

# COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (C.A.C.)

SPECIAL EDUCATION LOCAL PLAN AREA (SELPA)

8005 MORRO ROAD, ATASCADERO, CA 93422

PHONE: (805) 782-7304 □ FAX: (805) 466-1473

---

## AGENDA

**Tuesday, November 15, 2016**

**4:30 – 6:00 p.m.**

**Morro Road Education Center**

**8005 Morro Road, Atascadero**

- 1.0 ATTENDANCE CONFIRMATION**
- 2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT**
- 3.0 ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES/AGENDA**
- 4.0 DISCUSSION/ACTION**
  - 4.1 WA1**
  - 4.2 Facebook Posting**
  - 4.3 Golden Apple Nomination Form**
  - 4.4 Fun Run**
  - 4.5 Scholarships**
  - 4.6 Surrogate Parent Training (11/15/16, 1pm)**
- 5.0 SELPA REPORT**
- 6.0 DISTRICT REPORTS**
- 7.0 HANDOUTS/INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**
  - 7.1 The Special Educator**
  - 7.2 The Special EDge**
- 8.0 CLOSING/NEXT AGENDA**

## COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (C.A.C.)

Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA)  
8005 Morro Road, Atascadero, CA 93422  
Phone: (805) 782-7301 □ Fax: (805) 466-1473

---

### MEETING NOTES

**Tuesday, October 18, 2016**  
**Morro Road Education Center**  
**8005 Morro Road, Atascadero**

#### **Members Present:**

<i>Jill Heuer</i>	<i>SELPA Liaison</i>
<i>Julie London</i>	<i>Lucia Mar Unified School District</i>
<i>Erin Brzykcy</i>	<i>San Luis Coastal Unified School District</i>
<i>Jaime Riley-Akers</i>	<i>San Luis Obispo County Office of Education</i>
<i>Michelle Rauenzahn</i>	<i>San Luis Coastal Unified School District</i>
<i>Rayne Rice</i>	<i>Member-at-Large</i>
<i>Lisa Graystone</i>	<i>Coast Unified School District</i>
<i>Loretta Butterfield</i>	<i>SELPA Program Specialist</i>
<i>Alex Alvarez</i>	<i>San Miguel Joint Union School District</i>
<i>Christine Scholl</i>	<i>Paso Robles Joint Unified School District</i>

#### **Members Absent:**

<i>May Nunes</i>	<i>Atascadero Unified School District</i>
<i>Dakota Zandt</i>	<i>Templeton Unified School District</i>
<i>Joy Rose</i>	<i>Almond Acres Charter Academy</i>
<i>Andrea Vergne</i>	<i>Lucia Mar Unified School District</i>
<i>Julie Kirby</i>	<i>Pleasant Valley Joint Union Elementary School District</i>
<i>Open (1)</i>	<i>Atascadero Unified School District</i>
<i>Open (1)</i>	<i>Cayucos Elementary School District</i>
<i>Open (1)</i>	<i>San Luis Obispo County Office of Education</i>
<i>Open (1)</i>	<i>Shandon Joint Unified School District</i>
<i>Open (1)</i>	<i>Paso Robles Joint Unified School District</i>
<i>Open (1)</i>	<i>Bellevue-Santa Fe Charter School</i>
<i>Open (1)</i>	<i>Member-at-Large</i>

#### **Guests:**

<i>Stephanie Schofield</i>	<i>San Miguel Joint Unified School District</i> <i>Special Education Director</i>
<i>Wendy Nielsen</i>	<i>Pleasant Valley Joint Unified School District Superintendent</i>

#### **1.0 ATTENDANCE CONFIRMATION**

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m.

#### **2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

fairly significant report is coming at the end of November with major recommendations.

- None of our LEAs were selected for a compliance review.
- SEOC will be discussing the possible need to revise the SCI Assistance Manual.
- The smalls meet four times a year with the SELPA following the SEOC meeting to address concerns/training.
- Reinstating the SELPA third program specialist is in the approval process; job duties were noted.

