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North Dakota IDEA Advisory Committee Position Statement on a Unified System of Education

North Dakota shall have a seamless education system that is responsive to the needs of all children, adolescents, and young adults, and their families. Parents and students must be given the opportunity to participate as full partners in all educational endeavors. We must build the capacity in general education for all children, while supporting each individual student’s rights and the gains made since the passage of federal legislation in special education. In such a system, all children reap the benefits of a free appropriate public education through effective, research based, instructional programs and practices based on equitable standards with accountability and high expectations for all.

Approved by the ND IDEA Advisory Committee on September 21, 2001.
ABOUT THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The purpose of the North Dakota Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Advisory Committee is to provide advice and guidance to the Department of Public Instruction with respect to special education and related services for children and youth with disabilities as required by the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The committee provides a forum for issues regarding potential unmet needs of students with disabilities. The advisory committee members are viewed as key agents in their efforts to improve educational opportunities for children with disabilities in North Dakota. One of the most significant contributions each member brings to the committee is his or her representation of a constituency.

The functions of the North Dakota IDEA Advisory Committee are to:

- Advise the Department of Public Instruction of unmet needs within the State in the education of individuals with disabilities;
- Comment publicly on the rules and regulations proposed by the Department of Public Instruction regarding the education of children and youth with disabilities;
- Advise the Department of Public Instruction in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary of Education under Section 618;
- Advise the Department of Public Instruction in developing a state performance plan and annual performance reports under Part B of the Act;
- Advise the Department of Public Instruction in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities; and
- Advise the Department of Public Instruction regarding the education of eligible students with disabilities in adult prisons, children with disabilities who are homeless, and children with disabilities participating in child welfare services.

MEMBERSHIP

The North Dakota IDEA Advisory Committee is formed of a broad representation of individuals with knowledge and expertise on needs of children with disabilities. Appointments to the committee are made by the North Dakota Superintendent of Public Instruction for a three-year term. In accordance with the regulations governing the implementation of the IDEA, the majority of members of the committee are parents of children with disabilities or individuals with disabilities. The remaining members of the committee represent a variety of stakeholders concerned with, and involved in, improving results for children with disabilities attending public schools in North Dakota, state supported educational programs, private schools, juvenile and adult correctional facilities, state human service agencies, and higher education representatives.
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COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS
In North Dakota, the lead agency responsible for services for children with disabilities from birth through age 2 (IDEA, Part C) is the Department of Human Services. The lead agency responsible for services for children with disabilities from age 3 through 21 (IDEA, Part B) is the Department of Public Instruction. Since September 2002, the ND Interagency Coordinating Council (IDEA, Part C) and the ND IDEA Advisory Committee (IDEA, Part B) have recurrently held joint meetings.

YEAR IN REVIEW
The IDEA Advisory Committee held regular quarterly meetings throughout the year. Complete minutes are available on the Department’s website.

Meeting Summary: September 15, 2021
TAESE held new IDEA Advisory member training.

IDEA Annual Report Approval – Dr. Patti Mahar
The IDEA Advisory Committee approved the annual report. Jacey Enget made the motion to approve and Jodi Webb second the motion.

DHS Early Childhood Division Special Education Office Update - Jackie Adusumilli and Mary McCarvel-O’Connor

DISCUSSION
DHS Early Childhood Division was created in the Department of Human Services and was created in the last legislative session. Enhanced collaboration with childcare, CFS, and Part C. It was meant to bring everyone under one roof.

Exciting initiatives are:
- Best in Class – 23 programs and 32 total
- Waterford Upstart – serves 1200 four-year-old. It is an online program – more of family engagement preparing them for kindergarten. It is 15 minutes a day for 5 days a week. If families enroll and complete the program, they get a laptop to keep. [https://www.waterfordupstart.org/register](https://www.waterfordupstart.org/register)
- Inclusion grant – [https://www.nd.gov/dhs/services/childcare/inclusion.html](https://www.nd.gov/dhs/services/childcare/inclusion.html)

Mary was a teacher of deaf and hard of hearing. She worked in Iowa and Wisconsin. She has worked for the department for 11 years. She was the assistant director for 7 years and worked under Gerry Teevens.

