Bloomfield Hills Schools
Special Education Design Committee
Report
November 1, 2019

Report compiled by Michele A. Harmala, Ph.D.
on behalf of Bloomfield Hills Schools

Table of Contents

    A: Best Practices/Current Research Resources
    B: Informational Presentations to SDC and Data Needed by SDC
- **Special Education Director Wonderings**
- **Special Education Director Programs & Services**
- **State Performance Plan (SPPs) Indicators**
- **Special Education Finance**

    C: Plus/Delta List
    D: Success Gaps Team Study & Presentations and Related Questions
    E: Success Gaps Rubric Ratings Charts by Role
- **General Education Teachers**
- **Administrators**

- **Ancillary**
- **Special Education Teachers**
- **Paraprofessionals**
- **Parents**

F: Miscellaneous Meeting Notes
G: Group Process Charts (not included in other report sections)
H: Meeting Agenda and PPTs
I: Report Review Information
J: Material Provided by Parents on October 17, 2019

The Task
Bloomfield Hills Schools (BHS) convened the Special Education Design Committee (SDC) during June 2019 to:

> *"rethink" special education and work to create a system of supports that is consistent, compliant, and ensures educational benefit for all students! Please consider completing an application to join the Special Education Design Committee. The committee will work to:*
> - ◦ *Examine the current state of special education programs and services in Bloomfield Hills Schools*
> - ◦ *Learn about requirements and best practices in special education*
> - ◦ *Make recommendations for improvements and develop goals.*

The Committee
The Committee was designed to reflect the diversity of positions, perspectives, levels, schools and voices involved with the education of students who receive special services in BHS. Interested individuals applied to serve on the committee in response to a communication that was published to both staff and community stakeholders. Participants were selected by a team of staff and parents to assure this diversity. Forty-six (46) stakeholders applied to participate. The selection team sorted applicants by position (teacher, ancillary, parent, etc.) and schools, grade level and type of position or affiliation within the district. The selection team took time to review each application.

The selection team included: Rebecca Anders (staff), Carrie Fines (staff), Angela Grondz (parent), Beth Mueller (staff) and Heather Rosenberg (parent). The SDC members selected were:

Administration	● Rob Durecka, West Hills Middle School ● Mary Hillberry, Lone Pine Elementary ● David Reed-Nordwall – Bloomfield Hills High School
Special Education Teachers	● Lisa Brown – Transition Coordinator ● Linda Carlson – West Hills Middle School (has Elementary, ARP and Resource Room & Wing Lake teaching experience) ● Carrie Fines - Bloomfield Hills High School ● Beth Mueller – West Hills Middle School / BHEA Union Rep ● Arica Porter – Bloomfield Hills High School ● Elizabeth Tallent – Deaf/Hard of Hearing
General Education Teachers	● Elizabeth Akers – East Hills Middle School, Parent of BHS Student ● Doug Thompson East Hills Middle School ● Pam Walch – East Hills Middle School, Parent of BHS Student ● Anne Williamson - Lone Pine Elementary

Early Childhood Staff	• Colleen Cady-Kalanquin, SSW – Project Find / Fox Hills
Ancillary Staff	• Julie Chinoski, Physical Therapist – BHHS, Conant, Early Intervention, East Hills, Eastover, Fox Hills, Lone Pine, PREP, private schools, West Hills • Melissa Elkus, Speech/Language – Wing Lake & private schools • Tiffany Hartman, Occupational Therapist – BHHS, BHMS, Conant, Lone Pine, PREP, West Hills • Cassandra Jones, SSW – Bloomfield Hills High School / McKinney Vento • Marci Schumacher, Psychologist – East Hills Middle School / Private Schools
Parents	• Amy Goodman Bloomfield Hills High School (Kim Costis – Eastover Elementary took Amy's place beginning June 17, 2019) • Stephanie Crider – East Hills Middle School • Kimberly Cromer – Wing Lake • Aftab Farooq – Bloomfield Middle School, PREP • Angela Grondz – PAC Rep / Conant • Gina Morgan - Deaf/Hard of Hearing • Brian Munn – Conant, West Hills Middle School • *Michele Soto – Eastover & Bloomfield Hills High School and Jennifer Darawi – East Hills Middle School were selected to serve but unable to attended. Both communicated they would not be attending.*
Para Educators	• Kathy Lawor – Conant • Donna Polasek – East Hills Middle School

In addition to these members, Ms. Margaret Schultz, Administrator for Social-Emotional Learning and Educational Equity attended two meetings.

Michele Harmala, Ph.D. (non-BHS facilitator) and Carrie Fines (staff) facilitated the Committee.

Committee Activities
The committee of the whole held one two-hour, two three-hour and five six-hour meetings over the course of eight days (June 6, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, and October 3 and 17, 2019). The first meeting focused on group formation and confirmation of the group charge. Five meetings involved a review of current research, presentations of information related to a variety of BHS specific topics, an analysis of the information received, identification of the current state using a variety of group activities, a review of best practices to address the gaps, as well as identification of immediate and near-term areas of concern by role-alike groups. One meeting included the

review and suggested revisions to the draft report, and one meeting included the development of priority recommendations for work groups and other more immediate considerations by administration. Presenters included (presentation information and information requested and/or questions to be answered for the SDC are included in Appendix B):

Presenter	Position/Title	Presentation Topic	Date of Presentation
Jennifer Perrone	Director, Special Education	BHS Administrative Vision of SE – Jennifer's Wonderings	June 17, 2019
Jennifer Perrone	Director, Special Education	Review of Current BHS Special Education Programs and Services	June 17, 2019
Michele Harmala	Facilitator	BHS Special Education State Performance Plan (SPPs) and Determinations	June 18, 2019
Michele Harmala	Facilitator	Best Practices in Special Education Programs & Services: Success Gaps by IDC Data Center	June 18, 2019
Christina Kostiuk; Karen Hildebrandt	Assistant Superintendent, Finance and Operations; Director of Finance (respectively)	BHS Special Education Funding and Finance	June 18 and June 19, 2019
Todd Bidlack	*Assistant Superintendent of Learning Services*	*BHS Strategic Plan and Neurodiversity: The Future of Special Education?*	*THIS PRESENTATION WAS NOT PROVIDED DUE TO INSUFFICIENT TIME WITHIN THE GROUP'S MEETINGS*

The Legal Requirements
The Committee was introduced to the State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators and related Determinations (ratings of BHS for compliance and results) based on Michigan Department of Education criteria for the SPPs, the Oakland Schools ISD Plan for Special Education Programs and Services, and the Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education (MARSE). Select teams within the SE Design Committee utilized these resources during their investigations of particular topics related to the current and desired state for BHS.