#### **6.0 DISTRICT REPORTS**

CUSD: Lisa Graystone reported on training and professional development.

SLCUSD: Erin Brzycky reported on a pilot program using evidence-based practices.

SMJUSD: Stephanie Schofield noted the district has a new CAC member, Alex Alvarez. The year is off to a good start and staff training being provided.

#### **7.0 HANDOUTS/INFORMATIONAL ITEMS**

The following handouts/information items were included in the packet:

7.1 The Special Educator

#### **8.0 CLOSING/NEXT AGENDA**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:41p.m.

## School groups alarmed by Supreme Court move to revisit *Rowley*

Although it dates back to at least 1975 and really to 1966, when Congress launched what is now the IDEA Part B program as Title VI of the ESEA, the IDEA is still unsettled law.

That has become clear this year as the Supreme Court agreed first to hear a case about the IDEA's exhaustion requirement in *Fry v. Napoleon Community Schools*, 65 IDELR 221 (6th Cir. 2015), cert. granted, 116 LRP 27666 (06/28/16), and now with its decision to hear arguments in *Andrew F. v. Douglas County School District RE-1*, 66 IDELR 31 (10th Cir. 2015), cert. granted, 116 LRP 41846 (09/29/16).

The question in each case is whether the court can resolve ambiguities in the law or whether Congress will have to solve those problems itself. *Andrew F.*, for example, concerns the level of benefit to which students are entitled under the IDEA — a “meaningful” one or something less than that.

But as far as the Autism Speaks Legal Resource Center and the Public Interest Law Center are concerned, Congress has already answered that question through its many amendments to the IDEA since the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Pub. L. No. 94-142, was enacted.

“Review is warranted because of the dynamic changes to the IDEA and national policy for educating children with disabilities since *Rowley* was decided in 1982,” they said in an amicus brief, referring to *Board of Education of the Hendrick Hudson Central School District v. Rowley*, 553 IDELR 656 (U.S. 1982).

For example, they said, “the words ‘assistive technologies’ did not appear in the original statute, and autism was not a covered IDEA disability.”

But school attorney Wayne Stewart of Hammonds, Sills, Adkins & Guice in Baton Rouge, La., is less impressed by changes in legislative language than changes in appropriations. And to date, he said, Congress has failed to uphold its end of that part of the bargain.

“If they ... extend FAPE to a higher level... parents are going to say, ‘Well, we get more,’ [and] ‘get more’ means more services or more accommodations or more stuff,” he said. “Well, more stuff costs money, [and] unless Congress can step up and give states more money, this is going to be devastating.”

### Fearing more litigation

One of the arguments against the push to adopt a more aggressive reading of *Rowley* is that Congress has never taken issue with that ruling.

But for Daniel Unumb, former executive director of the Autism Speaks legal center, that's not the point.

Rather, he said, it's that *Rowley* must be interpreted under current circumstances, including changes

to the IDEA as well as other education laws.

“Certainly the Solicitor General would say this is not so much a change in opinion as a clarification,” he said in reference to a brief by the Solicitor General urging the Court to take the case. “It's more corrective, [an attempt to say], ‘Let's look at the intent of *Rowley*, and let's look at what the current intent is as informed by all of these statutes.’”

Ron Hager, senior staff attorney at the National Disability Rights Network, said he is also glad the Court agreed to hear the case.

“I would love to see the Circuit Court's decision overturned, and I am hopeful the Supreme Court will do that,” he said.

But Jeff Simering, legislative director for the Council of the Great City Schools, said any change in the definition of FAPE should be left up to Congress.

“The suggestion that ‘some’ benefit is equivalent to a ‘shade above de minimis’ is highly questionable,” he said. “In my opinion, such a substantive departure from the long-standing *Rowley* standard should be determined only by statutory change.”

Stewart, meanwhile, said he is worried about the outcome, saying schools can only be asked to do so much with the resources they have. That is the issue that doesn't come out in the arguments to revisit *Rowley*, he said.