Special Education Updates – Mary McCarvel-O’Connor
We currently have three open positions.

New Projects:
- Specially Designed Instruction
- Early Warning Systems
- Educator Pathway – grow dual credit in education for junior and seniors in ND
- Graduation Improvement Project – project help build capacity within our state to help with graduation and target bigger districts that make up our SSIP indicator 17
- Research Grants-IREEED – Lea and Mary are working IREEED project which comes out of UND. Starting a partnership to research recruitment and retention and dyslexia in North Dakota.
- NCD Training
- Early Childhood Outcomes Training

Continued Projects:
- Professional Development Series – 2nd Tuesday of every month
OSEP Levels of Determination Part B & Part C OSEP Differentiated Monitoring & Support (DMS) North Dakota - Jackie Adusumilli and Mary McCarvel-O’Connor

DISCUSSION
Annually, the Secretary reviews the State’s performance based on the information provided by the State in the State’s annual performance report, information obtained through monitoring visits, and any other public information made available, the Secretary determines the State’s Level of Determination.

IDEA-Part C – meets requirements on the February 2020 submitted SPP/APR for Part C. This is the second year in a row that they met requirements.

IDEA-Part B - meets requirements on the February 2020 submitted SPP/APR for Part B.

Differentiated Monitoring and Support 2.0
Beginning in Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2021, Part B and Part C programs in States were monitored by OSEP in a five-year cycle. North Dakota was in cohort 2 which was set to begin October 2021. Because of COVID monitoring effort were placed on hold and moved back a year. North Dakota will now begin the monitoring process October 2022. OSEP will monitor all States on their general supervision systems. OSEP will continue to provide support and technical assistance that is differentiated based on each State’s unique strengths, challenges, and needs. It is a three-year process.

Overview of FFY 2020-25 SPP/APR Requirements
SPP/APR requirements – OSEP has released new measurement table for the FFY 2020-25 SPP/APR.

- States are required to:
  I. Set new targets for all results indicators
  II. Establish baseline for new components or revise existing baseline where there are changes
  III. Involve stakeholder groups in the new baseline and target-setting process

- FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission (due Feb. 1, 2022) will include targets and baseline data for the FFY 2020-25 SPP/APR.

Stakeholder Meeting Participants – November 2, 2021. We will bring three targets for each indicator and the group will help determine the target for our indicators. It is half a day in the morning.

Stakeholder Meeting Participants
- Parents/family members
- Local special education directors or administrators
- Other state agency personnel
- Business/community representatives
- Advocacy groups
- Students or former students

Stakeholder Group One Meeting
- Early Childhood – Indicators 6 & 7, (Indicator 12)
- Equity for All – Indicators 4, 5, and 8 (Indicators 4b, 9, 10)
- Secondary Transition – Indicator 1, 2, 17 and 14
- Assessment – Indicator 3

We need volunteers to be on these groups. Janakate Walker – janakate05w@gmail.com volunteered. Renee Wetzsteon would be interested in volunteering.
Kimberly Hruby was wondering if you are looking for parent volunteers or agency partners for these stakeholder groups? Her Division of Special Health Services is interested in transition and are a part of the Transition Community of Practice but would also be interested in a subgroup.

Jodi Webb will put the word out for volunteers.

IDEA B SETTING TARGETS-STAKEHOLDERS GROUP FAMILY ENGAGEMENT ON THE 5S - Mary McCarvel-O’Connor and Angela McSweyn

Family Engagement – Angela McSweyn

- Superintendent Baesler’s Family Cabinet
- Goal Setting Process
- Indian Education Summit – Grafton Family Engagement Coordinator & Social Worker Team
- Family Engagement Resources: ND Family Engagement (padlet.com)

Beyond Bedtime stories and No More Mumbo Jumbo. These two books are excellent reads.

Acronyms – ELA, IEP, NWEA, ESSA, ISS, RTIB, FERPA – would you know all these acronyms?