Best Practices/Current Research/Resources Available to the SE Design Committee
For purposes of the work of this committee, best practices/current research included a review of the following items (see Appendix A):

- Factors That Contribute to Success for All Children (Success Gaps White Paper and Success Gaps Rubric)
  Adapted from *Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity Addressing Success Gaps* White Paper
  Nancy O'Hara Tom E. Munk Kristin Reedy Cesar D'Agord
  May 2016 Version 3.0
  The IDEA Data Center (IDC) edited this document under U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs Grant No. H373Y130002.
- US Department of Education (DOE) Results Driven Accountability Mission Alignment for the DOE, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Office of Special Education Programs, and Results Driven Accountability (slides 6 & 14)
- US Department of Education 2018 Determination Letters on State Implementation of IDEA, Revised July 24, 2018
- Michigan Department of Education Part B and Part C Results and Compliance Indicators definitions
- Universal Design for Learning (www.cast.org/our-work/about-udl.html)
- Teaching Works High-Leverage Practices (University of Michigan, TeachingWorks)
- High Leverage Practices in Special Education (HLPs) (Council for Exceptional Children, CEEDAR Center, 2017)
- Visible Learning Plus 250+ Influences on Student Achievement (Visible Learning Plus, August 2017)
- Bloomfield Hills Educator Evaluation – based on Charlotte Danielson model (www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-5683_75438_78526---,00.html)
- The Post-High School Outcomes of Young Adults with Disabilities up to 8 Years After High School: A Report From the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) (NCSER 2011-3005, US Department of Education, National Center for Special Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences)
- Part B Data Display: Michigan, Publication Year 2018 (pages 1-13)
- Education Commission of the States: Response to Information Request Prepared August 18, 2016, Stephanie Aragon, Policy Researcher
- Michigan 2018 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix (pages 1-2)
- Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) (www.pbis.org/school/mtss)
- Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (www.pbis.org)
- MDE Alternatives to Suspension and Expulsion Toolkit (www.michigan.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-74638_72831_72836---,00.html)
- Neurodiversity: The Future of Special Education? Thomas Armstrong, Educational Leadership (Volume 74, Number 7, April 2017, pages 10-16)
- Articles provided to the Committee by Stephanie Crider (parent): Lower Merion SD Special Education Plan Report 07/01/2018 - 06/30/2021; Mt Lebanon SD Special Education Plan Report (authors/sources for articles unknown).

The Current State
The "current state" of BHS Special Education Programs and Services was determined by considering both stakeholder perceptions and district data (where readily available to the SE Design Committee). The Equity, Inclusion and Opportunity Addressing Success Gaps Indicators of Success Rubric, and stakeholders' perceptions of areas of concerns or areas for potential change (noted as "deltas" throughout the convening) were used to identify the current state and areas/issues that could be addressed immediately and in the near term ("immediate" was defined to mean concerns that could be addressed without convening a workgroup; "near term" was defined to mean concerns that should be addressed by a workgroup during the 2019-20 school year; Committee members' perceptions about using/not using a workgroup vary by role). Specific data and information were not organized by Special Education administration for the Committee's use prior to convening the Committee to ensure the full scope of considerations, including "needed data" came from the Committee. In some cases, Committee members expressed frustration that all data requested during the course of the meetings was not available to them. These data requests (see Appendix K) were documented, including when items were addressed. Requested data could also be organized for use by the workgroups that will convene as an outcome of the SE Design Committee's work.

The Equity, Inclusion and Opportunity Addressing Success Gaps Indicators of Success Rubric include indicators for five factors that were rated according to level of implementation by role-alike groups. The Rubric was provided to the SE Design Committee as a systems level assessment that could help to inform recommendations for continuous improvement. Stakeholders read a related White Paper, discussed the Rubric and White Paper to develop preliminary understanding, and, as small teams, selected factors for in-depth analysis using best practices research and district data where available. The teams presented their information to the Committee as a whole. Team presentations and questions that may guide future work groups are included in the Appendix D.

Following the presentations, participants were asked to individually rate each factor and to discuss and determine an agreed upon rating in role-alike groups. Role-alike groups noted related evidence (or lack thereof) for their ratings and aligned "deltas" with the evidence/lack of evidence by factor/indicator, if appropriate. It should be noted that parents requested that they provide their perception about areas for potential change; however, they did not believe they had sufficient information or sufficient data to rate factors. Table 1 reveals the ratings and a brief summary of supporting evidence (captured as written) by role and according to the The Equity, Inclusion and Opportunity Addressing Success Gaps Indicators of Success Rubric. The rating options are as follows: Planning, Partially Implemented, Implemented, Exemplary and Not Rated or Insufficient Data/Information to Rate. Evidence of ratings, as identified by each group, is included in Appendix E, Success Gaps Rubric Ratings Charts by Role.

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Table 1: Equity, Inclusion and Opportunity Addressing Success Gaps Indicators of Success Rubric Ratings by Role-Alike Groups
NOTE: This Rubric is best understood by reading the Equity, Inclusion and Opportunity Addressing Success Gaps White Paper and the associated Rubric (see Appendix D). Ratings are as follows: Planning, Partially Implemented, Implemented, Exemplary and Not Rated. The category "Incomplete/Insufficient Data" was added to allow participants to identify areas in which specific data was not available or accessible to the SE Design Committee. Information provided by participants within each factor section may represent individual perceptions or knowledge and does not necessarily reveal SE Design Committee or role-alike group consensus. Information is presented to ensure voices are "heard" even if comments may represent individual points of view. In regard to evidence for the ratings selected by each role-alike group, parents associated "deltas" (see page 21 and Appendix C for more details) with each/some Success Gaps Factors as opposed to "evidence" of implementation. Other groups used a combination of evidence and/or "deltas" to elaborate on their selected rating.