“You can elevate FAPE all you want — raise it, lower it — but until you provide the resources, it's only going to increase litigation; it's not going to increase services for kids,” Stewart said.

Statement of ownership, management, and circulation for October 2016. *The Special Educator* is published biweekly, except one issue omitted in May, July, November and December for \$310 by LRP Publications. Complete mailing address: LRP Publications, 360 Hittatt Drive, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33418. Publisher: Kenneth F. Kahn. Editor: Lisa Bocchino. Managing Editor: Lisa Bocchino. Owner: Kenneth F. Kahn. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of the total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities: None. The average number of copies of each issue during preceding 12 months are: Total number of copies: 996. Paid and/or requested distribution: 966. Free or nominal rate outside county copies: 0. Total distribution: 966. Copies not distributed: 26. Total: 996. The number of copies of single issue published closest to filing date are: Total number of copies: 1570. Paid and/or requested distribution: 964. Non-requested distribution: 580. Total distribution: 1544. Copies not distributed: 26. Total: 1570. Statement signed and certified to be true by Roberta J. Flowers, Director of Publications.

## Amended Title II regs emphasize broader coverage

In August, the Justice Department issued a final rule that implements the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 into Title II and Title III regulations.

The changes shouldn't be a surprise to those familiar with the ADAAA and the amendments made to Title I in 2011, said school attorney Julie J. Weatherly with Resolutions in Special Education Inc. in Mobile, Ala.

In certain places, the Title II regulations borrow almost word-for-word from the amended Title I regulations, Weatherly said. For instance, both underscore that a student with LDs could be academically successful but still substantially limited in one or more major life activities compared to most people in the general population.

Congress passed the ADAAA in 2008 to correct what it viewed as the court's improper narrowing of ADA coverage. With that passage, the ADAAA expanded coverage for students under Section 504 by removing the consideration of most mitigating measures for eligibility purposes, adding examples of major life activities, and stating that impairments that are episodic or in remission, when active, may still be substantially limiting.

Taken together, the amendments to Title I and the recently amended Title II and III regulations offer schools the same message, Weatherly said:

"We shouldn't be spending our time debating whether or not a child is disabled; we should err on the side of identifying more students under Section 504."

Once eligible, these students receive antidiscrimination protections. From there, teams still need to determine if accommodations are necessary, she added.

### Major changes to Title II regulations

Review the major changes to the Title II regulations as a result of the 2016 amendments. These include:

- Understanding that the definition of "disability" shall be construed broadly in favor of expansive coverage, to the maximum extent permitted by the terms of the ADA. 28 CFR 35.108(a)(2)(i).
- Addition of the immune system and the circulatory system as examples of bodily systems that may be affected by a physical impairment.
- Addition of dyslexia and ADHD to the nonexhaustive list of physical or mental impairments.
- Recognition that certain impairments will in "virtually all cases" result in coverage including: deafness, blindness, intellectual disability, partially or completely missing limbs, mobility impairments requiring the use of a wheelchair, autism, cancer, cerebral palsy, diabetes, epilepsy/muscular dystrophy and multiple sclerosis, HIV, major depressive disorder, bipolar disorder, PTSD, TBI, OCD, and schizophrenia.
- Addition of examples of major life activities including all the 2010 examples plus: eating, sleeping, standing,

sitting, reaching, lifting, bending, learning, reading, concentrating, thinking, writing, communicating, and interacting with others. 28 CFR 35.108(c).

- Recognition that "major life activities" includes the operation of major bodily functions.
- Description of mitigating measures like AT, modifications, and learned behavioral or adaptive modifications.
- Recognition that an impairment does not have to prevent or severely restrict the performance of a major life activity to qualify as a disability. 28 CFR 35.108(c)(2).
- Explanation that Title II entities only need to provide reasonable modifications to individuals with disabilities or individuals with a record of disability, not to an individual who is only regarded as having a disability.

