



IDEA Advisory Meeting

MINUTES

DECEMBER 15, 2021 9:00 AM – 3:00 P.M.

VIRTUAL MEETING

MEETING CALLED BY	Dr. Patti Mahar, Chairperson
TYPE OF MEETING	IDEA Advisory Meeting
FACILITATOR	Mary McCarvel-O'Connor
NOTE TAKER	Michelle Souther
ATTENDEES	Mary McCarvel-O'Connor, Michelle Souther, Lucy Fredericks, Susan Wagner, Dr. Patti Mahar, Alyssa Kramer, Jodi Webb, Renee Wetzsteon, Haley Lang, Angela McSweyn, Tina Degree, Jacqueline Adusumilli, Brenda Ruehl, Amanda Meier, Debbe Poitra, Nicki Kehr, Victoria Johnson, Melissa Casteel, Rachel Tabler, Lea Kugel, Colette Fleck, Jacey Enget, Jennifer Withers, Michelle Woodcock, Karla Philip, Tracy Zaun, Dean Sturn, Carson Grave, Penny Breuer, Penny Hetletved, Tracy Klein, Jessica Howling Wolf, Rachel Thomason, P & A Legal Director

Agenda topics

SPP/APR BASELINE, TARGETS AND DATA

SUSAN WAGNER AND TEAM

DISCUSSION	<p>Review the proposed new targets and get your input on how to meet the proposed new targets for the SPP indicators.</p> <p>North Dakota met requirements last year.</p> <p>The SPP/APR consists of 17 indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 of the indicators are compliance indicators. • 9 of the indicators are results indicators. • 2 of the indicators pertain to dispute resolutions and mediations. • 1 of the indicators is the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). <p>Biggest Changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator 1 (Graduation) and Indicator 2 (Drop-Out) uses Table 618 data, no longer the adjusted cohort data. • Indicator 3 (State Test) has gone from 4 sub-indicators to 24 sub-indicators! <p>Target-Setting Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There's a total of 43 indicators/sub-indicators for which new targets were set. • Stakeholders met on November 2nd to select a recommended target for each indicator/sub-indicator. • Additional stakeholder input is being collected via online surveys. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You will have an opportunity to complete these surveys after the meeting, if you like. A document with the links will be made available to you. • Indicator 1 and 2 Graduation and Dropout • Indicator 3A Participation rate for children with IEPs • Indicator 3B Proficiency rate for children with IEPs on the North Dakota State Assessment • Indicator 3C Proficiency rate for children with IEPs on the North Dakota Alternate Assessment • Indicator 3D Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students on the North Dakota State Assessment • Indicator 5 Education Environment (School Age) • Indicator 6 Preschool Environment • Indicator 7 Preschool Outcomes • Indicator 8 Parent Involvement • Indicator 14 Post-School Outcomes • Indicator 17 State Systemic Improvement Plan <p>Indicator 1: This is a new calculation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The percent of youth with IEPs exiting from high school with a regular high school diploma. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma out of the youth with IEPs (age 14-21) who left high school by (a) graduating with a regular high school diploma; (b)
-------------------	---

- graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) receiving a certificate; (d) reaching maximum age; or (e) dropping out.
- Data for this indicator are "lag" data for 2020-21 it is really 2019-20 data.
- The baseline is 75.24% and target for 2025-26 is 77.74%

Indicator 2: Drop Out

- The baseline is 19.46% and target for 2025-26 is 17.21%.

Indicators 1 & 2 Input: Graduation/Drop-Out

What are some barriers to making progress on the graduation and dropout rates of SWD?

- COVID
- Financial Insecurity
- Unaddressed trauma
- Smaller districts tied to schedules and staff/less flexibility with thinking outside the box to meet unique student needs and situation
- The number of students with the ability to earn a regular diploma
- Learning difficulties due to long distance learning
- Lack of academic support
- Lack of para support
- Sometimes there is a disconnect between home and school supports or a lack of family engagement
- Behavioral health issues and family supports
- Children with no available foster homes or placements
- Change in structure of online classes during pandemic
- Unqualified teachers, poor student attendance
- Find ways to engage parents in their child's IEP and assist with getting wrap around for them

What are some improvement strategies surrounding graduation and drop-out rates of SWD that could be implemented?