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
1. Data-Based Decision Making	1. Decisions about the school curriculum, instructional programs, academic and behavioral supports, and school improvement initiatives are based on data.	Partially Implemented We do better with identified kids; Building Intervention Teams (BITs) do well monitoring struggling students; It is the middle/lower performing students need more attention	Partially Implemented Lack of data; Special Education (SE) training for admin; (deltas) communication from admin; communication by staff & admin; communication between staff & admin; communication consistent; increase in training for paraprofessionals	Partially Implemented Systemically broken - too many inconsistencies in process, delivery, vision.	Not rated We do not track data; we observe and share with general ed teacher and special ed teacher; we need to be include in the Individual Education Program (IEP) meeting	Incomplete/Insufficient Data PowerSchool vs effective use of MiStar versus Illuminate; paper copy of IEP housed at buildings; tracking system – uniform processes; database; centralized process / storage; lack of integrity with areas of concern; inadequate or nonexistent tracking protocols; use of data to make	Partially Implemented Research based materials used by some teachers

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
1. Data-Based Decision Making (continued)						decisions Deltas: hear the district lawyer is involved too much and has questionable ethics; comfort in saying everything takes time and is a slow process; no sense of urgency; data purposely obscured; making decisions that impact very few students; Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) vs Restorative Practices with training; Connected relying too much on reputation and arrogant approach to new ideas- "we're the best so do nothing" with Planning (rating) level	

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
2. Cultural Responsiveness	2a. Culturally responsive instructional interventions and teaching strategies are used throughout the school or district.	**Implemented** Several intentional outreaches; training has been provided; not all teachers have reached where we would like them to be	**Implemented** Increase in district wide Professional Development (PD) (global champs, opening day speaker); Multicultural com. & evening offerings; Global Education Teams (GET); District GET; East Hills changed end of year celebration to not coincide with Ramadan	**Implemented** Restorative practices, Healing Racism, Global Ed Teams, PD- Sense of Belonging, Multi-Age/grade Grouping at Eastover/Way/ East Hills	**Exemplary** Observations throughout the school year	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** Plus: likes to have committee for discussion; We have an opportunity to shape SE for years to come Improve community involvement in volunteering for job placement; Need for staff understanding that it is your job to welcome all students (with disabilities); unethical behavior (win at all costs to family); define education as equal to instruction, social function living skills, independence	**Partially Implemented & Implemented** Training is provided but not all follow through; not consistent building to building

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
2. Cultural Responsiveness (continued)	2b. Faculty and staff are prepared for linguistic diversity among students and families.	**Implemented** Supports like our translating system; translators in-house; interpreters on staff	**Partially Implemented** Interpreters available; interveners; teacher consultants from Oakland Schools (O.S); ESL ? – Support in electives at HS? MS?	**Partially Implemented** Newcomers Program stopped? Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Training – some teachers are currently trained (elementary 1 per grade), unsure about MS, HS, UA (Unified Arts)/Specials; ELL teachers Elem & MS, unsure about HS; Q-communication–email/text/voice; Language interpreters	**Exemplary** Active English as a Second Language (ESL) interventions	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments	**Partially Implemented** Not all staff are linguistically competent; not all buildings have English Language Learners (ELL) programs; define language
	2c. The school or district facilitates the participation of all the families that make up the diversity of the school.	**Partially Implemented** We have outreach and nights dedicated to specific groups; still need to involve parents with action steps to effect	**Partially Implemented** Diff at levels of education; family at pre-school may feel more welcome than parents of HS students	**Implemented** Not unique to our district; BHS communicates with parents often and through many modes; BHS communications are read how often? Parents are	**Exemplary** Different language options on BHS website	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments	**Partially Implemented & Implemented** Dependent on size of building and number of teams & staff working with students

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
2. Cultural Responsiveness (continued)		improved relationships /performance		overwhelmed by communications			
3. Core Instructional Program	3a. A consistent, well-articulated curriculum is in place and implemented with fidelity.	**Partially Implemented** Mostly presenting – work needs to be done vertically and horizontally	**Implemented** Research based curriculum for special education classes and assist in meeting academic goals on IEP; more special ed co-taught at HS level; need for basic level core curriculum	**Implemented** Elementary moving toward aligned curriculum ELA/Math; Vertical Alignment Elem to MS, MS to HS	**Partially Implemented** Not every teacher has the same special ed skill set; Factor-age-experience-class make up; parent disagreement / discontent with placement possibly because of programs available; we need consistency at the same building	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** Deltas: inadequate training for GE staff; improve room specific training / knowledge of all service providers; concerns about prior history and ability to lead implementation; equal programming across schools; not servicing the whole child – no 2E support; too many categories in Academic Resource Program (ARP), Functional Resource Program (FRP); Create a role to keep up with the research, interventions, skills, tools; we	**Planning & Partially Implemented** Revisit idea of specialized classes in ELA & Math; vertical and horizontal alignment in progress; BHHS teacher created curriculum in some subjects

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
3. Core Instructional Program (continued)						hear county centers are dumping grounds; Explore these topics for training; Effectiveness of out-of-district center based programs/good fit? Phonics-based explicit instruction for all students; LRE effectiveness (implementation); lack of in-service training	
	3b. The instructional program and strategies used in the school are research-based practices.	**Implemented** Through workshop methods and differentiation, although more could be done to eliminate stratification; HS research-based studies & implementation	**Implemented** Dis wide based implement of research based curr; iPads issued to all students (middle); Chromebooks issued at HS	**Implemented** Elementary- yes- SS is coming; MS-new ELA units – SS is coming; HS?	**Implemented** Many teachers are opened to new ways to teach different learners; we need iPads or Chromebooks so we can keep up with the students we work with	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments	**Partially Implemented** Varies by program and building or teacher; May not be using then with fidelity

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
3. Core Instructional Program (continued)	3c. Differentiated instruction is used to address the need of all learners in the school.	**Partially Implemented** More training need for differentiation and shared resource /cache development	**Partially Implemented** Administrative focus on high achievement; leveled program between buildings; need for interventions to better facilitate level transitions	**Implemented** Specific differentiation strategies; training on a continual basis for Gen. Ed. teachers	**Partially Implemented & Implemented** Some do and some don't	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments Noted plus: teachers care	**Partially Implemented** Some teachers do more differentiation than others
	3d. Families are informed about the core instructional program and how the needs of their child are being met.	**Partially Implemented** Continue to utilize existing resources (new) more intentionally	**Implemented** Curr night /IEP accom discussed / transitional parent meeting; some improvement could still be needed	**Implemented** Stronger in core areas than UA/Specials Classes; Elem newsletters post weekly curriculum; Q communications; Language interpreters	**Exemplary** It's in place if families want it	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments	**Planning** Not often informed in languages they understand
4. Assessment- Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring	4a. Universal Screening is used to identify needs for early intervention or targeted supports.	**Partially Implemented** Elementary and Middle School in place; High School not; Emphasis on formative assessment across the board needs to be more	**Partially Implemented** Bc inconsistent data on behavior risk factors & no behavior screening for gen ed- only if being referred; need more staff training to	**Partially Implemented** Identifying behavioral issues; lacking systematic approaches; behavior screening	**Partially Implemented** Done as needed based staff or parent recommendation	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** How can we get paras in the room (IEP, 504 mtg?) subs?; Explore ways to involve paras in screening/identification process; Provide multiple	**Partially Implemented** Screeners in place NWEA, progress monitoring, BIT, LC (Learning Community) meetings; TEAM (IEP Team?) meetings; Behavior