Upcoming Events – 2021 National Family Engagement Summit - NAFSCE

Family Resource Toolkit | North Dakota Department of Public Instruction (nd.gov)

Great resources for engaging families and children who are English Language Learners LiNK Family Engagement CoP - Resources (padlet.com)

What are some highlights of Family Engagement in your schools and or community? Missi thanked Angela for her energy and passion for connecting with parents.

Please join our North Dakota Family Engagement Facebook Group. https://www.facebook.com/groups/855606714955377

On the 5’s Resource – awarded grant through CLSD. Provide easy user-friendly resources for families that have kids who are struggling. We have disseminated 39,000 copies throughout the state. https://www.nd.gov/dpi/sites/www/files/documents/SpeEd/Final%20NDDPI_OnThe5s_pdf.pdf

Jodi Webb has parent resource guides available at info@pathfinder-nd.org

RESILIENT EARLY INTERVENTION LEADERS (REIL) GRANT - Jackie Adusumilli

Part C Developmental Disabilities received $200,000.00 grant to grow leadership in early intervention. It is 14 webinars provided for no cost. Devereux Center is providing the training. It begins in October. It is the first Tuesday of every month. There are 100 spots available.

UND early intervention graduate leadership certificate. Grant Funding Application

UND Info: https://und.edu/programs/early-intervention-leadership-graduate-certificate/index.html

Cohort 1:
- Complete Grant Funding Application Survey by October 1
- Notified by October 15 if funded by grant
- Complete UND Application ($35 fee) by November 1 with all documents/transcripts submitted.
PART B STATE SYSTEMIC IMPROVEMENT PLAN -Mark Ehrmantraut
SSIP 2020-21 to 2021-22 School Years

ND’s SSIP Goal – (SiMR) - Improve 6-year graduation rates for students identified as having an Emotional Disturbance

In 2020-21: SSIP Messaging – Dropping Out is a Process, NOT an Event
This implies… and rightly so… that there are numerous points to intervene all along the pathway toward graduation
High school
Middle… elementary…
Students moving between setting…

As you’re well aware
Transitions are critical
Transition to school
Transition to reading
Transition from Middle to High School – Critical
Attendance – first 10 days
Floundering and failing, but if enter 9th grade and earn credits…moving back onto graduation pathway

This is all part of the process

When you recognize what students are good at, school becomes more meaningful to them, and they are more likely to show up. Relationships matter and engaging hopes and dreams matter.

Leverage ESSER Funds
Develop a Cadre of ND expert trainers and coaches in EWIMS
• University Personnel
• Regional Education Personnel
• ETC
  o 3-year process
  o Build upon our work with the American Institute of Research
  o Train and coach schools

There is a difference between random acts of family engagement and seeing that family engagement is a strategy toward whole school improvement.

If you want to be trusted, do trustworthy things - Dr. Karen Mapp

Workforce Ready – career awareness, occupational courses, career technical education and career employment/work experience.


IMPACT OF COVID ON OUTCOMES FOR CHILDREN - OPEN DISCUSSION

Graduation rates of students with ED went up over COVID. Sometimes the peer pressure of going to school sometimes takes over the ability to learn. Being at home some kids succeeded more. Some kids don’t like school and being at home they do better academically. Students with Social-Emotional mental health can benefit from supports in those areas. Some students can do better at distance learning format. Reduced class size and transitions were reduced. There are more students suffering from anxiety. Lessons are still being learned since we are still dealing with COVID. Increase of mental health issues. It isn’t just students; staff are dealing with anxiety too. I’ve seen the impact of COVID with our youth group once we were able to be together again, the kids I’ve seen are much happier. Parents are concerned about what if schools shut down again? How do we keep the good things we learned from the pandemic? How does anxiety effect attendance? Anxiety doesn’t fall within a disability category – how does that fit in? Renee has several families that are having problems getting their kids to school. How do we deal with the long-term implications
of COVID? It will be interesting to see the data. We may see a lower number of referrals due to COVID so our
denominator may be smaller. We could see the impact over the next several years.

I wonder about the impact on development about some of those kids born into COVID. It is going to be better because
they were home with their families.

Trauma within the pandemic – political field having some significant impact on this. Kids are calling students that are
choosing to wear masks liberals. The labels are hurtful and how do you teach empathy during this time.