- Training and resources for drop-out prevention
- Student engagement
- Coordinating wrap around services early and sticking with a family during big school transitions
- More thinking out of the box and individualization in developing route to graduation
- GED prep while enrolled in school
- More personalized learning opportunities
- Praise the kids and give them the technology they need to succeed. Give the kids praise
- Access to alternative school options in small districts
- Training and resources on attendance
- Create more internship/apprenticeship type programs
- Better family engagement efforts
- Give the kids praise
- Multiple learning modes COVID has opened new avenues to education typical/atypical learners
- Professional development, teachers who engage students to increase their interest and motivation

3A Target – Grade 4 Math Participation baseline is 92.24% and target for 2025-26 is 96.00%

3A Target – Grade 8 Math Participation baseline is 90.61% and target for 2025-26 is 95.00%

3A Target – High School Math Participation baseline is 85.17% and target for 2025-26 is 95.00%

3A Target – Grade 4 Reading Participation baseline is 91.91% and target for 2025-26 is 96.00%

3A Target – Grade 8 Reading Participation baseline is 89.08% and target for 2025-26 is 95.00%

3A Target – Grade High School Participation baseline is 85.68% and target for 2025-26 is 95.00%

Indicator 3A Input: Participation

What are some barriers to making progress on the participation rate of SWD?

- Assessment not viewed as relevant to the student
- Paraprofessional/teacher shortages
- Student not interested in outcome
- Lack of understanding between students and teachers/instructional aid
- Family support of the student
- Criteria to determine who will be excused from the test
- Low expectations of students by teachers
- Teacher promotion to students and parents
- Buy in of students, what is in it for them
- Teachers sometimes view it as a hassle
- Students not understanding the purpose of the assessment results
- Student attendance

What are some improvement strategies surrounding participation rate of SWD that could be implemented?

- Improved information/training for staff on how the assessment is presented to parents at IEP meetings
- Family engagement
- More prep of students especially students with social emotional needs
- Make sure you give the teachers or aides the proper training so they can give kids the help they need
- Criteria to determine who will be excused from the test

Indicator 3B Math:

- **This is a new calculation.**
- The math proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- This represents students who took the regular state test.

- 3B Target – Grade 4 Math Proficiency on Regular Assessment baseline is 14.88% and target for 2025-26 is 18.00%
- 3B Target – Grade 8 Math Proficiency on Regular Assessment baseline is 9.38% and target for 2025-26 is 12.00%
- 3B Target – High School Math Proficiency on Regular Assessment baseline is 5.57% and target for 2025-26 is 7.00%
- 3B Target – Grade 4 Reading Proficiency on Regular Assessment baseline is 13.22% and target for 2025-26 is 15.00%
- 3B Target – Grade 8 Reading Proficiency on Regular Assessment baseline is 11.91% and target for 2025-26 is 14.00%
- 3B Target – High School Reading Proficiency on Regular Assessment baseline is 8.65% and target for 2025-26 is 11.00%

Indicator 3B Input: Proficiency – Regular Test

What are some barriers to making progress on the proficiency rate of SWD on the regular test?

- The student's disability
- Ensuring that subject matter in the classroom aligns to the test materials
- Measuring proficiency rather than progress
- Technology and executive functions skills limit the students ability to show what they know on top of the specific disability they are trying to overcome
- Teacher presentation of testing and prep of student
- Student understanding of test and what it means for them
- Student anxiety about testing
- Student provided the necessary accommodations to be successful on the test
- Make sure the students know the importance of the assessment
- Lack of availability to study guides
- Departmental barriers between the State DPI and DHS creating multiple steps to operating prek.

