

# Personnel Prep Consortium Meeting

May 15, 2008

8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Sheraton Safari  
Orlando, FL

**Facilitator:** Linda McDowell & Ella Taylor      **Note taker:** Linda McDowell & Ella Taylor

## Attendees:

Linda Alsop, Melissa Engleman, Gail Leslie, Susan Bruce, Mary Jean Sanspree, Susan Bashinski, Linda McDowell, Roseanna Davidson, Effie Laman, Rosanne Silberman, Bill Sharpton, Julie Durando, Diane Pevsner, Gloria Rodriguez Gil, Jerry Petroff

## Minutes

---

### Agenda item: Introductions

#### Discussion:

Since there were a couple of new individuals we all introduced ourselves.

#### Conclusions:

Gloria was attending on behalf of Maurice Belote & Pam Hunt. Diane is a UAB doctoral student and was attending at the invitation of Mary Jean. Julie is a NCLVI Fellow and was attending at the invitation of Ella.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ None	All	

---

### Agenda item: CEC SPA

**Presenter:** Mary Jean Sanspree

#### Discussion:

Intervener competencies were presented and edited at the CEC meeting in Boston. The professional competencies will be revised and presented at the September board meeting for edits. Both will be distributed to professionals in the field for feedback. This will be done through Survey Monkey. Hopefully, both will be ready for final board review and potential approval by April 2009.

#### Conclusions:

Revisions are being made to professional competencies. Mary Jean, Alana, and Linda A. are spearheading the effort.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Revise professional competencies for CEC meeting in September	Mary Jean, Alana, Linda A.	ASAP
✓ Send email lists/listserv ideas to Mary Jean for Survey Monkey distribution	All	Aug 1
✓ Do a crosswalk of competencies with NCDB Service Provider OPIs	Ella	Aug '08

---

### Agenda item: Research Work Group

#### Discussion:

Roseanna shared the work she, Amy Parker and Devender Banda presented at CEC in Boston (2008) which compiles single-subject research conducted including individuals with deaf-blindness between 1965 – 2006. They developed a rubric based on the CEC quality indicators for single-subject research (2003) in order to identify and classify studies. Since these authors focused on single-subject design, no correlational, empirically descriptive or

---

other qualitative design type articles were included. Roseanna and Amy's chart includes: author & year, participant age/etiology, dependent variable, independent variable, adaptations for db, setting, design and results/indicators. They then compiled one of these charts for each of the NCDB Child OPIs. Only 4 Child OPIs have single-subject design articles (Expressive Communication (C.04), Orientation & Mobility (C.06), Child/Youth Increased Self-care (C.07), and Employment post-secondary (C.15). There are no single-subject design articles on Receptive Communication (C.03).

Predicated upon this work, Roseanna disseminated a matrix for classifying, organizing and initiating research in the field. This matrix incorporates the types and amounts of evidence, the levels of evidence and the stages of programs of research. The following is a verbatim transcription from Davidson & Parker (2008), Lines of Research in Deafblindness.

#### "Type & Amounts of Evidence

- (A) Well-established (APA)
  - a. 2 well-conducted group design studies written by different researchers
  - b. 9 well-conducted single-subject designs
- (B) Emerging & effective (Odom, et al, 2003)
  - a. 4 – 6 well-conducted single-subject design studies
- (C) Probably efficacious (APA)
  - a. 2 group design studies by same investigator or at least 3 single-subject designs
- (D) Promising practice (What Works Clearinghouse)
  - a. Qualitative research

#### 4 Levels of Evidence: ASHA & Oxford Centre

Level I evidence derives from meta-analysis including at least 1 randomized experimental design or well designed randomized control study

Level II evidence includes controlled studies without randomization and quasi-experimental designs (single-subject research would fall in this level)

Level III evidence is well-designed non-experimental studies (correlation and case studies)

Level IV evidence includes expert committee report, consensus conference, and clinical experience of respected authorities.

#### Stages of Programs of Research

Stage 1: Review of literature and Meta-analysis

Stage 2: Model demonstrations – controlled lab experiments and classroom-based demonstration and design experiments.

Stage 3: Validation – Randomized trials or multiple single-subject studies.

Stage 4: Translational Research – Evaluate organizational factors.”

The **Lines of Research Summary** matrix (Davidson & Parker, 2008) shows the NCDB Child OPIs with a classification for each based on the (1) next stage of research required; (2) amount of evidence; and (3) level of evidence for each child outcome. While the summary that Roseanna distributed includes only single-subject research, the group agreed that it could easily be used for all types of research in order to indicate the breadth and depth of research within the field. The matrix could easily be used to identify what level and type of research is necessary within a particular topic area.

Many, many thanks to Roseanna & Amy for sharing their hard work and ideas in order to help us move forward in a research design.

---

**Conclusions:**

- (1) Develop rubrics for each level of research within the Exceptional Children (2003) related to quality indicators.
- (2) Review literature in field and complete rubrics.
- (3) Review literature in related fields.
- (4) Use Lines of Research Summary (Davidson & Parker, 2008) for all classifications.
- (5) Use Summary to identify research opportunities and possible IES funding.