SAP/SICC September 2021 Webinar Lessons Learned during COVID Pandemic on Stakeholder Engagement on
September 28, 2:00 – 3:30 (ET)

ANNUAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REPORT - MARK EHRMANTRAUT

IEP Facilitation – (2 Successful; 1 meeting in August, 2021; 1 Withdrawal) (1 in August, 2020 - filed 2019-20)
Mediations – 2 Successful
Complaints – 8 Filed (6 Investigated; 3 Corrective Action Plans; 2 Systemic)
 *(1 NDDPI initiated General Supervision Review started, completed in August, 2021)
Due Process – 1 Hearing Complete; 1 continuing

Dispute Resolution Update through 9/10/21 –
• Facilitated IEPs – 3 filed, three completed (1 continued, 1 just filed)
• Mediations – 2
• Written State Complaints - 1
• Due Process Complaints – 1 new; 1 continued
  • Corrective Action Plans in process

Written State Complaints
Investigations
• Individual Complaints – If violations identified – Required to determine a systemic concern isn’t the cause of
  the violation
• May find:
  • No violation
  • No violation with recommendation(s)
  • No violation, but corrective action plan under General Supervision requirements
  • Procedural violation, not resulting in denial of FAPE
  • Violation, requiring corrective action plan

General Supervision
• Over the course of an investigation, if substantial violations noted outside of the allegations, the SEA must
  address it (34 C.F.R. 300.151(b))
• Must also address “appropriate future provision of services for all children with disabilities”

2019-20 Prepandemic
1. IEP Issues
2. Behavior
3. Evaluation, Placement, AT
4. Other

2020-21 Pandemic/COVID
1. Failure to Implement
   a. Service Minutes Dropped
   b. Contingency Plans – SDI
   c. Individualization
2. Parent Participation
5 Concepts
- Communication
- Individual Decisions
- Good Faith Efforts
- Prior Written Notices – Communication
- Reconvening if Necessary

SUGGESTIONS SUMMARY

Issues and Concerns in our State: Nicole Lang is no longer in her position at North Central Human Service Center and she talked to Cory about adding someone new to serve on the committee.

The committee approved the June minutes. Penny Hetletved made the motion to accept the minutes and Brenda Ruehl seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Public Comment: No Public Comment

December meeting is scheduled for: December 15, 2021. The IDEA Advisory Committee wants the meeting to be held virtually.

Agenda Items for December meeting:
- Update on the REL Grant – Jackie Adusumilli
- SPP/APR Data

Meeting Summary: December 15, 2021 – Meeting was held virtually.

SPP/APR Baseline, Targets and Data – Susan Wagner and Team
Review the proposed new targets and get your input on how to meet the proposed new targets for the SPP indicators.

North Dakota met requirements last year.

The SPP/APR consists of 17 indicators
- 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).

Biggest Changes:
- 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!

Target-Setting Process
- 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.
  - 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

Indicator 1: This is a new calculation.
• The percent of youth with IEPs exiting from high school with a regular high school diploma.
  • 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 baselines 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 childcare 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 medial, 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%
• 17 Target – SSIP

Indicator 17: Input: ED Graduation Rate

What are some barriers to making progress on ED graduation rate?
• 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

What are some improvement strategies surrounding ED graduation rate?
• 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
SSIP – Haley Lang
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.

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.

- 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.
  - Disability Category
  - Gender
  - Ethnicity
  - LRE
  - Attendance
  - Discipline Data

Closing the Achievement Gap – Lea Kugel & Haley Lang
Strategies for Closing the Achievement Gap for Students with Disabilities
- Striving Readers
- National Dropout Prevention Center
  - 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 participation in the general classroom as much as possible and hold them to high expectations. All students mean all students.
3. Collaboration – effective outcomes relay 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.bw/XP7c-asfl4

Legislative Update and ESSER Projects – Lea Kugel & Mary McCarvel-O’Connor
- HB 1388 Professional Development for K-3 Reading
- SB 2269 Post-Secondary Transition Programs
- HB 1131 Credentials for Specialists Trained in Dyslexia

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.

ESSER Projects
- 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

SDI 1st meeting with the progress center to define and provide examples of SDI. $100,000

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

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.