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
4. Assessment- Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (continued)		formalized	support beh challenging students; lack of consistency between buildings			screening/identification methods – para's are essential as they work closely with students; Lack of inclusion among staff-paras are often excluded from mtgs, trainings, etc.	Intervention Plans (BIPs), Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA's)
	4b. Progress monitoring is planned and implemented by the school to support the developmental, academic or behavioral progress of each child/student.	**Partially Implemented** Not all grades are consistent with this; F.A.M.E. Teams working and expanding; MYP (Middle Years Program) Assessment rubrics not utilized consistently	**Partially Implemented** BIT teams; utilize comm with counselors learning community; NWEA & Fountas and Pinnell (F/P) reviewed at BIT but may not filter back to classroom intervention or adjustment of classroom instruction; different interpretation of eligible categories between buildings; need improved data	**Partially Implemented** We have data but how is it being used in instructional decisions? Behavior monitoring; Purpose and usage; BIT, Illuminate, K-5 Reading Data Digs	**Planning** Done as needed but not across the board	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments	**Partially Implemented** We review data on a regular basis-however many do not change classroom instruction

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
4. Assessment- Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (continued)			tracking; consistency of referral, BIT, etc.; Tier 1 classroom interventions & support of teachers; consistency of General Education Resource Teacher (GERT)- identification, service /supports				
	4c. Families are informed about screening and progress monitoring results.	**Partially Implemented** More reactive in nature than proactive in present state.	**Implemented** Report cards, progress reports, MIstar, standard scores, conferences, meetings, phone calls, REED	**Partially Implemented** IEP-so much info and not always delivered in parent friendly jargon; communication lacking between Spec.Ed. and Gen.Ed. – who is responsible for what in the IEP? Is this consistent in all building at all levels?	**Partially Implemented** Families not always informed of gaps upon discovery; teachers may try multiple in class interventions first	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments; Inconsistent communication with parents and responses and planning.	**Implemented** Informed, translators, Team meetings

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
5. Evidence-Based Instructional and Behavioral Interventions and Supports	5a. Evidence-based behavioral interventions and supports, in addition to core instruction, are embedded within a multi-tiered framework and implemented with fidelity.	**Implemented** Small groups – connecting; Restorative Practices; common prep for teachers; BIT process; Learning Communities /teams; support staff meetings; SIP teams	**Planning & Partially Implemented** Restorative practices & PBIS; conflict res training; Crisis Prevention Institute (CPI) training; Behavior plans; more time to work with students; not enough time for support staff to get into classrooms; peer to peer classroom support opportunities; more support in the classrooms for behaviors; Sp Ed sometimes doesn't have the good or nice classroom; Life skills classes for students not in ARP; space availability for programs & services	**Planning** Inconsistent within buildings and between buildings; Recommendation - tighten up the inconsistency with a district-wide policy that is implemented the same in all areas and in all buildings	**Planning** Not sure -there could be a plan or plans being implemented; we need to have knowledge in what our roles are; all staff need to be on same page working with ARP students; not enough people for caseload; open resource room take on non-IEP kids	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** Explore these topics: Lack of identifying supports for 504 and fidelity of intervention – FEMA school emergency operation plans; Diabetes model policy of mgmt. in school setting; all allergies; Sensory room in every building; Better "tools/skills" to identify struggling students; more training needed for specific student needs (implementing IEP & 504); noncompliance issues are not fully disclosed to parents or staff	**Partially Implemented** Lacking in behavioral area

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
5. Evidence-Based Instructional and Behavioral Interventions and Supports (continued)	5b. School-level practices use tiered response methods Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) that include academic and behavioral interventions and supports.	**Partially Implemented** Not consistent K-12	**Partially Implemented** Restorative practices & PBIS; conflict res training; CPI training; Behavior plans; more time to work with students; not enough time for support staff to get into classrooms; peer to peer classroom support opportunities; more support in the classrooms for behaviors; SE sometimes doesn't have the good/nice classroom; Life skills classes for students not in ARP; space availability for programs & services; Group opportunities for social skills at HS level; more inclusion at every level; more outreach	**Planning** Inconsistent within buildings and between buildings; Recommendation - tighten up the inconsistency with a district-wide policy that is implemented the same in all areas and in all buildings	Not Rated	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments Plus perceptions aligned to this indicator: DHHS staff-student relationships; EHMS has great support staff who actually put the student first Delta perception aligned to this indicator: Parents & teachers to write the "manual" about the student;	**Planning** Disjointed; ineffective; inconsistently implemented

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Success Gaps Factors *	Success Gaps Indicators*	Ratings by Role-Alike Groups within the SE Design Committee					
		Administrators	Ancillary Staff	General Education Teachers	Para Educators	Parents *Listed items are "deltas" that seemed related to the Factor*	Special Education Teachers
5. Evidence-Based Instructional and Behavioral Interventions and Supports (continued)	5c. A comprehensive district-level school discipline policy is in place and implemented.	**Implemented** Point of pride – made a big shift from punitive to restorative	**Partially Implemented** Parent support, involvement, ed	**Partially Implemented** Staff is getting trained in Restorative Practices; G.E.T. Teams, Healing Racism, Global Champions; District policy exists but is inconsistently implemented across everything	**Not Rated**	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments Delta perception aligned to this indicator: Conflict resolution parent dissatisfaction	**Partially Implemented** We have a policy but it is not implemented; do we have policies for all areas? Attendance?
	5d. Families are regularly informed, in their native or home language, of interventions provided to their children and their children's responses to those interventions for academic and behavioral skills.	**Implemented** Priority	**Partially Implemented & Implemented** Behavior mon forms; frequent parent phone calls/email/text; prog monitoring; IEP	**Implemented** Behavior plans; communication should include positives and details	**Not Rated**	**Incomplete/Insufficient Data** See above comments Delta perception aligned to this indicator: No trust in IEP process without representative	**Partially Implemented** Lacking "language they can understand"

*See Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity Addressing Success Gaps White Paper and associated Indicators of Success Rubric in Rubric A and Success Gaps Rubric Ratings Charts by Role in Appendix E for specific details.