### Follow 9 rules on 'substantial limitation'

"Substantially limits" is not defined in Title II regulations; however, it includes nine rules of construction. The DOJ explained that these rules "provide ample guidance on determining whether an impairment substantially limits a major life activity." 81 Fed. Reg. 53,229 (2016):

1. "Substantially limits" is not intended to be a demanding standard.
2. The threshold issue of whether an impairment substantially limits a major life activity should not demand extensive analysis.
3. An impairment does not need to substantially limit more than one major life activity.
4. An impairment that is episodic or in remission qualifies as a disability if it would substantially limit a major life activity when active.
5. An impairment does not need to prevent or significantly or severely restrict an individual from performing a major life activity to be substantially limiting; the question is how the impairment limits the individual's ability to perform the major life activity as compared to most people in the general population.
6. The determination of whether an impairment substantially limits a major life activity requires an individualized assessment.
7. An individual with an impairment generally does not need to produce scientific, medical, or statistical evidence to show how his performance of a major life activity compares to the performance of most people in the general population (however, the individual may present such evidence where appropriate).
8. Public entities may not consider the ameliorative effects of mitigating measures when determining whether an impairment substantially limits a major life activity.
9. The effects of an impairment lasting or expected to last less than six months can be substantially limiting for establishing an actual disability or a record of a disability. ■

## Avoid missteps when handling education records in placement determinations

The parents of a 17-year-old boy with a disability decline to consent to the release of his education records to potential placements.

Despite this, the student's school district sends placement referral packets with the student's neuropsychological evaluation, psychiatric update, and other mental health records to several potential schools.

This disregard for privacy concerns led the judge in the case to deny the district's motion to dismiss the parents' 14th amendment claims. *W.E. v. Hendrick Hudson Cent. Sch. Dist.*, 67 IDELR 178 (S.D.N.Y. 2016). The judge said the records were "excruciatingly private and intimate in nature" and were "precisely the sort that might subject a person to societal discrimination and intolerance."

This kind of situation is difficult because it pits a potential violation of a student's privacy against a potential FAPE violation if the district doesn't make an appropriate placement offer, said Anahid Hoonanian, a school attorney at Lozano Smith LLP. Parents may fear the stigma attached to their child's mental health issues and not trust everyone will maintain their confidentiality.

Don't make a similar inappropriate disclosure. Learn other ways your teams can work with families to find a suitable placement for a student with mental health difficulties.

"When parents won't agree to share records," Hoonanian said, "it makes it almost impossible for a private institution to decide if it will be able to serve the child's needs."

Take these steps:

- **Clarify for parents your reason for wanting to share records.** Tell parents why you want to send their child's information to potential placements, said Christine Hamiel, a school attorney at von Briesen & Roper S.C.

"Have a very candid conversation with parents about various placement options and why you think their student may benefit from them," she said. "Map out how things may play out long term in a particular placement and be transparent with parents about the process in hopes of obtaining their consent."

Provide written information about each placement as well as the parents' rights and procedural safeguards, Hoonanian said.

"You really want to break the process down for them," she said. "This is why we're asking you for

this information. This is what will happen if you give consent. This is what will happen if you don't give consent. If we can't share information with the facility, it can't tell us if it can serve your child, so we can't offer the placement."

- **Suggest families take facility tours.** If parents are still reluctant to give consent, help them connect with a contact person at each prospective facility you are considering and arrange a tour, Hamiel said. For example, she said, say to parents, "I can reach out to Steve if you're interested in learning more about this facility." Reassure them that they can raise their concerns with that person, Hamiel said.

"This shows them that the district truly wants to help the student and parents build a rapport with the agency," she said.

Encourage the child's case manager to accompany the family on the tour to build more trust and improve communication, Hoonanian said. Emphasize to parents that facilities are under the same constraints to maintain their child's confidentiality. The prospective placement would also have to seek parent consent to share records if the student ultimately enrolled.

- **Offer programs a summary profile instead.** If parents continue to refuse to give consent, give a prospective facility a summary of the student's needs without including any details that anyone can trace back to the student, Hoonanian said. Do not share the student's name, address, or anything else considered personally identifiable information under FERPA. You may be able to share redacted records if the combination of characteristics in the files wouldn't allow anyone to figure out who the student is.