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
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.

**Indicator 8 Updates – Haley Lang**

**The Survey Itself**
- 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

**Survey Scoring**
- 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

**ND State Results (2020-21)**

- # of Parents who received a score – 510
- # of Parents who Met Indicator – 345
- % who Met Indicator – 67.73%

NDDPI set a target of 67% for 2020-21. The state met the target.
42 districts did not meet the target
64 districts met the target

**Previous Years:**
- The survey was mailed out to a percentage of parents from an out-of-state agency.

**Last Year:**
- 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.

**Current Year:**
- 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

**Issues and Concerns in our State:** No issues.

**Action Items:**

The committee approved the September minutes. Tracy Klein made the motion to accept the minutes and Jodi Webb seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m. Brenda Ruehl made the motion and Tracey Zaun seconded the motion to adjourn.

**Public Comment:** No Public Comment

March meeting is scheduled for March 21, 2022.

**Agenda Items for March meeting:**
- Indicator 14 – comments from students that drop-out
- Indicator 13 – IEPs written correctly
Meeting Summary – March 21, 2022

Discussion on the Number of Meetings Per Year – Dr. Mahar and Advisory Committee

The bylaws say that we need two meetings per year. We are currently scheduling four meetings a year. How does the committee feel about the June meeting? This meeting seems to have the least amount of participation. Brenda and Jacqueline recommended three meetings a year since the IDEA/ICC advisory joint training is one of the meetings. The committee recommended eliminating the June meeting since participation is always low. How does the committee feel about the meetings being virtual? Tracy Klein suggested a hybrid option for people that are close that could attend the meeting in person. Renee said the heritage center has a room that works well with the hybrid option. The committee agreed that virtual should always be offered. We will try the blended option in September, and the committee will decide after that meeting regarding future meetings.

Office of Special Education Updates – Mary McCarvel-O’Connor and Team

Special Education Webinar Series
- 21-22 School Year
  - 9 Live Webinars
  - 15 Recorded pieces of training
  - 332 People Registered
- Last webinar April 12th topic: Progress Monitoring

Some ECSE modules and DLM modules that could be taken for credit. The OT, PT, SLP boards all approved these as continuing education sources.

Conferences:
- Northern Plains Law Conference-October 5-7, Bismarck. This is a collaboration with SD and Montana.
- Pathway to Partnership - Parents can attend for free and can qualify for a $100 stipend to go towards travel/child care/hotel. There are also vendor booths available.
- Literacy Conference (northdakotapd.com) July 11-13-Bismarck
- Indian Education Summit – July 7 & 8, 2022 in Brynhild Haugland Room at the ND State Capitol, Bismarck

IDEA-B Application and Allocations – Mary McCarvel-O’Connor

- Annual State Application Under Part B of the Individuals With Disabilities Act As Amended in 2004 For Federal Fiscal Year 2020 (MS Word) Public Comment is March 25th

NCD Guidelines Training
- NDDPI extends A special thanks to those members of the NCD stakeholders work group, who assisted in the development of the document and were led by our facilitator, Frank Podobnik from the National Technical Assistance Center.
- Here are the categories of Disabilities under ND Century Code. IDEA allows states to also use the category of Developmental Delay but in North Dakota, it is referred to as Non-Categorical Delay. ND Century Code lists NCD as a delay, which is why it is not listed under the disability categories. NDC can be used when it is difficult to determine the precise nature of the disability for students between the ages of three and nine.

Significant changes and updates
- Detailed process of eligibility determination
- Outlines the two-pronged approach to eligibility
- Eligibility Criteria- ND No longer uses percentage of delay. We require a standard deviation or percentile score
- Outlines the role of the MDT and the component of professional judgment when determining eligibility
Child Count – Alyssa Kramer

Alyssa gave an overview of the December 1 child count data.

SPR/APR Submission – Alyssa Kramer

The SPP/APR was submitted on February 1, 2022.

Indicator 1: Graduation
% of youth with IEP’s graduating with a regular diploma
Target is 76.12% and State Rate is 76.12%.