Committee Perceptions of Plus/Delta within BHS

In addition to the Success Gaps Rubric ratings in Table 1, participants identified strengths (plus) and challenges (delta – including things that should be considered for change) as individuals and combined like items by role-alike group. The list of all identified plus/deltas is included in Appendix C. Themes evident across multiple groups (minimally three stakeholder groups) include:

Plus
- Qualified, experienced and caring staff (e.g., we have good staff interaction; staff care about these S.E. kids; spec. ed teams work well together; teachers care; dedicated staff)
- Money and/or resources (e.g., technology; gen ed resource teachers; well resourced programs; one of the more "resourced" districts in the state; supportive BOE)
- Processes (e.g., for Building Intervention Team consistent at the building level; OSTC; comprehensive evals – look at the whole child)
- Parents (e.g., involved parents/families; engaged, committed parents willing to work w/ staff; positive parent relationships)

Deltas
- Consistency* (e.g., District wide S.E. identification process; consistency of language; all staff need to be on the same page when working with ARP students; define responsibilities; writing 504 and IEP to be highly targeted and effective; referral process)
- Alignment*(e.g., alignment across buildings; between programs; site based practices that don't always align during transitions)
- Collection of data, measuring outcomes and program evaluation*(e.g., data more cohesive to allow for better overall programs; measuring outcomes (improve system); use of data to make decisions; a regular survey of Sp Ed parents and students (exit surveys); data collection)
- Communication*(e.g., need knowledge of specific roles; more information to G.E. teachers about Spec Ed; lack of community awareness as ASD population grows; noncompliance issues that are fully disclosed to parents and staff; need common language; input at all levels)
- Training (e.g., up to date training of Spec Ed and Gen Ed teachers; para training; training at all levels; inadequate training for GE staff; training Tier 1 instruction and interventions; staff, paras, admin, parents)

*Note: Participants were asked to identify a key theme heard during the presentations of Success Gaps factors. The noted deltas match the key themes identified by Committee participants.

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Table 2 reveals the immediate (address immediately and without a work group) and near-term (convene a work group during the 2019-20 school year) factors the SE Design Committee participants identified.

Table 2: Immediate and Near-Terms Factors for Consideration/Action

Role-Alike Group Identifying the Need	Immediate Needs	Near-Term (Workgroup 19-20)
Administrators	Cultural Responsiveness (2C): we have outreach and nights dedicated to specific groups. Still need to involve parents to effect improved relationships / performance. Core Instructional Program (3D): continue to utilize existing resources (new) more intentionally	Core Instructional Program (3A & 3C): mostly presenting; work needs to be done vertically & horizontally; more training needed for differentiation and shared resource/cache development Assessment- Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (4A, 4B & 4C): elementary & middle school in place; HS – no; emphasis on formative assessment across the board needs to be more formalized; not all grades are consistent with this (4B); F.A.M.E Teams working and expanding; MYP (Middle Years Program) Assessment rubrics not utilized consistently; (4C) more reactive in nature than proactive in present state. Interventions and Supports (5B): not consistent K-12
Ancillary Staff	Communication: improve at all levels; more outreach	Assessment- Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (4A, 4 B & 4C): inconsistent data on behavior risk factors and no screening for gen ed only if being referred; BIT teams utilize comm w/ counselors learning community; NWEA and F & P reviewed at BIT but may not filter back to classroom intervention or adjustment of classroom instruction; data sources include report cards, progress reports, MIStar; standard scores, conferences, meetings, parent calls, Review of Existing Evaluation Data

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Role-Alike Group Identifying the Need	Immediate Needs	Near-Term (Workgroup 19-20)
Ancillary Staff (continued)		(REED)
		Interventions and Supports (5A, 5B, 5C & 5D): restorative practices and PBIS; conflict res training; CPI training: behavior plans; behavior monitoring forms; frequent parent phone calls, emails, text; progress monitoring; IEP
General Education Teachers	Assessment- Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (4C): communication lacking between Spec Ed & Gen Ed (who is responsible for what on the IEP? Is this consistent in all bldgs at all levels?)	Data-Based Decision Making (1)
	Interventions and Supports (5A & B): behavioral interventions and multi-tiered framework – inconsistent within and between buildings	Assessment- Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (4B): we have data but how is it being used in instructional decisions? Behavior monitoring; purpose and usage.
Para Educators	Core Instructional Program (3C – differentiated instruction): some do and some don't	Core Instructional Program (3A – articulated curriculum): not every teacher has the same special ed skill set; factor – age, experience, class make up)
	Assessment- Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (4C): families not always informed of gaps upon discovery; teachers may try multiple in class interventions first; possibly having a standard form or letter)	Include para educators in IEP meetings or portions/parts of meetings
	Need knowledge of specific roles (different within schools and across schools; consistency within buildings for sure)	Parent disagreement/discontent with recommended placement for child: possibly because of available alternatives / programs
	Not enough staff for caseload	

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Role-Alike Group Identifying the Need	Immediate Needs	Near-Term (Workgroup 19-20)
	All staff needs to be on same page with ARP students	
Parents	Data-Based Decision Making (1): PowerSchool vs (effective use MIStar) versus "Illuminate"; paper copy of IEP housed at buildings; tracking system-uniform processes; databases; centralized process/storage; data to make decisions; Qualification/certification of staff based on student and classroom needs; Need for ASD certification of staff – "There aren't any now"

Interventions and Support (5A Behavioral Interventions, 5B - MTSS & 5C – Discipline policy):lack of identifying supports for 504 students & fidelity of interventions (FEMA school emergency operation plans; diabetes model policy mgmt. in school setting; all allergies

The continuum of services for ASD children is not fully defined or implemented in this district (specifically least restrictive)

Overall communication strategy: update the website-district-school-w/ org chart SE & Curriculum Vitae (CV) for SE staff; automatic enrollment to SE listserv (IEP & 504)

Map the district's own services to the Special Ed spectrum of services to distribute to parents | Need for ASD Program. |
| Special Education Teachers | Interventions and Support (5B - MTSS & 5C – Discipline policy): disjointed, ineffective, inconsistently implemented; we have a policy but is | Data-Based Decision Making (1): connected to core curriculum (3); research based materials used by some teachers |

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Role-Alike Group Identifying the Need	Immediate Needs	Near-Term (Workgroup 19-20)
	not implemented; do we have policies for all areas? Attendance?	
Special Education Teachers (continued)	Staffing for DHH (social workers, counselor, transition teacher)	Core Instructional Program (3A): revisit idea of specialized classes in ELA & Math; vertical and horizontal alignment in progress; BHHS teacher created curriculum in some subjects
		Assessment- Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (4A, 4B & 4C): screeners in place NWEA, progress monitoring, BIT, LC (Learning Community) meetings, TEAM (IEP Team) meetings, BIPS, FBAS; we review data on a regular basis however many do not change instruction; informed, translators, Team meetings

The themes across all rankings in Table 2 reveal a need to address all areas of the rubric to some level dependent on the view of each role-alike group. Two groups addressed communication as an immediate area of concern. Three role-alike groups identified the need to address Data-Based Decision Making (factor 1) and three groups identified the need to address Core Instructional Program (factor 3), five groups identified the need to address Interventions and Support (factor 5) and Assessment-Universal Screening and Progress Monitoring (factor 4).