What are some improvement strategies surrounding proficiency rate of SWD on the regular test that could be implemented?

- Be creative about engaging student in testing
- Find ways to get teachers excited
- Ensuring students stay on task and not get distracted
- Regression towards the mean?
- Relationship building (students and teachers)
- Look at all of the responsibilities a teacher has and how to reduce something as they prepare students for teaching – more support for teachers
- Make sure you are teaching material at the student rate of speed
- Break the test down into small sections depending on the student's ability to stay on task

Indicator 3C Math:

- **This is a new calculation.**
- The math proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- This represents students who took the alternate state test.

- 3C Target – Grade 4 Math Proficiency on Alternate Assessment baseline is 31.88% and target for 2025-26 is 34.00%
- 3C Target – Grade 8 Math Proficiency on Alternate Assessment baseline is 13.95% and target for 2025-26 is 16.00%
- 3C Target – High School Math Proficiency on Alternate Assessment baseline is 36.96% and target for 2025-26 is 38.00%

- 3C Target – Grade 4 Reading Proficiency on Alternate Assessment baseline is 53.52% and target for 2025-26 is 59.00%
- 3C Target – Grade 8 Reading Proficiency on Alternate Assessment baseline is 35.29% and target for 2025-26 is 41.00%
- 3C Target – High School Reading Proficiency on Alternate Assessment baseline is 39.13% and target for 2025-26 is 44.00%

3C Input: Proficiency – Alternate Test

What are some barriers to making progress on the proficiency rate of SWD on the alternate test?

- Time for staff to review progress/make changes on NDAA
- A lack of one-on-one time
- Does the curriculum align with the state assessment
- Would a review of the outcomes with the students help to get more aware and engaged in the testing
- When student changed district, getting caught up with team, team finding new strategies to address the IEP, student struggled
- Lack of teacher training on assessments

What are some improvement strategies surrounding proficiency rate of SWD on the alternate test that could be implemented?

- Find ways to address the low scores throughout the year as student are more skilled
- Ask the child how they prefer to learn or how they learn best
- Ask for teacher input on need to improve and possible solutions
- Make sure adaptations are in place for testing and student knows how to use those adaptations
- Implement good teaching strategies
- Strategy repetition by teachers

Indicator 3D Math:

- **This is a new calculation.**
- The gap in math proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.
- This represents the difference in proficiency rates for all students who took the regular state test and students with disabilities who took the regular state test.
- 3D Target – Grade 4 Math Gap Data baseline is 20.48% and target for 2025-26 is 19.00%
- 3D Target – Grade 8 Math Gap Data baseline is 27.84% and target for 2025-26 is 26.00%
- 3D Target – High School Math Gap Data baseline is 22.58% and target for 2025-26 is 20.00%
- 3D Target – Grade 4 Reading Gap Data baseline is 24.25% and target for 2025-26 is 22.00%
- 3D Target – Grade 8 Reading Gap Data baseline is 36.71% and target for 2025-26 is 35.00%
- 3D Target – High School Reading Gap Data baseline is 31.67% and target for 2025-26 is 30.00%

3D Input: Gap Data

What are some barriers to making progress on the gap rate of SWD?

- A disability barrier
- Time restraints to review data
- Not understanding how to interpret student data
- Lack of communication with parents
- Parent involvement and student engagement

What are some improvement strategies surrounding gap rate of SWD that could be implemented?

- Data assessment and implementation of intervention strategies for each student
- Identify why there is such a gap and why does it widen in high school
- Instruction on test-taking strategies
- Professional development for teachers on how to interpret and use data to better understand student progress
- Professional development in teaching reading and math
- Listen
- Personal contact with parents to build trust and discuss student barriers
- If you listen to parents, you will learn more about the child you serve

Indicator 5 A:

- **This is a new calculation.**
- The percent of children with IEPs enrolled in Kindergarten through grade 12 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day.
- 5A Target – LRE Regular Classroom baseline is 73.23% and target for 2025-26 is 75.00%.