"In a small community, someone at the facility may know who you're talking about," she said.

- **Document your attempts to garner consent.** Record the date of every attempt to get parental consent, Hoonanian said. Keep a copy if you send a letter saying, "Once again, we are sending you a release form and asking you to reconsider signing it." Doing this may help ward off later legal difficulties, she said.

"That way there is documentation in case there is a later FAPE dispute that you made reasonable attempts to get their consent to show schools records to be able to make an appropriate placement at a private facility," Hoonanian said. ■

## Needs, data, process: Drill staffers on 3 key principles of Section 504

The message scribbled on a prescription pad reads, “Diagnosed with ADHD, needs 504 plan, extended time.”

### Key points

- Use consistent process to gather data, determine needs, discuss accommodations
- Explain intent of 504 is to provide access, not fundamentally change experience
- Ask for input from content experts about accommodations

Too often today this note is the path to Section 504, said John B. Comegno II, school attorney with the Comegno Law Group PC. A parent hands a school nurse a diagnosis from a doctor and a 504 plan is born.

If that’s how it works in your district, take a step back and

review the “trifecta” of Section 504 with your teams, Comegno advised.

“There are three key principles for staying out of trouble, staying compliant, and, most importantly, honoring, addressing, and respecting the best interests of our students,” Comegno said. They are:

**1. Focus on student needs.** “In 504, we’re focusing on the student’s needs, not demands,” Comegno said.

These needs are different than what we see under the IDEA, he said. At the eligibility stage, Section 504 asks two questions: Is there a mental or physical impairment? Does that substantially limit a major life activity? If the answer to both questions is yes, the student is eligible for protections under Section 504, Comegno said. That doesn’t necessarily mean the student receives accommodations.

Section 504 is a civil rights law that prohibits discrimination against students based on disability, Comegno said.

“It seeks to ensure that the experience of the student with the disability is not different than the general ed student,” he said. A student with a 504 plan is a general education student who should have access to the same curriculum as any other student, he said.

“The only way that we may treat the 504 student differently is by way of the accommodations we’ll provide in order to make sure the student has access to the same curriculum and experiences,” he said.

That’s where student needs come in, he said. The student’s needs determine what, if any, accommodations are necessary to provide the student access to his education without providing him an

unfair advantage. A 504 student may need accommodations that change “how” he’s taught, but they do not fundamentally change “what” he’s taught, Comegno said.

**2. Collect data.** “What do we review, assess, and analyze to objectively determine those student needs?” Comegno asked. “Student data.”

Data should come from multiple sources, he said.

“The more data or observations, the more information we have for which to make decisions with regard to students’ needs,” he said.

These decisions shouldn’t rely solely on a diagnosis or a doctor’s recommendations.

“We may look very broadly at multiple sources,” Comegno said.

**3. Establish consistent, objective process.** “The process needs to be both vertically and horizontally consistent throughout your district,” Comegno said.

That means the 504 process at Elementary School A needs to be the same as the process at Elementary School B and the same as the process at middle and high schools, he said.

There shouldn’t be differences in the way schools treat Section 504, such as, “Elementary A, you bring a doctor’s note, get a 504 plan. Elementary B ... you bring the note, they say, ‘No problem, we give everyone extended time,’” Comegno said. “We need to be consistent in our processes. We need to be mindful of the data we plug in, and we need to remember that what we’re focusing on [are student] needs.”

### Clarify difference between accommodations, modifications

Is reducing a 20-page paper to 10 pages an accommodation or a modification?

“You know who would know the answer? Our English teachers,” Comegno said. “The folks who know the curriculum — the captains of that ship — need to be at the table to give us input into what is an accommodation,” he said.

If the student can demonstrate the concept in a 10-page essay, a reduction in the amount of pages may be an accommodation, he said.