Recommended Priorities from October 17, 2019 Meeting
Parents and ancillary personnel, as well as a para professional staff member attended the October 17, 2019 meeting. The majority of members were not in attendance (15 of 28).

Ancillary participants recommended three priorities to be addressed through work groups or immediate action: best practices, communication and general education supports. Best practices in special education were identified as the top priority for this group. The following summarizes the priorities as shared by this group:

Best Practices in Special Education
Best practices must be defined by the work group based on current research, must address cross categorical and disability specific information, and must include research based evidence for the following;
- Delivery of services by support/ancillary staff;
- Similarities and differences in regard to demographics;
- Current instructional materials used in special education classes and in general education classes to support students receiving special education services;
- Positive Behavior Support practices;
- Physical space and materials for staff (offices, storage, therapy rooms) and students (classroom size, motor/sensory rooms, quiet rooms); and
- Goal/data tracking and IEP/MET tracking systems (such as MiStar, etc.); and
- Diploma versus Certificate of Completion practices (such as who is involved, how is the decision made (criteria), when decision is made, when to have communication, etc.).

Communication
Communication should include consideration of the following:
- How do other districts communicate with parents with similar demographics (such as survey many parents within the district, survey staff across district)?
- How do other districts build community?
- What parent organizations are in place?

General Education Supports at the Systems and Classroom Level
Questions to be addressed by the work group include:
- How do we/should we identify and classify at-risk students?
- What is the prereferral process?
- What general education supports are used prior to special education referrals?
- How are students and the general education supports monitored? How is data collected during the prereferral process?
- How are behavioral challenges handled?
  - What are the behavioral interventions?
  - How is data tracked and communicated at all levels and to all appropriate parties?
  - What are the discipline procedures and how are they communicated?
  - How are functional behavior assessments and behavior intervention plans used?
- What leveled or basic classes are in place and needed?
- What do we have in general education classes to support students who receive special education services?

- How is data used to drive decision making and instruction?
- How, with whom, and when is the personal curriculum used? What is a personal curriculum?

Parents and a paraprofessional staff member worked together to identify priorities for action. In addition, this group provided a Model Policy on the Management of Diabetes in the School Setting by the Michigan State Board of Education, FEMA Guidance for Developing High-Quality School Emergency Plans, and a packet of information from the CTL (Hartmann-Eton Center for Teaching and Learning) that includes a description of the organization and the services it provides (Teacher Training & Coaching, Tutoring, Testing, and Consulting). These documents are located in Appendix J. Pages 27 – 34 of this report include the information as developed by this group (Special Education Design Committee, Work Group Recommendations, Parent Meeting Notes 10/15/19; Special Education Design Committee, Parent Recommendation - Template for Work Groups; FoDL group Suggestions/Concerns table):

<div align="center">

Special Education Design Committee
Work Group Recommendations
Parent Meeting Notes 10/15/19

</div>

Work Group Descriptions

<u>Overarching Focus for Work Groups</u>
In addition to the structures we put in place, we have to consider/be mindful of every learner's limitations. What can we do to move students from special education services to general education or vice versa?

Work group outcomes should yield the most effective practices, with the highest degree of efficiency. Therefore, each work group will provide recommendations with intentionality, based on the following criteria. Each consideration listed below should be discussed for every work group goal.

<u>Research and Best Practices</u>
Best practices is defined as...

<u>Communication</u>
Measurable outcomes for <u>ongoing</u> evaluable. Communication should be disseminated to staff and families by...

<u>Measurable Outcomes</u>
All work group recommendations should consist of <u>S.M.A.R.T goals</u>, ensuring that they building staff? (Curriculum Vitae (CV) & Experience Gaps)

      A. Implementation Needs
          1. Central Administration
          2. School
          3. Home

Suggested Work Groups

II. **Training**
   Definition: Expand the expertise of current staff and families to handle any diagnosis in the building. Every child in special education should be able to interact with an expert with their specific area of eligibility.
   Training for specific audiences (staff and families) by assessing BHS needs
   A. What certifications and "expertise" do we already have in every building? (Current CVs)
   B. What specific skills are needed for central office administrators and other district personnel.

III. **Tools & Data**
   Definition: Universal tools that are provided district-wide - for all grade levels - for tracking, analysis, and distribution. The end goal is to help define and measure the processes and outcomes being used for programs and services.
   A. Tool Selection
   B. Data Selection
   C. Maintaining Data Systems

IV. **Programs & Services**
   Definition: Consistent, integration of best practices in programs and services by general education and special education administrators and staff. The outcome is to provide a continuum of services, in terms of curriculum, from LRE to MRE (physical placement). Collaboration between Central Administrators (Todd Bidlack-academics; Margaret Schultz-social & emotional learning and equity & inclusion; and Jennifer Perrone-special education).

   The following are factors to discuss for the purpose of creating a system that ensures educational benefits for all students.
   A. BHS Matriculation
      1. Early Childhood Home Services
      2. Pre-K
      3. Elementary School
      4. Middle School
      5. High School
      6. PREP (and beyond)
   B. Spectrum of Services
      1. Students' diagnoses determine the set of services defined for Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) -> Most Restrictive Environment (MRE)

    C. <u>Functional Skills</u>
1. Academic Skills
2. Life Skills
3. Social Skills
4. Community-Based Learning Skills
5. Mental Health/Coping Skills
6. Behavior Management Plan

    D. Collaboration and Conflict Resolution
1. <u>Professional Ombudsman</u> Assistance
   a) Training
   b) IEP and 504 Process
   c) Meeting Communication

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Special Education Design Committee
Parent Recommendation - Template for Work Groups

Parent attendees identified three overarching work groups - Training, Tools & Data, and Programs & Services. To ensure the most effective practices, with the highest degree of efficiency, the following template is being recommended for the "Work Groups" to utilize during the Design Committee's next phase of work. Here are our final meeting notes. The information provided by representatives from Friends of Different Learners (FoDL) was categorized (based on the three work groups) and is available on this document.

Work Group Descriptions

<u>**Overarching Focus for Work Groups**</u>
In addition to the structures we put in place, we have to be mindful of every learner's strengths and limitations. What can we do to move students from special education services to general education or vice versa?

Training

Expanding the expertise of current staff and families to handle any diagnosis in the building. Every child in special education should be able to interact with an expert within their specific area of eligibility.

Tools & Data

Universal tools that are provided districtwide - for all grade levels - for the purpose of tracking, analysis, and distribution. The end goal is to help define and measure the processes and outcomes being used for programs and services.

Programs & Services

Consistent, integration of best practices in programs and services with general education and special education administrators and staff. The outcome is to provide a continuum of services (curriculum) from LRE to MRE (physical placement). Collaboration between Central Administrators (Todd Bidlack-academics; Margaret Schultz-social & emotional learning and equity & inclusion; and Jennifer Perrone-special education).