Indicator 5B:

- **This is a new calculation.**
- The percent of children with IEPs enrolled in Kindergarten through grade 12 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day.
- 5B Target – LRE Separate Classroom baseline is 6.42% and baseline for 2025-26 is 5.00%

Indicator 5C:

- **This is a new calculation.**
- The percent of children with IEPs enrolled in Kindergarten through grade 12 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/ hospital placements.
- 5C Target – LRE Separate Facilities baseline is 1.57% and target for 2025-26 is 1.25%.

Indicator 5 Input: K-12 LRE

What are some barriers to making progress on LRE of K-12 SWD?

- Paraprofessional shortage
- Lack of para support
- Not having enough supports in place to assist the classroom teacher
- Sometimes there is a disconnect between general education and special education about best settings for SWD
- Resistance of gen ed teachers to read and support IEP
- Under paid over worked
- Student performance data may drive placement of students within an MTSS system
- General education teachers resistance to include children with disabilities
- Lack of training on strategies for successful participation
- Parent education/understanding of rights/laws
- Parent justified fears that the child will not be supported in gen ed setting as they are in the less restrictive environment

What are some improvement strategies surrounding LRE of K-12 SWD that could be implemented?

- Parent training and resources
- Offer more professional/education training
- Explicit training/PD for regular education teachers on personalization, differentiation, classroom management and accommodations
- Communication all around
- Offer financial incentives for general education teachers per students with IEPs
- More disability awareness and inclusion activities for gen ed students and teachers
- More opportunities for shared professional development and IDEA guidelines with gen ed and special education
- More support and training for gen ed teachers regarding IEPs and SWDs

Indicator 6A:

- **This is a new calculation.**
- The percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.
- 6A Target – LRE for Preschool: Regular Classroom baseline is 21.98% and new target for 2025-26 is 25.00%

Indicator 6B:

- The percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- 6B Target – LRE for Preschool: Separate Settings baseline is 40.07% and new target for 2025-26 is 38.00%

Indicator 6C:

- The percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program receiving special education and related services in the home.
- 6C Target – LRE for Preschool: Receiving Services in the Home baseline is 1.05% and new target for 2025-26 is 1.00%

Indicator 6 Input: Preschool – LRE

What are some barriers to making progress on LRE of preschool SWD?

- Lack of community daycare/preschools

- Parents education/understanding of rights and issues
- Commitment of districts to making progress
- Staff shortages
- Lack of funding to support children with additional needs in preschool programs
- Parents education/understanding of rights and laws
- Early diagnosis and schedule of services
- COVID has likely impacted opportunities for this population
- Lack of coordinating community services to children and family
- State child care licensing requirements to decrease rises to most developmental level of students needing additional supports (which reduces income of program).
- Misunderstanding
- ND's rural geography and lack of programming and staff

What are some improvement strategies surrounding LRE of preschool SWD that could be implemented?

- Preschool personnel training, resources and support
- Identify and look at districts or schools who are having better results
- Learn your students
- Additional funding to support inclusion in Pre-k population
- Timely observations by preschool staff
- Streamline the process between the State department of DPI and DHS to simplify approval for all PreK programs
- More financial support for classrooms to purchase items
- Social/emotional training for all teachers of preschoolers
- Time for teachers to collaborate with other professionals and parents

Indicator 7A1:

- States must determine of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited.
- 7A1 Target – Social-Emotional Skills: Growth baseline is 84.50% and new target for 2025-26 is 88.00%

Indicator 7A2:

- States must determine of those children who entered the program, the percent who exited at age level.
- 7A2 Target – Social-Emotional Skills: At Age Level baseline is 63% and new target is 63.50%

Indicator 7A Input: Social Emotional

What are some barriers to making progress on the social-emotional skills of preschoolers?

