

Governor's Council on Blindness and Visual Impairment (GCBVI)
Education Committee Meeting Minutes
August 20, 2018

Members Present

Bob Kresmer*, Chair
Ed House*
Lisa Jackson*
Lisa Yencarelli*
Doris Woltman*
Janet Fukuda*

Members Absent

Jared Kittelson
Julie Urban

Staff Present

Lindsey Powers, Council Liaison
*Teleconferenced

Guests Present

Jay Johnson*, ADE

Call to Order and Introductions

Bob Kresmer, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:02 pm in the Council Liaison Office, Phoenix, AZ. Introductions were made and a quorum was present.

Approval of June 11, 2018 Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Arizona Post-Outcome Data Presentation

Jay Johnson, Arizona Department of Education (ADE), stated the ADE had collected Post-Outcome Data from schools for four years from June 1 – September 30. Mr. Johnson stated the ADE was collecting data from all students in a special education program at the time that they dropped out, aged out, or graduated from high school. He added that the data was collected one year after the student had exited school. Jay Johnson stated the data that he would review was for blind and visually impaired students. Jay Johnson stated the data could be broken down by disability, ethnicity, exit type, gender and by region.

Jay Johnson stated the Arizona Post-Outcome Data information included the different areas of engagement of students. He noted that the information was tiered with higher education as the highest tier and other employment as the lowest tier. Jay Johnson stated the highest tier of higher education

referred to individuals going to community college or a university full or part time that had completed one term or semester. Jay Johnson stated the next tier was competitive employment, which indicated individuals receiving at or above minimum wage in an integrated setting for 20 hours a week for at least 90 days. Jay Johnson stated the next tier was other post-secondary education or training, which referred to individuals going full or part time to some type of training such as adult education, a day program, or workforce development. Jay Johnson stated the last tier was other employment, which referred to an individual that had worked for 90 days and had been paid.

Jay Johnson reviewed the state engagement rates for all students with disabilities in which 6333 responded for a 75.3% response rate. Jay Johnson stated 25% of individuals were not engaged, 39% were receiving competitive employment and 22.4% were enrolled in higher education. Jay Johnsons stated in reviewing the previous three years of data collection, the rate of individuals not engaged had decreased from 25% to 13% and the rate of individuals in competitive employment had increased from 10% to 20%. Jay Johnsons stated the number of individuals that responded in the 2015-2016 school year was 30 students. Bob Kresmer stated the most recent information included a sample of 30 students and inquired whether the ADE could survey all blind and visually impaired students from each school district. Jay Johnson stated the ADE tracked the students for one year after the individual had dropped out, aged out, or graduated. Jay Johnson stated the ADE did not collect data on current students. Bob Kresmer inquired whether there was an estimate on the number of blind or visually impaired students that had graduated statewide. Jay Johnson stated the Arizona Post-Outcome Data included the students with visual impairments that could be contacted. Bob Kresmer stated that 30 students responded, which was 80% of the students. Jay Johnson stated he did not have the exact percentage of visually impaired students that participated in the survey, although his prediction was that the number would be 80% or higher.

Ed House inquired whether the data could be broken down by zip code or county. Jay Johnson stated the data could be broken down by zip code, county, or region. Jay Johnson stated the data included 30 students with visual impairment, which could be broken down by region, although a number smaller than 10 could skew the data. Janet Fukuda stated the ADE could provide state level data, although the ADE could not provide data on a school district or charter school because that data would belong to the school district. Ed House stated the committee was interested in identifying the schools with high performing students and to potentially share their Best Practices with other schools. Jay Johnson stated he could share the overall engagement rates of students, but if the number of students in a region

were low, the data would not be an accurate reflection. Bob Kresmer stated that an overall engagement percentage would be helpful. Jay Johnson stated he could break the data down by region, which would likely offer a larger number of students per region. Jay Johnson stated anecdotally, the students with visual impairments had the highest level of engagement rates. Bob Kresmer inquired whether the surveys would require more specific information such as what type of school the individual was attending. Jay Johnson stated the data could be broken down by community college or university or military training. Ed House inquired whether the ADE would extend the survey to four or five years post school exit. Jay Johnson stated the Federal government required the ADE report individuals one-year post exit. Jay Johnson stated the Good Jobs Project out of Georgetown University provided student data as well as Census data, which would offer information regarding employment and training. Bob Kresmer inquired whether the state of Arizona would provide funds for additional surveys. Jay Johnson stated he had not heard about any additional surveys. Bob Kresmer inquired whether Jay Johnson, Janet Fukuda, and Lisa Yencarelli would be able to break the data down by region. Jay Johnson stated he could begin working on that information, although he cautioned that the numbers could be small and potentially skew the numbers. Ed House inquired whether the regional information referred to the student's address or the school address. Jay Johnson stated the regional information would be broken down by the school address.