CONSIDERATIONS	Research & Best Practices	Communication	Measurable Outcomes
WORK GROUPS	Best practices is defined as… *Pick 2 or 3 districts who are best in the world. Choose research from top universities to guide this work. Considerations: -Districtwide -Building -Teacher -Ancillary -Support Staff/Para -Student -Family	Dissemination Methods Staff: Families: Considerations: -Districtwide -Building -Teacher -Ancillary -Support Staff/Para -Student -Family	Use S.M.A.R.T goals to ensure desired outcomes. Considerations: -Districtwide -Building -Teacher -Ancillary -Support Staff/Para -Student -Family
Training	Guiding Statement: Building staff should be trained at an appropriate level to provide support/management based on students' eligibility.		
Tools & Data	Guiding Statement: Pick a best-in-class tool for the continuum of services needed - for all grades - with the purpose of tracking, analysis, and distribution; to measure our processes AND outcomes; and adjust as needed.		
Programs & Services	Guiding Statement: Consistent, integration of best practices in programs and services by ALL general education and special education administrators and staff. The intended outcome is to provide a continuum of services (curriculum) based on students' eligibility (Spectrum of Services) from LRE to MRE (physical placement). Collaboration is needed between Central Administrators (Todd Bidlack-academics;		

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

	Margaret Schultz-social & emotional learning and equity & inclusion; and Jennifer Perrone-special education). Functional Skills to Consider for EVERY program and service: -Academic Skills -Life Skills -Social Skills -Community-Based Learning Skills -Mental Health/Coping Skills -Behavior Management

The following is general input provided by Parent SE Design Committee members from the FoDL group.

	Suggestion/Concern
	In-Service training
	Provide IEP & 504 process flowcharts
	Collaboration with PAC reps
	Automatic enrollment to SE listserv
	Use our group as ongoing advisory committee
	identify experts in the field: dyslexia, HFA, autism, ABA, inclusivity, etc
	new parents - information
Training	communication linked to elementary schools, middle schools and high school PTO and PTOC
	Organization chart for each building detailing special ed staff with CV
	Better and earlier ID of struggling students
	Keep Specials teachers informed on accommodations
	Staff needs additional training on providing direct and explicit instruction
	New parents need other parents to connect with from age 0 - 26
	Basic IEP/504 compliance procedures are not followed
	Staff needs training on writing appropriate goals

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

	Staff needs appropriate people at meetings to write 504/IEP goals
	Hidden unannounced, attorney's should not be brought in as first course of 504 /IEP action, is staff not trained?
	MSBEMP on managing diabetes in a school setting should be followed and training across district
	Shelter, lockdown, evacuation policies for those with medical needs should be written into 504/IEP's and REHEARSED. RESULTS openly posted.
	Executive functioning and self-advocacy goals should be included on IEP and considered as important as academic goals
	Implement ongoing general education discussions and activities around building a classroom and schoo culture that is accepting and inclusive for all
	Staff should be available to meet with parents for a period of time before and after school, not just during school hours.

Tools and Data	LRE is not happening in our district
	Review budget and discuss allocation of funds
	Separate IEP / 504 audits
	Website Updates
	Create a tracking system for complaints
	Provide our group with MDE complaints
	Provide our group with OCR complaints
	Staff needs additional training on implementing accommodations
	Staff cannot continually VIOLATE FERPA laws and share unauthorized student info (psych or medical)

Programs and Services	"Closing the gap" academically should be a priority in ALL classrooms, including ARP
	Provide sensory rooms for meaningful breaks
	Consider phonic based explicit instruction for all students
	Create system / provide resources for students not challenged enough
	Develop program/supports for ADHD and gifted (2E)
	Develop age and deficit appropriate program/supports for Executive Functions K-12, especially HS
	Accessibility of playgrounds is an issue
	There should be clear communication on goals, accommodations, behavior plans between ALL members of a child's team, gen ed and special ed
	A school administrator should be present at every IEP

Bloomfield Hills Schools Special Education Design Committee (2019)

Children should be placed in a program that is appropriate for them, not just the closest thing that currently exists in the district. If the right program doesn't exist, build it!
Behavior Plans should be positively viewed as a proactive measure that benefits children, not as a consequence for "bad behavior."
It would be nice for the district to be able to educate their own, rather than sending home students to other districts to have their needs met because we lack certain programs.
Flexible seating options offered in all classrooms

Note Regarding the SE Design Committee Meetings and Suggested Priorities
The SE Design Committee met eight times. On the sixth meeting day (June 25, 2019), the members voted to either continue meeting or to allow the administration to use the data/report "as is" to determine workgroups and related charges for those workgroups. The vote was split largely by role. Parents and two staff members elected to meet again as a Committee, whereas staff largely voted to let administration determine next steps (see Appendix F). The Special Education Director communicated with parents/staff related to potential next steps and an approach toward consensus or further action by the Special Education Design Committee. It was determined that the Committee would meet to review the draft report and identify priorities in October 2019.

The SE Design Committee did not reach consensus on final recommendations or related goals; however, each role-alike group identified immediate and near-term areas of concern (see Appendix E). In addition, parents and a small number of staff (ancillary and paraprofessional) attended the October 17, 2019, reviewed all information available to the SE Design Committee and identified a few priorities for immediate action and study by work groups (see pages 26-34). The study of factors within the Success Gaps Rubric, related questions, and the wealth of information reviewed and provided through this process should assist the Special Education Department in determining next steps.

Review of the Draft Report (October 3, 2019)
On October 3, 2019, members of the SE Design Committee convened to review the draft report using the following criteria:
- ▶ Is anything missing?
- ▶ Is anything incorrect?
- ▶ What does it say about BHS?
- ▶ What is not addressed in the report and was not studied by the Design Committee but should be on the Director's/District's radar?

It is important to note that some items within the report are individual's perceptions or small group perceptions, as opposed to a consensus of the SE Design Committee. Items that were fully agreed upon by the Committee are noted. The following information summarizes the Committee's feedback related to the questions noted above:

Is anything missing?
- Not all buildings were represented on the Committee by staff or parents. The application process included broad communication across the district and within the community. Applications were not submitted by representatives of each school. The selection committee identified participants from within the applicant pool. Some participants represent multiple buildings and/or roles.
- A suggestion was made to remind readers of this report that implementation of some strategies can be very complex (involves a lot of manpower at times, involves a lot of different schedules, ability to understand a lot of different perspectives). Specifically, some things are easier to say and much harder to do (such as ESL for students who are DHH, Restorative Practices, etc.).