- Doctors not listening to parents
- Lack of funding for early childhood programs. Lack of inclusive environments
- Increased childhood trauma and pressures on families
- Lack of learning opportunities and strategy development
- Not looking at growth or lack of across all environments
- Preschool equipment – help with equipment needs
- Need for collaboration with other services child is receiving from outside of school
- Preschool may be the first experience for students who have confined to their family unit. They need to learn appropriate behavior with adults and children not in their family unit.

What are some improvement strategies surrounding social-emotional skills of preschoolers that districts could implement?

- SEL training and resources
- Let them play
- Family engagement
- Early intervention and parent education
- Identify core SEL Exemplar curricula to support training and implementation. Prevention vs. reaction!
- Collaborating with home/daycares/preschools for training in SEL instruction
- In home behavioral supports
- Intervention strategies to teach appropriate behavior. Patience!
- More training for staff/paras

Indicator 7B1:

- States must determine of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited.

- 7B1 Target – Knowledge & Skills: Growth baseline is 86.42% and new target for 2025-26 is 90.50%

Indicator 7B2:

- States must determine of those children who entered the program, the percent who exited at age level.
- 7B2 Target – Knowledge & Skills: Growth baseline is 55.06% and new target for 2025-26 is 56%

Indicator 7 Input: Knowledge & Skills

What are some barriers to making progress in the area of acquiring knowledge and skills for preschoolers?

- Lack of classroom teacher knowledge on strategies for teaching students with special needs
- Limited staff
- Lack of parent involvement and opportunity to be involved in the preschool program
- Staff are expected to do more than they have time for or are trained to do
- Lack of collaboration with other service providers

What are some improvement strategies in the area of acquiring knowledge and skills for preschoolers that districts could implement?

- Professional development
- Brain gym
- Younger parents need more support

7C1:

- States must determine of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited.
- 7C Target – Using Behaviors: Growth baseline is 84.29% and new target for 2025-26 is 88.00%

7C2:

- States must determine of those children who entered the program, the percent who exited at age level.
- 7C2 Target – Using Behaviors: At Age Level baseline is 72.70% and new target for 2025-26 is 73%

Indicator 7C Input: Using Behaviors

What are some barriers to making progress in the area of using appropriate behaviors to meet needs for preschoolers?

- Lack of understanding of behavioral guidance techniques
- Behaviors increase when child moves to Kindergarten
- Again, lack of funding, supports, family/school connections and programs
- Lack of time or skill by teacher to teach appropriate behavior
- Lack of transitional pre-k to K training and resources for families
- Lack of real transition to school and expectations in the new school environment
- Miss communication of information and requirements associated with IDEA
- More learning time with parents so they can help

What are some improvement strategies in the area of using appropriate behaviors to meet needs for preschoolers that districts could implement?

- Collaboration for training with daycares/preschools/homes
- Family engagement
- Parents and professional training and resources
- More staffing (easier said than done!)
- Professional development, parent involvements
- More involvement with BCBAs for skill building before preschool ends
- Ensuring that there is fidelity in our data collection and assessment administration
- Problem solving focus and accurate information relating to IDEA across agencies
- More collaboration with schools and teachers
- Engaging the family of the child

Indicator 8:

- The percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

- Indicator 8 Target – Parent Involvement baseline is 70.58% and new target for 2025-26 is 72.00%

Indicator 8: Input: Parent Involvement

How can we increase our response rate?

- Work collaboratively with parent organization for additional outreach to parents
- Make phone calls to families
- Clearly define benefits from survey results
- Have staff familiar with parents reach out about the surveys (like some units are doing)
- Ask if parents will complete after their annual IEP meeting
- Multiple ways to complete survey; some people prefer technology and others paper
- Do more outreach marketing
- 1 on 1 feedback – connect with families and students

How can we increase representativeness?

- Have staff familiar with parents reach out about the surveys (like some units are doing)
- Use social media and different forms of communication to reach parents and tie the ask to the why
- Reach out to stakeholders share link and information with others (board, councils, agencies, organizations)
- Reminder to talk to the child no matter how old they are they learn by watching you
- Do more outreach marketing
- Larger districts have SPED coordinators assigned to specific schools – have them be the driver
- Schools are the best connection parents have with their child’s education – support districts and schools in increasing participation by having them be the driver on it
- Assign special education directors the task of notifying and following up with parents to ensure they are completing the survey.