Focus on the concept behind the assignment, Comegno said. For example, reducing a 20-question quiz to 10 questions might be a modification if each question asks about a unique concept the student should know, Comegno said. On the other hand, if each concept can be tested in just 10 questions, reducing the number of questions might not reduce the rigor or expectations, he said. ■

## Ward off disagreements with parents by strengthening their advocacy skills

Parents sometimes unwittingly impede the development of their child's IEP. They may not trust others to meet their child's needs if they've just recently learned of her disability. They may walk into IEP meetings already on the defensive, believing you aren't going to listen.

### Key points

- Help parents learn more about their child's disability
- Encourage parents to develop summary of child's strengths, needs
- Remind parents to ask questions throughout process

Encourage your teams to give parents guidance on how to better advocate for their child at the outset to gain their trust and promote the sense that you are all a part of the same team. In doing

so, you may avoid parent claims that they didn't meaningfully participate in the process.

"Parents can't fully participate if they're not fully informed," said Cathy Boswell, a regional program specialist at the Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs. "Sometimes a lot of conflicts between parents and schools come from parents' not fully understanding the limitations schools have for what they can and can't provide."

Take these steps:

#### • **Help parents understand their child's disability:**

Encourage a school psychologist or other teammate to spend some time with parents to answer their questions about their child's disability, Boswell said.

"Even though there's a statement in the student's IEP, it's usually not very detailed," she said.

Therefore, take time to carefully explain what their child's disability category means and how it can affect the student's learning. Offer parents resources to read about the disability, Boswell said. Recommend reputable organizations for them to consult with and workshops they can attend, she said. Every state has to have at least one Parent Training and Information Center under the IDEA, for example.

After making sure parents understand their child's disability, embolden them to share their perspective on how the disability manifests in their child's daily life, said Jill Summerlot, also an IN\*SOURCE regional program specialist. For example, autism does not look the same in every child.

"You may say a child with autism doesn't like to be touched," she said. "But a parent may have

learned over the years that the child doesn't like to be touched specifically on his back and forearm. Every child is complex."

• **Encourage parents to keep records:** Recommend that parents get organized, Summerlot said. Suggest they keep their child's IEPs, homework samples, and medical records in a file for each year and record every time they speak with school personnel. Ask them to develop a one-page summary of their child's strengths and needs that they can hand out to everyone at the IEP meeting.

"It gives everyone a snapshot of the child," she said.

It opens the lines of communication so you can go up to the student's mother and ask her a question about the student's individual needs without feeling like you're imposing, Summerlot said.

Also ask parents to give the case manager a one-page list of their concerns ahead of the IEP meeting, Boswell said.

"That way the school has time to think about everything," she said. "It empowers the parent and makes them feel like they really did contribute something and they are being heard."

#### • **Improve parents' knowledge of their rights:**

Go through parents' procedural safeguards and any other materials you distribute with them so they clearly understand their rights and what they do and don't have the right to ask you to do, Summerlot said. Clarify what is involved in going to mediation and going to due process. If they seem to struggle with any of this information, recommend they seek out a reliable parent center before a meeting takes place to ward off distrust.

Also make sure they know to expect their child to receive the services and supports stipulated in his IEP but not to expect anything else discussed, but not documented, to be implemented, Boswell said.

"Transparency promotes teamwork," she said. "Parents say, 'We talked about such and such in the meeting and the school's not doing it.' I try to tell parents, if it's not written down, it didn't happen."

Project the IEP on the wall during the meeting so the student's parents can read what is being typed into it and ask questions as concerns arise, Boswell said. Also emphasize the importance of everyone using a school-home communication book to keep track of when the student receives services and supports so parents can have confidence that you are delivering the services stipulated in their child's IEP, Summerlot said. ■



Kristin Wright: Director, Special Education Division, CDE  
Kristen Brown: CDE Contract Monitor and Project Liaison  
Jim Alford: CDE Editorial Consultant  
Stacey Wedin: CDE Editorial Consultant  
Connie Silva: CalSTAT Project Manager  
Mary Cichy Grady: Editor  
Geri West: Content Consultant  
Giselle Blong: Editorial Assistant  
Janet Mandelstam: Staff Writer and Copyeditor  
Elizabeth Estes: Contributing Writer  
Robert Powell: Contributing Writer

*The Special EDge* is published triannually by Napa County Office of Education's CalSTAT Project (California Services for Technical Assistance and Training).