Indicator 2: Drop Out
% of youth with IEP’s dropping out
Target is 18.38% and State Rate is 18.38%.

Indicator 3: Assessment
Indicator 3 was updated by OSEP this year. Before this year, we were submitting all grades and now we only report Grade 4, Grade 8, and HS.

3A: Participation rate for children with IEP’s
3B: Proficiency rate for children with IEP’s against grade level academic standards
3C: Proficiency rate for children with IEP’s against alternate academic achievement standards
3D: Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEP’s and all students against grade-level academic achievement standards

Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion
4a: % of LEA’s with Significant Discrepancy
4b: % of LEA’s with Significant Discrepancy by race/ethnicity
Target is 0.00%

Indicator 5: Educational Environment (School Age)
% of children with IEP’s, age 5, enrolled in kindergarten and ages 6-21 served:

5A: Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day
Target is 73.23% and State Rate is 73.23%.
5B: Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day
Target is 6.42% and State Rate is 6.42%.
5C: In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements
Target is 1.57% and State Rate is 1.57%.

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments
% of children with IEP’s, ages 3, 4 and 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program

6A: Receiving majority of special education and related services in regular early childhood program
Target is 73.23% and State Rate is 73.23%.
6B: Attending separate special education class, separate school or residential facility
Target is 40.76% and State Rate is 40.97%.
6C: Receiving special education and related services in the home (this is new to indicator 6)  
Target is 1.35% and State Rate is 1.35%.

**Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes**  
% of children with IEP’s, ages 3, 4 and 5 with improved

7A: Positive social-emotional skills  
A1: Of those students who entered or exited below grade level expectations in Outcome A who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6  
A2: % of students who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6

7B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills  
B1: Of those students who entered or exited below grade level expectations in Outcome B who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6  
B2: % of students who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6

7C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs  
- C1: Of those students who entered or exited below grade level expectations in Outcome C who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6  
- C2: % of students who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6

**Indicator 8: Parental Involvement**  
% of parents who report that the school facilitated parent involvement  
Target is 67.73% and State Rate is 67.84%.

**Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation**  
% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups due to inappropriate identification

**Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories**  
% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification

**Indicator 11: Child Find**  
% of children evaluated within 60 days of parental consent  
Target is 100% - State Rate was 98.81%

**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**  
% of children found Part B eligible with IEP implemented by 3rd birthday  
Target is 100% - State Rate was 99.75%

**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**  
% of youth ages 16+ with measurable, annually updated IEP goals and appropriate transition assessment, services and courses  
Target is 100% - State Rate was 72.39%

The drop in percentage was because we were reporting data after the units were given an opportunity to fixed the data.

**Indicator 14: Post School Outcomes**  
% of youth with IEP’s no longer in school and are

14A: Enrolled in higher education  
14B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed  
14C: Enrolled in higher education, other postsecondary education or training program, competitively employed, or in other employment  
*Within one year of leaving high school
14A - Target is 21.13% - State Rate was 21.22%
14B - Target is 59.27% - State Rate was 59.27%
14C - Target is 81.13% - State Rate was 81.13%

Do you feel you were prepared for life after high school? Yes – 63% No – 37%
Post-School Outcomes Measurement – Total Respondents – 302

Other category – more comments on living couch to couch, living on the curb, with boyfriend or girlfrends parents.

Indicator 14 – Big Picture
- 109 participants
- 715 students with disabilities who graduated, dropped out, or aged out in 2019-20 who were eligible to be called
- 302 of exiters (42.24%) who were interviewed
- 115 interviewed exiters (38.08%) who pursued some type of education
- 245 interviewed exiters (81.13%) who were employed in some type of job

Majority of students with disabilities that responded to the survey are attending a 2-year college (11.3%). Some are taking a Voc-tech program (6.3%). Employment setting – most of our students are working a competitively integrated setting (69.5%).

Indicator 15: Resolution Session
% of hearing requests resolved through resolution session settlement agreements

Indicator 16: Mediation
% of mediations held resulting in mediation agreements

Due to North Dakota having an N size of less than 10 for both indicators, ND is not required to report this information on the SPP/APR.