What is incorrect?
A variety of errors (inaccurate reflection of content/perceptions, acronyms without clarification, spelling of names/abbreviations, etc.) were identified within the June 2019 draft report. Revisions were recommended by Committee members. In some cases, consensus of the SE Design Committee was necessary (potential interpretations or content that may have been specific to any particular group's input); while in other cases no consensus was needed. In addition, some things have changed within the district since the SE Design Committee convened in June, 2019. The report does not include updates to or revisions of information that may have changed as a normal course of action since the June 2019 SE Design Committee meetings (see next paragraph in this section). All other revisions were made and provided for final review at the October 17, 2019 meeting. Attendees of the October 17, 2019 meeting did not recommend further revisions.

There was also a lack of clarity within the SE Design Committee related to where and how services for English Language Learners (ELL) are offered. It was noted that all buildings have some sort of service for students who are ELL. In addition, it was noted that Chromebooks are currently being introduced therefore changes are currently going on and may conflict with information within the report that reveals a lack of technology.

What does the report say about BHS?
Most Committee members did not share specific summaries of, or interpretations of the report. However, some participants suggested that the report reveals that there are things that should be addressed or improved in the district and/or special education department, such as:
- The district has adequate assessment data but it does not effect change.
- Currently there is poor special education communication to all stakeholders.
- Pre-referral intervention procedures need to be clarified and implemented consistently across the district.
- There is a need for improved behavioral systems (i.e., tracking, reporting, supporting).
- There is a need for a well-supported and research based curriculum for special education (it was noted that many teachers have been creating their own curricula or curricular materials).

In addition, the district was identified positively for cultural diversity being well supported within the district, and a well-supported and research based general education curriculum.

What is not addressed in the report and was not studied by the Design Committee but should be on the Director's/District's radar?
Committee members identified a variety of things that were not addressed by the Committee (either because the items were not related to the charge of the Committee or because the Committee ran out of time to deal with all of the issues). The items recommended by individuals and/or members more broadly that must be on the "Director's/District's radar" include (in no particular order):
- The SE Design Committee did not address Section 504 in any way.
- The SE Design Committee did not specifically address, nor did the Success Gaps Rubric include factors specifically related to social/emotional, functional, occupational therapy,

physical therapy, health, diet, physical education, etc. The whole child must be addressed not just data, diversity, core education, etc.

- At each age group (PreK, ES, MS, HS, Post HS) students have different needs and these need to be explicitly addressed.
- Include post-high school parents in dialogue/support.
- Changes in intervention services need to be communicated across the whole system.
- Job title changes, configuration changes, etc. monitor impact on those most impacted.
- The continuum of services should be reexamined to ensure every child's needs are addressed.
- A question was raised as to the need for additional programs to support students (such as ASD, EI, etc. programs)
- Clarity is still needed in regard to the special education programs offered within the district.
- Examine behavior interventionists, potential center/gifted programs.
- Oakland Schools can support with public relations and resources for both employees and parents. They have a wealth of information, including support for parents going through the IEP process.
- Ensure feedback loops for working groups in all areas (Bond, Special Education, ELL)
- A workgroup should be established that works to ensure alignment of all workgroups. The intent is to ensure feedback and communication among all workgroups.
- Work groups need to be formed along lines of "immediate" and "near-term" goals or have extreme clarity of what the goals and timelines are.
- Other groups are meeting in the district (such as a group addressing the bond) and this may impact the outcomes of the SE Design Committee.
- Attend to bond language such configurations, facilities, safety & security.

The report was revised, as needed, and provided to the October 17, 2019 participants for final review. No additional changes were recommended. This report reflects the final changes.

Parking Lot Items
Throughout the meeting process, Committee members may have brought up topics or issues that were not within the charge of the Committee or that the Committee did not have time to address. In other cases, issues were brought up and addressed during the meetings (although not always on the day the items were raised). A "Parking Lot" was used to document and maintain a record of these particular issues. Parking Lot items included the following:

- Question related to frequency of complaints (working with MDE, Advocates, Attorney) – Are we tracking formal and informal complaints? (Only numeric data specific to the State Performance Plan indicator related to State Complaints was shared with the Committee – see Appendix B3, State Performance Plan Indicators, BHS SPP History).
- Teacher Consultant position, is it .5 or .5 for each elementary? (This was a clarification question asked in relation to a potential addition of special education staff during a presentation by the Director of Special Education).
- What does shaded mean regarding SPP 14? (This was addressed during the meeting – some indicators are assessed intermittently versus annually - see Appendix B3, State Performance Plan Indicators, BHS SPP History)

- Can BHSD change the way they spend special education funding?
- Has there been/is there transition training for staff from C to B (IDEA)?
- Is SPP data based on primary disability? (This was addressed during the meeting – "yes")
- Can the district obtain a data base to populate data moving forward?
- What does "SF" mean in the SPP report? (This was addressed during the meeting – segregated facility, see Appendix B3, State Performance Plan Indicators, BHS SPP History)
- Can Wendy O. be available to us for data on assessments?
- How is data tracked on ages 22-26 years? (This was addressed during the meeting – some data for this age group is not included in the SPP reports)
- What is an FTE in regard to staffing? (This was addressed in the meeting – one FTE is equal to one "full time equivalent," in other words a person would be in a building/role full time, whereas .5 FTE would mean half time in a building or role)

Communication Plans
The SE Design Committee's work will be shared periodically with the Board of Education through updates provided by the Director of Special Education. In addition, staff and the broader community will be invited to participate in workgroups during the 2019-20 school year once those work groups are determined and the charge for each group, with related goals, are established.

Evaluation Plan
Program/service evaluation is an essential part of implementation of any initiative. Quarterly updates will be provided by 2019-20 workgroups to the Director of Special Education and the Board of Education. A plan for evaluating and communicating the implementation of workgroup outcomes will be developed by each workgroup and shared with their reports/recommendations by the end of the 2019-20 school year.

Appendices

A: Best Practices/Current Research Resources
B: Informational Presentations to SDC and Data Needed by SDC
- **Special Education Director Wonderings**
- **Special Education Director Programs & Services**
- **State Performance Plan (SPPs) Indicators**
- **Special Education Finance**

C: Plus/Delta List
D: Success Gaps Team Study & Presentations and Related Questions
E: Success Gaps Rubric Ratings Charts by Role
- **General Education Teachers**
- **Administrators**
- **Ancillary**
- **Special Education Teachers**
- **Paraprofessionals**
- **Parents**

F: Miscellaneous Meeting Notes
G: Group Process Charts (not included in other report sections)
H: Meeting Agenda and PPTs
I: Report Review Information
J: Material Provided by Parents on October 17, 2019