Bob Kresmer stated he received information from the Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and Blind (ASDB) that there were 1440 blind and visually impaired students served by the American Printing House (APH) funds. Mr. Kresmer stated 450 were served by ASDB schools, 250 were served by Foundation for Blind Children (FBC) and 700 were served by the various school districts and charter schools. Bob Kresmer stated the committee had the opportunity to identify the blind and visually impaired students in each school district and charter school. Bob Kresmer inquired whether ASDB had any ideas on how to reach the students not served by ASDB or FBC. Lisa Jackson stated ASDB had information on all students served through APH funds. Ed House inquired regarding the number of students that graduated from ASDB the previous year. Lisa Jackson stated she did not have the exact number, although she could check. Dr. Jackson stated that when a student was enrolled with a visual impairment, the student was uploaded into the system with a code. Lisa Jackson stated information regarding the student's disability would be included as well as the student's grade level, therefore the ADE would know when a student graduated. Lisa Jackson stated the ADE's data was likely accurate, which indicated that 30 students had participated in the survey. Janet Fukuda stated that Jay Johnson had referred to the overall response rate of students, which was 80%, although

the response rate of blind and visually impaired students was likely higher. Lisa Jackson stated there would always be a percentage of students that ASDB could not contact due to the family moving. Dr. Jackson stated that ASDB's surveys could be distributed to a family member or relative as well.

Bob Kresmer stated the committee was originally interested in learning the number of blind and visually impaired students in the state as well as their location. Bob Kresmer stated the committee knew the number of blind and visually impaired students but did not know where the students were located. Lisa Jackson suggested the ADE break down the information by rural and urban groups to keep the numbers large. Lisa Jackson stated the committee could also request the average age of the students when they graduated. Bob Kresmer agreed that information would be useful.

Lisa Yencarelli stated the ADE Data Dashboard webpage included information regarding the ages of students that graduated with regular high school diplomas, although the numbers appeared to be high. Lisa Yencarelli stated the information could be separated by county but could not be separated according to disability. Lisa Yencarelli inquired whether the committee had submitted a Public Records Request for the number of blind and visually impaired students in Maricopa county and the rural regions. Janet Fukuda stated her understanding that the ADE was overwhelmed with public records requests and were not currently accepting requests due to a lack of resources. Bob Kresmer inquired whether the ADE Data Dashboard information correlated to the Arizona Post-Outcome data. Janet Fukuda stated she assisted with the Arizona Post-Outcome Data review, although she was not familiar with the ADE Data Dashboard information. Lisa Jackson suggested the Arizona Post-Outcome Data be extended to three to five years post exit, which would yield useful information. Lisa Yencarelli stated that rehabilitation services or adult service programs could potentially survey the individuals three to five years post exit. Bob Kresmer inquired whether that would require an intergovernmental agreement between the agencies. Ed House stated that additional information would be useful, although the agencies would have to deal with privacy concerns when sharing information between agencies. Mr. House stated the committee would not get individual data but could potentially get information according to different groupings of individuals. Bob Kresmer inquired regarding the current number of residential students at ASDB. Lisa Jackson stated there were 46 total students and ASDB. Dr. Jackson stated her understanding that the data was still being entered, although there were 15 residential students currently. Bob Kresmer inquired regarding the number of students that graduated from the South East Regional Co-Operative. Doris Woltman stated her recollection that approximately six students graduated. Doris Woltman stated the number of students enrolled fluctuated each year.

Bob Kresmer stated he was approached by an individual inquiring whether there was a state regulation that mandated vision screening tests in schools. Lisa Yencarelli stated there were guidelines for hearing screening tests, although there were no guidelines or mandates for required vision screening tests. Bob Kresmer inquired whether the committee would like to suggest that the ADE require school districts to offer vision screening tests to students. Lisa Jackson stated that students could be identified with a visual impairment early so the student could obtain services. Doris Woltman stated any student with an Individualized Employment Plan (IEP) received vision screening from the school nurse or individuals from the Lions Club. Ms. Woltman stated that different schools had different rules regarding if the students received vision screening. Bob Kresmer stated he would delve into the vision screening tests and identify whether the council could obtain support from consumer groups or parental groups. Ed House suggested the committee recommend simple screening tests, in order to gain more support from other entities.

High Stakes Test Score Collection Discussion

This item was tabled.

Early Childhood Activities Discussion

This item was tabled.

Youth Transition Program Discussion

This item was tabled.

Date and Agenda for Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Education Committee TBD. Agenda items are as follows: Agenda items are as follows:

- ASDB Post Outcomes Data Discussion
- Vision Screening Mandate Discussion

Announcements

There were no announcements.

Public Comment

A call to the public was made with no responses forthcoming.

Adjournment of Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.