**Action items**

**Person responsible**

**Deadline**

- |   |  |                                   |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| ✓ Replicate the process with other levels of evidence & adjust chart to reflect additional research other than single-subject | Research subgroup (S. Bashinski, S. Bruce, Jerry, Roseanna, Amy, Ella and others who are interested) | Ongoing                           |
| ✓ develop protocol per each research-design (see CEC journal of types)  | Research subgroup (S. Bashinski, S. Bruce, Jerry, Roseanna, Amy, Ella and others who are interested) | Share chart designs at PDM (July) |
| ✓ after chart creation, invite in researchers (“old and new”) from the field (Research group)                                 | Research subgroup (S. Bashinski, S. Bruce, Jerry, Roseanna, Amy, Ella and others who are interested) | After July PDM                    |

**Discussion:** Area 1 practices collection

Gail shared the process Area 1 used to gather common practices across the region. The Area 1 states wanted to address the question “What are the ways we can work together to identify practices, collect info, and collect data about the effectiveness of those practices?”. Each state was asked to identify three child specific strategies and three TA strategies. [This would be a Level IV type of data collection using Roseanna’s chart.] The lists they developed were compiled by Tom Udell and aligned with the NCDB OPIs.

**Conclusions:**

- (1) Area 1 is engaged in a Level IV type data collection (clinical findings).
- (2) Encourage Area 1 to turn their findings into a proceedings type article so that it becomes a consensus or expert committee type document.
- (3) JVIB may be interested in publishing this as a practice report type article. We could compare Area 1 findings to other area findings.

- |   |             |          |
|---|-------------|----------|
| ✓ See if Area 1 (Paddi & Tom) are interested in working on this further   | Gail        | July PDM |
| ✓ Explore the possibility of replicating this study (with possible research design modifications) in the other areas. | Gail & Ella | July PDM |
| ✓ Discuss with Roseanna components that need to be included to reference on Lines of Research Summary                 | Gail        | July PDM |

**Discussion:** Grant ideas

Given our conversations about the Lines of Research summary and the Area 1 data collection, we briefly discussed the possibility of pursuing a Goal 1 or Goal 2 IES grant. Goal 1 grants are identification projects and include the possibility of detailed literature reviews/meta-analysis. Goal 2 grants are development projects.

Goal 1 could be identifying and classifying literature using the rubrics developed by the research sub-group.

Goal 2 could be that we identify literature in significant disabilities that supports the practices collected by Area 1

---

and then conduct an extension to see the results with children with DB. It was also suggested that we may want to develop an assets map to examine state initiatives that may or may not include students with DB.

**Conclusions:**

Explore Goal 1 and Goal 2 possibilities

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Disseminate IES NC SER RFP	Ella	June 5
✓ Initiate further discussion about grants through listserv	Ella	Mid-June
✓ Explore assets map possibility	Gail & Bill	July PDM

**Agenda item: Personnel Training**

**Discussion:**

Ella shared the components of the PP grant submitted in January. There are several areas that we could collaborate on even if we are not successful in the grant competition. We briefly discussed the possibility of hosting graduate and doctoral students at the yearly topical. We also discussed the possibility of developing a systems training to occur after the topical as described in the grant proposal.

Bill Sharpton provided a brief summary of his project that involves moving coursework to video-conferences, and developing an electronic repository of video clips providing examples of exemplary practices. S. Bashinski shared that a similar video repository effort has been going on in Kansas. The goal is to organize clips by practices that are also aligned with the CEC standards. Gail discussed that DB-Link is often asked to do something similar.

**Conclusions:**

- (1) Explore hosting graduate and doctoral students at topical.
- (2) Initiate linkage between Bill, S. Bashinski, and Gail to explore development of video respository.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Talk with Kat about hosting graduate and doctoral students at topical conferences	Ella	June '08
✓ Initiate collaboration between Bill's project and NCDB IS regarding video repository	Gail	June '08

**Agenda item: Intervener & Teacher Certification**

**Discussion:**

Linda Alsop discussed the efforts around intervener and teacher certification. Certification is a very difficult road to go down. It is quite expensive to develop a test, need to show that certain % can be successful on each item of the test, and need to address any legal issues related to those who are unsuccessful. Minimally there needs to be at least 100 people who are willing to pursue certification each year. There also must be something in it for person who gets certification otherwise no motivation to pursue. This may be confounded when when individuals may not have a bachelor's degree. Certification for interveners would put DB interveners out of alignment with other similarly situated professionals. Rather than certification, the next step is likely a credentialing process. Director of ACVREP is working on what that might look like. DB Intervener group will review this process to determine if those are the next steps. Still looking at levels of certification (Level 1 – 18 hours; Level 2 – 28 hours; Level III – AA degree) – allows individual to continue to advance skills. Need to be sure that levels are reflected since universities are now advancing courses for interveners in DB.

Teacher certification – conversation not as far along. Need to build upon CEC SPA process.

2 levels – national (build standards); state (work with DOE licensing vehicle so that it is reflected in state licensure)

States very different around how they determine highly qualified & how that is determined

Two steps

- 1) Put national vehicle in place – CEC SPA
- 2) Help states think about how to approach this within each state

**Conclusions:**

The national intervener group will continue to explore credentialing. Linda A. will provide updates to PP group.

<b>Action items</b>	<b>Person responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
✓ Update from national intervener group	Linda A.	Ongoing

---

## ***Other Information***

---

**General info**

We are hopeful that we might be able to briefly meet at the July Project Director's meeting. We are continuing to explore this possibility and will let everyone know if this becomes a possibility. Travel would not be funded by NCDB for this meeting.

**Resources:**

NCDB uses Meeting Wizard (<http://www.meetingwizard.com/>) a free, online resource for identifying potential meeting times for a group of individuals.

**Special notes:**

A Meeting Wizard will go out to identify conference call possibilities.

---