Indicator 8: Parent Involvement

What are some barriers to making progress on parent involvement?

- Parents overwhelmed
- Parent time management too busy
- Funding to parents/agencies work more collaboratively
- Parents are more distrustful after COVID – has to be addressed
- Parents and teachers alike are overwhelmed
- Possible language barriers
- Parents feeling intimidated by staff (outnumbered)

What are some improvement strategies surrounding parent involvement that could be implemented?

- Small simple tidbits of information
- Relationship building – most important aspect of the team
- Resources at their fingertips
- More outreach programs
- Proving multiple avenues for parents to connect – social media, virtual, paper, etc
- Opportunities to work more closely to strengthen family engagement efforts
- IEP meetings are not always collaborative – parents are being TOLD rather than active decision members
- Need increased communication and transparency between school team and parents
- Understand that any parent contact should be important and pertinent to them and not an obligation due to program requirements.
- Problem solving focus accompanied with accurate communication of required supports and expectations across agencies
- Make contact with parents concise and direct
- Problem solving focus accompanied with accurate communication of required supports and expectations across agencies.

Jessica commented that the lack of trust – does that fall on leadership? Does the IDEA have a consensus for indicator 8?

Indicator 14 Input: Post-Secondary Outcomes

14A responses rate is 42.2%

What are some methods for improving the response rate of the Post-Secondary Outcomes Survey?

- Having a conversation with students and parents before graduation to let them know they will be contacted in a year to get this information.

- Lack of IEP or programming in college
- Lack of preparing student for after high school grad and life
- Not getting Voc Rehab involved early
- College readiness training for student
- Parents need more education regarding alternatives to full guardianships and that IEPs do not carry over to higher education

What are some ways for improving the representativeness (e.g., race/ethnicity, disability, and exit type) of the responses?

- High schools work with secondary education institutions
- Again more outreach programs in college
- Help the kids find something they enjoy doing
- Assist students to develop a relationship with post-secondary opportunities
- Post-secondary tuition support incentives
- Parents aren't aware and understand that adulthood looks different in terms of what their child is entitled to
- Pre-college outreach program
- Evaluating effectiveness of outreach program
- Social support

Indicator 14A:

- Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- Indicator 14 Target – Post School Outcomes Measurement A baseline is 20.20% and new target for 2025-26 is 22.00%

Indicator 14A Input: Post-Secondary Outcomes

What are some barriers to making progress on post-secondary outcomes?

- Parent need more education regarding alternatives to full guardianships and that IEPs do not carry over to higher education
- Lack of collaboration with local colleges and businesses for career opportunities and work experience
- Lack of services

What are some improvement strategies surrounding post-secondary outcomes?

- Start working with VR prior to age 16
- Make connections to provide opportunities for students
- Build trust
- Connect students to campus resources (disability services, TRIO program, career development) so they know someone is there to support and assist them
- Career counseling with parents and students beginning at the start of high school
- Post-secondary tuition support incentives

Indicator 14B:

- Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- 14B Target – Post School Outcomes Measurement B baseline is 59.27% and new target for 2025-26 is 65.50%

Indicator 14C:

- Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.
- 14C Target – Post School Outcomes Measurement C baseline is 81.13% and new target for 2025-26 is 84.00%.

Indicator 17:

- North Dakota's State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) State identified Measurable Result (SiMR) is focused on improving the extended six-year graduation rate for students identified as having an emotional disturbance (ED).

