sustained and substantial effort (and)
- Whenever referral is made
- Adhere to timelines in general rule unless mutual agreement to extend

#### Criteria for Eligibility

- Does not achieve adequately in one or more of the major areas
- Does not achieve adequately based on Rtl process OR Rtl process and pattern of strengths and weaknesses
- Findings not primarily result of other factors
- Team must include: general education teacher, person qualified to conduct and interpret individual diagnostic examinations, and district designee
- At least one observation in typical learning environment

#### Documentation of Determination of Eligibility

- Written summary of group's analysis
- Basis for determination, noted behavior during observation, and medical findings
- Rtl data confirming performance discrepancy, rate of progress, and educational need
- Effects of other factors
- Interventions, support provided, duration, frequency, and student data
- Parent involvement
- Signatures of agreement

#### Implementation

- SP&P must identify applicable criteria school-by-school
- Rtl process OR
- Rtl process and relevant pattern of strengths and weaknesses

Effective July 1, 2010, all schools will apply criterion #1 above; for schools using criterion #2 above, a description of relevant pattern must be included in a written summary.

Committee members were asked to identify technical assistance needs related to implementation of the new rule by completing a survey included in their materials.

Follow-up conference calls with district SLD supervisors and regional meetings will also address implementation needs.

Ms. Diamond concluded with a consensus-building tool on managing complex change which defined various outcomes when any of the following factors is missing in an attempt to bring about significant change: vision, skills, incentives, resources, action plan.

*Committee discussion centered on the lack of definition for “adequate response to intervention” and “adequate achievement” in consideration of grades, levels, outside assessments, etc. It was noted that there is no formulaic cutoff point, and that training would be provided through case studies for teams. In response to the question, “What happens when nothing is working?” it was emphasized that students can get help at any time in the eligibility process. Questions were also raised about 504 students and those who are able to compensate for a lack of ability, as well as about assistive technology and accommodations which are also interventions.*

*Concern was expressed regarding the lack of better coordination with speech and language services. A question regarding the involvement of the ESE teacher led to a discussion of the changing roles of ESE teachers and their integral role in the school in ensuring that all students are appropriately served.*

### **Closing Comments**

Co-chairs Harris and Collins made final announcements, thanked the members for their participation, and wished them safe travels home. Ms. Polland closed the meeting by reminding members of reimbursement procedures, and to forward to her any materials intended for distribution to the Committee. It was noted that the APR due February 1 would be sent to the Committee in advance for comment; prompt responses were encouraged. 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.