

**NCDB Personnel Prep
Consortium Meeting
May 13, 2009
Cincinnati, OH**

Facilitator: Christina Reagle

Attendees:

Susan Bashinski, Roseanna Davidson, Liz Hartman, Gail Leslie, Linda McDowell, Kathy Nelson, Tutty Aviles-Ortiz, Rosanne Silberman, Bill Sharpton, Anne Smith, Alana Zambone

Guests:

Holly Cooper, Julie Durando

Overall Note taker: Gail Leslie

Research Note taker: Susan Bashinski

Agenda Item: Introductions

Welcome to new attendees and Congrats to Liz and Julie who have just finished their doctorates!!

Agenda Item: Status of NCDB Personnel Prep Consortium Work

Christina shared that the NCDB Personnel Prep Consortium is officially two years old. Given this point in time it seemed an opportunity to review the outcomes and progress of the workgroups to this point.

Documents Group

- CEC SPA's for DB -intervener and teachers completed
- Special note: CEC will adopt intervener competencies, but there is delay because they are unsure of a larger policy issue regarding competencies for paras for specific disability groups. CEC will validate but plan to develop a framework for policy implications for advanced standards for special education paraprofessionals.
- Credentialing body needs something formally in place which CEC adoption will accomplish.
- Alana has agreed to continue to monitor the progress and conversations regarding the CEC adoption of competencies.

- Alana also handed out the survey results for the DB Teacher competencies that went out to the field. With the exception of two of the competencies, all had a rating of 80% or higher.

Professional Development Group

- The original discussion of the professional development group was to figure out a solution to allow states to work together to ensure programs offering content in DB would continue so recruitment for new students could occur.
- In an effort to work toward this goal the group is considering a mechanism for sharing materials and content for course development.
- Bill Sharpton shared his experience with the Low Incidence project that he has been working on in LA. In working with other personnel prep faculty he found it useful to “chunk” coursework into 5 week components. These 5 week “chunks” identified blocks that overlapped and could be shared and eventually utilized as a singular component of coursework.
- After group discussion a suggestion was made to take db course content and chunk it regardless of course title. This would form a basis for comparing chunks to see what content is common to all university curriculums.
- The creation of a repository of DB chunks is a large task that requires structure, procedures in place, and careful planning. The final product of materials organized to help deliver coursework in db is a need that will help all programs. The possibility of including individual exemplars of positive practice (video clips, interviews with parents) was also discussed and can be used in the future development of coursework.
- Another suggestion in the repository discussion was to partner with state db projects to capture products around two OPI’s each year. The products would be reviewed for placement in repository categories.
- It was also discussed that university programs could use students to collect and produce artifacts for repository chunks especially since they may already be doing similar activities in their course assignments.
- Gail shared that Area 1 is continuing their efforts to identify effective practices. It is important for the NCDB Personnel Prep group to stay informed regarding the Area 1 activity to identify child specific effective practices since they may eventually attempt to collect data around these practices. At some point the work of each of these groups will be complementary and provide evidence and research-based information to the field.

- Susan Bashinski discussed the INK project of repository materials for teachers of severe/mh that she assisted with in her TA in Kansas. The group wanted more information on the effectiveness of these materials.
- Several suggestions were made as the group summarized the repository discussion: a) to look at organizational structures of other repositories; b) to gather criteria information and examples of permission forms; and c) to begin collecting exemplars as a first step to understand the need and challenges of this work.
- Bill S. suggested that the repository site should be password protected

Conclusion/Action Steps:

1. *Establish a work group to further the idea of a national db repository to determine the issue and resources*
 - Ask from the university perspective – faculty to nominate what are the components of a repository
 - Determine content outline -
 - What would the infrastructure look like – size, cost, scale
 - Anne suggested using systemic change framework...i.e. Area 1 practices are the child line, other components could fill out other areas of the framework
 - Content outline could derive from people thinking about what they already have to contribute
 - Susan Bashinski to send Anne Smith information regarding the classification scheme and table of contents, utilized by Susan's Kansas state TA project, in the development of their video and document repository
 - Alana Zambone and Susan Bashinski to provide committee members with a copy of the new video permission form approved for use by ECU
 - Standards for db in the CEC competencies to be the organizing principle of repository
2. *Considerations to be discussed at the Fall meeting:*
 - Webinars – a) content of repository and b) infrastructure of the repository
 - Possible conference call or face-to-face meeting with OSEP staff as per Anne's suggestion. Dave Maloof, Jane Hauser and Joann McCann and others from the personnel prep to brainstorm about low incidence needs

Research Group

1. "DB Research Status Report" document was submitted to the group by Susan Bashinski and Christina Reagle.

This report included five additions to the original goals of the NCDB Research Committee work which the NCDB PP agreed.

a.) Add that the committee will "review existing research and identify gaps in the extant literature base" in order to establish a national research agenda, etc.

b.) Add a second "purpose" (to the notion of establishment of a research agenda); this second purpose would be to "guide the work of policy-makers and program authority"

c.) Add a third "purpose" to influence program implementation and improve practice

d.) Add the need for a "conversation" regarding how committee members (and others) might *pursue collaborative research*

e.) Implement a mechanism to have an *on-going conversation* regarding collaborative research

2. *Research Work Group Session*

During the DB Research Status Report discussion a suggestion was made to have a special work session for the research committee in order to move the work into a structural framework. Saturday, July 18th, in Washington, DC, was selected as a cost-effective date because it immediately proceeds the Sunday (7/19) DB conference day and the 2009 OSEP PDM dates. Several NCDB PP Consortium members tentatively agreed to attend this work session.