117 students in cohort – 66% students with ED graduated with regular diploma for a 56.41%

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 17 Target – SSIP <p>Indicator 17: Input: ED Graduation Rate</p> <p>What are some barriers to making progress on ED graduation rate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Typically students with ED need relationships within the school Most likely to be in more restrictive environment Lack of emotional/mental health supports right in the school setting Lack of motivation Lack of in-home options for family supports related to trauma, behavior, mental health Dropping out is not a single event Teachers not trained well enough on strategies to support ED Students Again learn how kids learn Less time with peers who do not have disabilities <p>What are some improvement strategies surrounding ED graduation rate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase time in LRE Train all teachers on the best strategies to work with students diagnosed with ED Prepare student and family throughout school career for adulthood Make sure students understand they have the ability to graduate and do great things afterwards Make it fun Greater focus on mental health in the school via private or public agencies, social workers, etc Focus on the students hopes and dreams Increase awareness about outcomes associated with particular program of study 		
CONCLUSIONS			
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE	

SSIP

HALEY LANG

DISCUSSION	<p>SSIP goes with Indicator 17. These students have some of the lowest graduation rates. This is why we choose to focus on this in the state.</p> <p>Jodi Webb asked about OHI and how it applies to absentees? If we can increase attendance in one group, we hope that it would increase in the other groups too. In our SSIP we target students with ED, but the state is concentrating on improving graduation rates in all areas of disabilities also.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing Focus: Improving Graduation Rates of Students with an ED Message for 2021-2022 School Year: Leveraging Hopes and Dreams Working with an External Evaluator, Data Driven Enterprises – Susan Wagner, to analysis the state graduation/drop out data. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disability Category Gender Ethnicity LRE Attendance Discipline Data 		
CONCLUSIONS			

CLOSING THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP

LEA KUGEL & HALEY LANG

DISCUSSION	<p>Strategies for Closing the Achievement Gap for Students with Disabilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Striving Readers National Dropout Prevention Center <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Linda Davis, Ph.D. 		
-------------------	---	--	--

- March 2020 to September 2021
- Highlight, share and leverage efforts to improve outcomes

Mark Ehrmantraut and Lea Kugel wrote a grant. The research study had four guiding questions.

- What are the effective strategies currently in use to support the progress of students with disabilities that can be replicated statewide?
- Are there effective data-based decision-making processes in place to mediate dropout rates? How do they look at their data?
- What is the efficacy of current literacy instruction programs? This one was hard to get specific information for high school students.
- How are the social and emotional needs of students being met? What could have been better? Lots of comments regarding anxiety. Being around people they didn't know.

158 respondents from 10 districts responded to initial survey.

After survey responses were collected, a variety of stakeholders from the 10 districts were interviewed either individually or in small groups

Strong levels of engagement and care for students with disabilities.

After reviewing all data collected, the overall finding was that respondents indicated a high level of engagement and care for SWD.

9 Key Findings emerged from the data.

1. Multi-tiered Systems of Supports
2. Values, Attitudes, and Beliefs – SWD should participate in the general classroom as much as possible and hold them to high expectations. All students mean all students.
3. Collaboration – effective outcomes rely on expertise of all stakeholders. We must be commitment and have respect. Students have the opportunity to know what their disability was and how it impacts their learning.
4. Individualization – it is important for SWDs. It is very important to create those unique plans, schedules and opportunities.
5. Relationship/Student Involvement – relationship with the student. Stakeholders should have a deep understanding of student's background and interests. Wrap-around approach to help support the student.
6. Administrative Support – administration need to support the initiatives.
7. Inclusion – effective inclusion – is so much more than the general education classroom. It includes both the family and the student in decision making. Have the student involved in their IEP team meeting.
8. Social-Emotional Learning – establish clear, consistent, and positive learning environments. Provide feedback on the student is participating. Increase motivation within the student.
9. Literacy – Reading is the skill that should be practiced in every classroom every day. If a student can't read, they may not be able to access academic material. Research based intervention to increase reading abilities. Practice reading across the system. Participate in reading.

