

*Feasibility Study Group Meeting
December 4, 2008
12:45 – 3:45*

Attendance: Kathy, Ruth, Jacqui, Jonas, Jim, ALT, Pam

Agenda:

- Review descriptive data from deans' survey and identify where to include in report.
- Review new data analyses
- Cross check alignment with content of Special Act No. 08-5 and identify areas we have not fully investigated or info we do not have.
- Developmental disabilities definition
- Discuss root causes of the issues that might be causing the issues

Discussion

Michael had an emergency and was not in attendance. We will have to reserve new data analyses interpretations until next meeting December 11th.

Jacqui shared data available through the SDE that showed categorical breakdown options across the following variables:

- Age
- Grade
- Race
- DRG
- Placement/setting and Reasons for education placement
- Total Special Education hours
- Check "Yes" for related service
- Service Plan

Jacqui will work with the SDE Bureau of Data Collection to get this information disaggregated by disability category for the report in order to present a statement of need for Connecticut.

Deans' survey likely to address the capacity issue as part of the resource section of this report. The window is open until December 18th – extension granted to higher education organizations. Jim has done a call for participation. Jacqui followed up with an additional call via certification officers in CT December 3, 2008.

ALT Internal Meeting update: Feedback from initial meeting with associate commissioner and Bureau of Educator Preparation - would like more data on what

training occurs across the state. ALT and others suggested that as part of this report we contact each of the CEU providers on Jacqui's list and ask them to provide the number and nature of PD/training they have provided each year. Jacqui will follow up – she send an e-mail inquiry asking the CEU providers to provide information by December 12, 2008..

Developmental disabilities – concerns that linger regarding how we as a State define the term and are working with it given this legislation. Group raised point – developmental disability is not an education term – we need a better definition of low incidence population since this seems to be the population under this legislation. The group reviewed IDEA disability categories and noted the following as likely falling under this legislation:

Autism
Intellectual Dis./MR
Hearing Impairment
Visual Impairment
Deaf/Blindness
Multiple Disabilities
Traumatic Brain Inj

Data: All comments should go in the appendix – we should refer readers to the appendix for specific data. Themes – included some survey findings which may need to be pulled out. Concern that the quantitative and qualitative information is meshed together in a way that is either unclear or not representative of those responding to particular data collection methods.

Report concerns: How much do we include in the report to the legislators? All? Representative comments? Where? Will this supplemental study have a stand alone findings and results section? Do we have a study report that is a second report on its own and refer to the study report?

Internal report notes:

- Need to change the Title for the Themes document.
- What data do we still need? What gaps still exist because we don't have the information?
- Introduction should contain more lay of the land – data – discussed what data we needed to run again. Framing information in terms of state problem statements.
- Reviewed CGA: <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2008/sup/chap166.htm#Sec10-155j.htm>
- Checklist for readers to use that says if we addressed the legislative requirements.

Other areas for consideration now and as part of the final report:

LEND grant

Capacity of CEU providers – number and nature of activities

Draft due to readers by December 23, 2008