  
**California Services for  
CalSTAT**  
Technical Assistance and Training

Funding is provided by the California Department of Education, Special Education Division, through contract number CN077046 with Napa County Office of Education (NCOE). Contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of NCOE or the California Department of Education (CDE), nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement.

Circulation: 51,000.

The information in this issue is in the public domain unless otherwise indicated. Readers are encouraged to copy and share but to credit CalSTAT and CDE. This issue is available on disk, audiotape, and in large print upon request. By going to CalSTAT's Web site—[www.calstat.org/infoPublications.html](http://www.calstat.org/infoPublications.html)—you can download PDF and text versions of this and previous newsletters. Contact *The Special EDge* by telephone at 707-849-2275; by e-mail at [giselle.blong@calstat.org](mailto:giselle.blong@calstat.org) or by postal mail at *The Special EDge*, c/o NCOE/CalSTAT, 5789 State Farm Drive, Suite 230, Rohnert Park, California 94928.

## Letter from the State Director

*The goal:  
one coherent,  
unified system that  
effectively and  
efficiently serves  
all children.*



During the past year, the Special Education Division—the second largest division in the California Department of Education, with its staff of more than 140 committed professionals—has seen three directors at the helm. As the third, I am both privileged to build on the foundation that my predecessors have laid and excited about the opportunities that lie ahead for students with disabilities, their families, and the professionals who support them.

Expressed appreciation goes to Fred Balcom, who led the division during its landmark alignment of special education accountability with that of general education, a practical as well as an importantly symbolic step toward unifying both “educations.” Balcom retired from the position of director in October 2015.

More appreciation goes to the eminently qualified Chris Drouin who, on the eve of his retirement from a 30-year career in public service, selflessly agreed to serve as acting interim director until a permanent director was selected. Drouin carefully navigated important work with the federal Office of Special Education Programs and furthered within the Special Education Division an atmosphere of innovation, collaborative thinking, and creative progress. This atmosphere is especially important for a number of reasons: The Local Control Funding Formula and its accountability plans are still taking shape. A new special education accountability system is under construction. And the state's rigorous learning standards and aligned assessments are in the middle of a complex unfolding. It's safe to suggest that every part of the state's PreK–12 system of education is in flux. With the many complications of these dramatic changes, the Special Education Division has made remarkable and steady progress during the past year, contributing to a system that improves school outcomes for students with disabilities and aligning efforts across all education-related initiatives and divisions. The goal: one coherent, unified system that effectively and efficiently serves all children.

There's an irony to this goal. The Special Education Division has been uniquely involved in and guided by the work of the California Statewide Task Force on Special Education. The recommendations of this group grew out of a discontent that parents, educators, policymakers, and other stakeholders had with a fragmented system of special education that seemed driven more by labels and funding categories than by a child's educational needs, a system that for too long had failed to support clear progress for too many students with disabilities. However, what has emerged from the work of this group is a general understanding that its recommendations articulate more than just the changes that need to be made to better serve students with disabilities. There is the growing belief that, when a system serves well its most vulnerable children, it is better able to serve all students. There is also the realization that the task force recommendations describe what needs to be accomplished for all children; they are, in fact, general education recommendations, which serve as a whole-system guide for improving outcomes for every student.

I assumed the mantle of state director because I believe in the vision of one coherent system of education that serves all students well. And I assume it with optimism because of the promising landscape that my predecessors have worked hard to shape. I am confident that the talent and commitment that exists within the Special Education Division will advance this one-system vision in a way that will contribute in unprecedented ways to the educational success of all students with disabilities. —Kristin Wright

CAC 11/15/16  
AGENDA ITEM #7.2