Roseanna Davidson

Linda McDowell

Bill Sharpton

Alana Zambone

Anne Smith

Christina Reagle

Susan Bashinski

Conclusion/Action Steps

- Anne Smith agreed to contact the hotel to reserve a room for this group's work on July 18th;
- Christina Reagle offered to check on the possibility / availability of hotel rooms, at the OSEP conference rate, for the night of Friday, July 17th.

- Christina Reagle and Susan Bashinski will jointly prepare the agenda and structure for the research work session, July 18th.
- Gail Leslie will gather print copies (1 per article—NOT 1 per attendee) of articles identified to date that were not included in the Davidson, Parker, et al., study for one reason or another (i.e., not single-subject design, identified since the time that research was conducted and published, etc.)
- In addition to the research committee reviewing *only* research published in peer-reviewed journals, consensus was achieved that OSEP policy analysis research (from the 1980's) and position papers and other resources and products from completed federally-supported projects should, also, be reviewed.
- Gail Leslie agreed to compile a list of post-1997 grant projects, awarded by OSEP, that have some relationship to the field of DB.
- The types of products the research committee's efforts might yield include:
 - a.) "State of the Art in DB"
 - b.) "State of True Implementation in DB"
 - c.) "Where Are We...30 Years Later"
 - d.) A report document analogous to the publication by the Department of Health and Human Service / NIH document re: the "State of Autism Research," first distributed to committee members by Ella Taylor and made available at the Cincinnati meeting by Susan Bashinski
- The following changes / additions were made to the teams of individuals who volunteered to review publications for the good of the cause:
 - a.) category iii - (Qualitative Research, Category C) - Holly Cooper and Bill Sharpton (who replaces Anne Smith)
 - b.) category iv - (Qualitative Research, Category D) - ADD: policy research to the already listed types of documents; Linda McDowell agreed to serve with Alana Zambone
 - c.) category v - (Quasi-Experimental Research) - Cathy Nelson and Roseanne Silberman (who replace Ella Taylor)
 - d.) category vi - (Correlational Research - Julie Durando agreed to serve with Susan Bashinski
- Susan Bashinski agreed to have a conversation with Susan Bruce, regarding the most appropriate categorization (in terms of the six categories identified for the work of the research committee's review teams) of "discourse" and "discourse analysis," which currently appear in two different categories.
- Christina Reagle agreed to send electronic copies of the "State of Autism Research" document to personnel prep research committee members.

Agenda Item: Review of Helen Keller Fellows Grant

Christina provided a review of the project

- Cohort #1 (2008-2009) of HK Fellows includes two groups - seven full fellows that received the \$10,000 scholarship and other activities and three partial fellows who did not receive the \$10,000, but did have opportunities to participate in the other activities.
- There was a discussion about the selection process. The HK Fellows Advisory Committee found it hard to select the Fellows because of limited access to the applicants – basically the written application. Beginning with Cohort #2 each of the Universities will select a fellow to represent their university. If there is a conflict or two equally-qualified candidates placing a burden on the University then the HK Fellows Advisory Committee and the University can collaborate in making the decision (maybe a phone interview).
- Since a couple of the current HK Fellows have limited or no education experience it was discussed and decided that the application needs to be clear about some experience with education and a criteria related to leadership.
- There have been some inquiries from people outside of the partner universities; however the NCDB PPC agreed that no applicants should be accepted from universities outside of the personnel prep programs partnering in the project.
- Questions and clarification about education and leadership will be added to the application essay.
- One of the objectives of the HK Fellows grant is to complete a Teacher Work Sample (or a variation) which several of the university partners require. Since a major focus of the grant is leadership it was recommended that this objective be revised to align the TWS with leadership.
- Seven of the Fellows are being matched with states for a two-week internship. The internships are very different in their breath of activities because many of the state projects are not as busy over the summer and the opportunities are varied.

Conclusion/Action Steps

- Applications for the second cohort of HK Fellows are to be out May 18th with a due of July 1st, and selections made by July 15.
- CR will send out topics covered in student webinars to NCDB PP members in order for them to see what is covered and provide suggestions.
- A suggestion was made that a leadership plan or component be integrated into the TWS.

- Christina shared that there will be some changes to the webinar deliver with the next HK Fellow cohort with the intent to tape some of them. It was then suggested that the taped webinars would meet the grant web based training module objective and could become part of the repository.

Agenda Item: Other Activities

- Interest in setting up database of grad students and doctoral students in db was discussed.
- Christina shared that \$10,000 of NCDB PP funds have been established to support research, mentorships or internships in DB for Doctorate or Master level students. Christina will develop a RFP and set up application process so the funds can be utilized before September 30, 2009.
- Christina reported on calls and collaboration efforts with National Center to Improve Recruitment and Retention of qualified personnel for children with disabilities (personnel Improvement Center)
- The NCDB Personnel Packet distributed to each of the universities by DB-Link was discussed and no changes were suggested at this time.
- Next Fall meeting - Anne is suggesting that we consider coming to DC again in the Fall. Dates to consider are October 15-16, or Oct 22-23.