ND Secondary Transition Interagency Conference is scheduled for November 2-3, 2022 at the Baymont Inn & Suites, Mandan ND. This will be a face-to-face conference no virtual option.

ND Administrative Rules – Lea Kugel
April 1, 2022
- Post-Secondary Transition Program
  - SB 2269
- Credential for Specialist in Dyslexia
  - HB 1131
- Science of Reading
  - HB 1388

Postsecondary Transitional Grant Programs. Allows post-secondary transitional programs at an institution of higher education to receive integrated formula payments for students with a documented intellectual or developmental disability that have graduated from high school in North Dakota and are under the age of 22. The rules provide a description of these programs and describes the parameters under which post-secondary transition programs may receive integrated formula payments. To be eligible for reimbursement under the proposed rules, post-secondary transitional programs must: provide individual advising, curriculum structure, supports, and services based on the individual needs of the student; provide a focus on the same academic and social opportunities available to students without disabilities; integrate work experiences and career skills into the program; offer a meaningful credential for students with disabilities upon completion of the program; and show evidence of results proving success for students with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Credential for Specialists Trained in Dyslexia would be issued to an individual that has completed prescribed coursework (Intro, Assessment, Interventions and Practicum) from a state-approved institution of higher education.
Individuals can become certified for the credential by completing certification by the International Dyslexia Association or the Center for Effective Reading Instruction. In either case, the individual is required to complete a practicum experience of a minimum of three semester hours of forty-five clock hours that is related to dyslexia assessment and interventions. While it is not required that schools employ a person with this credential, individuals with the credential will have demonstrated a higher level of knowledge and experience related to dyslexia than teachers that do not have the credential. Schools are also free to employ or contract with a dyslexia specialist from outside of the school system if they so choose. Individuals must renew the credential every five years by completing two semester hours of continuing education related to language-based reading disorders or dyslexia.

Reading curriculum and educator professional development: Beginning with the 2022-2023 school year, the portion of a school’s curriculum related to reading must be scientifically based, evidence based, research based, and focused on phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Schools must also use systematic direct instruction for students in grades kindergarten through three to ensure that all students obtain necessary early reading skills. The statute also states that, prior to the start of the 2022-2023 school year, each teacher or principal that works with students in grades kindergarten through three to complete training or demonstrate mastery of the reading curriculum components that I described earlier. Schools will report information such as curriculum used, professional development attended, and assessment instruments used to diagnose reading development and comprehension to the department annually. Schools that have submitted satisfactory information may be awarded an exemption from the reporting requirement for a period of up to three years. Satisfactory information may include reading outcome proficiency data using an assessment instrument, such as a screening measure.

ESSER Initiatives Update – Lea Kugel
- Specially Designed Instruction-$100,000
  - Progress Center –Tessie Baley, David Bateman
  - Draft Document
    - SDI, Interventions and Monitoring Progress
- Education Pathway-$100,000
  - Educating Exceptional Students
  - Special Education Field Experience
- EWIMS Cadre -$200,000
  - American Institutes for Research-David Blumenthal, Erin Clancy
  - Early Warning Systems-Currently 5 districts
  - Eight cadre members
    - Data, individual vs. group supports, interventions

SSIP Update – Haley Lang

Dropping out is a Process, Not an Event: All student shave Hopes and Dreams
- Focus of Six Year Graduation Rates for Students with an Emotional Disturbance
- Leveraging Students Hopes and Dreams to Improve Graduation Rates
- Moving our work forward:
  - Working with the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)
  - Working with an External Evaluator
  - American Institutes of Research on EWIMS
- Updating the submission template for Special Education Units
  - Qualitative and Quantitative Data

Issues and Concerns in our State: No issues.

The committee approved the December minutes. Jodi Webb made the motion to accept the minutes and Jacqueline Adusumilli seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 11:56 p.m. Jodi Webb made the motion and Barb Burghart seconded the motion to adjourn.
Public Comment: No Public Comment

September meeting is scheduled for: September 13, 2022

Agenda Items for September meeting:

- IDEA/ICC Advisory Training in the morning with TAESE
- REEL Grant - Jacqueline Adusumilli
- Data regarding the impact of COVID

There was no June 2022 meeting.