Minutes

Attendees: Barbara Ashmead, Carol Barlow, Susan Berry, Martha Brooks, Carol Lay, Margaret Colvin, Shaunna Crossen, John Dewey, Diana Farrell, Terri Hancharick, Jim Hartman, Miki Hartman, Melanie Hoffmann, Madelyn Jablon, Judi MacBride, Roseann McManus, Diana Moore, Kyle O’Shea, Wendy Roberts, Glenda Scott, Linda Smith, Vicki Spence, Brian Touchette, Doreen Walls, Janine Weber, John Werner, Cheri Woodall

Updates:
Federal Update- Brian received feedback on the DAPA from the federal administrators. The DAPA scores online are satisfactory. The DAPA is not satisfactory on the content areas assessed because it is not yet aligned with Science and Social Studies. The Standards Group has been meeting to work on the standards for Math and ELA, extra meetings have been scheduled to finish these standards and start on Science and Social Studies.

Scoring Plan- Scoring will take place during two weekends this March: 3-12 through 3-14 and 3-19 through 3-21.

Appeals Results- 94 dimensions were appealed. 63 were not changed as a result of an appeal. 31 scores went up due to appeals. Interactions was the dimension which was submitted for appeal the most, mainly due to the “down one rule.”

Participation Guidelines
The Advisory Committee examined draft statements from other states’ Participation Guidelines, in order to revise the DAPA Participation Guidelines document. The Committee met in small groups to discuss revisions the Participation Guidelines. Worksheets with excerpts from other states and comments were collected and will be looked at (unfinished ones can be mailed to CDS). The new Participation Guidelines will state and clarify the consequences (e.g., not receiving a diploma) for all DAPA students.

Exclusion Clause
The Committee also examined other states’ Exclusion Clauses in order to revise the DAPA Exclusion Clause. Currently, there is a 1% cap on who can participate in the DAPA, however there is a wide accommodation base for the DTSP, which should be suitable for most students. Any changes will be reviewed and finalized by early March. The new Exclusion Clause will be used for a year, and then the Committee will review feedback on the new version.
The Committee discussed possible revisions to the Exclusion Clause. These include:
Decreasing the double negative statements, in order to avoid confusion
Stating that participation should not be based solely on having an IEP
Making the Exclusion Clause as concise as possible (using Hawaii’s as a model)
Simplifying the sentences and criteria
Including examples of students who would be eligible to participate in the DAPA
Making the Exclusion Clause a separate document from the Participation Guidelines
The Exclusion Clause may be redundant of the Participation Guidelines, and therefore not necessary
The Exclusion Clause is necessary because the language in the Participation Guidelines is too vague and leaves too much room for interpretation and possible misuse.

Remodeling Update
The Remodeling Group has been meeting and reviewing information from other states in order to make recommendations on how to revise the DAPA Dimensions. They shared their recommendations with the Committee.

Activity Dimension-
Currently everyone receives a score of 4 on this dimension, making it a “gimme.” They recommend that we drop the dimension and move the information to the list of requirements. They discussed the issue of having a “gimme” dimension versus having too many requirements. An additional concern expressed was the desire to move to a 100 point scale, and the effects that dropping a dimension could have on that.

Progress Dimension-
They recommended that Progress be linked to the IEP and content standard. The DAPA target should be established by a team and there should be continuity between the target and the IEP. The entry will have to include a graph with at least 10 data points showing some type of “progress trend” or meaningful accommodations to instruction (which would allow for other types of trends). They also recommended to get rid of the “down one rule” and create a scaled system. They outlined a 2 year phase in plan for this dimension.
The Committee then provided feedback on this Dimension concerning:
Creating a graph could be extra work for teachers
It should be tied to the IEP cycle; it may be difficult to set targets and projective dates
Progress should be well defined for scorers; difficulty establishing continuity with IEP

Independence Dimension-
They recommended that the name be changed to “Self Determination” to be more aligned with other states and best practices. The Advisory Group voted on the name change (all but 3 people supported the change). The TFS should be an IEP objective and the activity chosen should be performed over the entire period. The entry should demonstrate repeated opportunities for Self Determination, and the rubric will be in a hierarchy.
Supports Dimension-
They recommended deleting this dimension because it is difficult to score and has the lowest inter-rater reliability. They suggested listing supports and accommodations under Activity (however, Activity may also be dropped). During group discussion it was suggested that Supports, Activity, and requirements be combined and scored, or to define Activity-based instruction and keep Activity.

Settings-
The group recommended changing the name to “Generalizations.” They discussed the importance of the number of different settings. They will examine the translation to the rubric.

Interactions-
They recommended changing the name to “Social Relationships.” They also recommended changing the definition of peer so that age is no longer a factor. They also discussed the issue of quality versus quantity of social relationships.
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