Best Practices/Strategies

- Small group instruction
- Centers/Station Teaching
- Flexible Scheduling
- The Least You Need to Know Method
- Pre-teaching/Re-teaching
- Technology

National Dropout Prevention Center Recording <https://youtu.be/XP7c-asfll4>

CONCLUSIONS

ACTION ITEMS

PERSON RESPONSIBLE

DEADLINE

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HB 1388 Professional Development for K-3 Reading • SB 2269 Post-Secondary Transition Programs • HB 1131 Credentials for Specialists Trained in Dyslexia <p>HB 1388: All teachers working in a public or nonpublic school with students in grades K-3 must have reading training. (1) Phonemic awareness; (2) Phonics; (3) Fluency; (4) Vocabulary; and (5) Comprehension; and c. Uses systematic direct instruction for students in Kindergarten through grade three to ensure all students obtain necessary early reading skills.</p> <p>ESSER Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specially Designed Instruction – should be paired with good instruction. How does it work with a system that has MTSS? • Education Pathway for High School Seniors • Early Warning System Intervention • Graduation Improvement Project • Para to Teacher Pathway <p>SDI 1st meeting with the progress center to define and provide examples of SDI. \$100,000</p> <p>Education Pathways 1st meeting with stakeholders to add two special education courses to the existing education pathway housed in CTE. (Introduction to special education with concentration of inclusion, field experience-students choose which area they would like to experience, a mentor is assigned, and review of the experience takes place at end. \$100,000</p> <p>EWIMS: Contract provided to AIR to develop a state coaching cadre (7 members from IHEs and REAs) to train and provide coaching to districts interested with implementing EWIMS and intervention based on student need. \$200,000.</p> <p>Graduation Improvement Project: Big 5 to develop EWIMS. Two were interested in moving forward. Will consider additional ways to implement EBP to increase graduation rates across ND. \$200,000</p> <p>Para to Teacher – developed during Covid to help with the shortage of special education teachers. Takes paras who have an associated degree and continue to take courses to become a special education teacher. Pathway program that can help bring teachers into the special education field. Minot State created this program.</p>
-------------------	---

CONCLUSIONS		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

INDICATOR 8 UPDATES

HALEY LANG

DISCUSSION	<p>The Survey Itself</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ND Parent Survey is a 10-item survey. • Each question is rated on a Likert scale: • Questions about the child’s demographics • Two open-ended questions <p>Survey Scoring</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parent responses on each item are “summed up” and parents who awarded at least 75% of the points when rating a school (e.g., on average, they agreed to each item) meet the indicator. • The percent of parents who meet the indicator is the Parent Involvement Percentage <p>ND State Results (2020-21)</p> <p># of Parents who received a score – 510 # of Parents who Met Indicator – 345 % who Met Indicator – 67.73%</p> <p>NDDPI set a target of 67% for 2020-21. The state met the target.</p>
-------------------	---

	<p>42 districts did not meet the target 64 districts met the target</p> <p>Previous Years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The survey was mailed out a percentage of parents from an out of state agency. <p>Last Year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Special education units had the option of completing the survey themselves. 3 special education units opted to complete the survey themselves. This showed very high level of engagement from the parents. 80% of engagement from parents when the units did the survey. <p>Current Year:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Special education units had the option to complete the survey themselves Options to complete the survey: In-person paper survey, emailed link, QR code to scan, mailed survey or a link by text message. 21 Units have opted to complete it themselves 9 Units have opted for an outside evaluator to complete the surveys
--	---

CONCLUSIONS

ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE

SUGGESTIONS SUMMARY		
Issues and Concerns in our State: No issues.		
ACTION ITEMS	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DEADLINE
<p>The committee approved the September minutes. Tracy Klein made the motion to accept the minutes and Jodi Webb seconded the motion.</p> <p>The meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m. Brenda Ruehl made the motion and Tracey Zaun seconded the motion to adjourn.</p> <p>Public Comment: No Public Comment</p> <p>March meeting is scheduled for: March 21, 2022.</p> <p>Agenda Items for March meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indicator 14 – comments from students that drop-out Indicator 13 – IEPs written correctly 		