

## SUMMARY

3/20/2026

### Indiana State Advisory Council (SAC) on the Education of Children with Disabilities

[Online Virtual Meeting](#) & In Person at CIESC, Sunrise Room- P2  
(3500 Depaw Rd, Indianapolis, IN 46268)

#### Call to Order

State Advisory Council Chair Kim Dodson called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. A quorum did not attend.

PIP	Kim Dodson	PIP	Patricia Hartman	A	David Reed/ Alicia Cooper
PIP	Katie Bustamante	PV	Donald Koors	PIP	Michelle Robinson
PV	Lucy Witte	PV	Jonathan Kraeszig	A	Bethany Goetz
A	Paloma Garza	PIP	Kristi Linson	A	Christopher Stilwell
PIP	Dr. Nancy Holsapple	PV	Dr. Dawn McGrath	A	Sarah Watson

P- Present A-Absent

Invited Guests:

- PIP: Maggie Hampton; Office of Special Education, Technical Assistance Specialist
- PIP: Melissa Cavaletto; Office of Special Education, Technical Assistance Specialist
- Mendi Cooley, Parent
- Dr. Lynn Scott

#### Action Items

- 

#### Information Items

- Travel documents are available for in person visitors.
- Ethics training available. SAC members must complete 1 per year
- [1% Participation Updates:](#)
  - Last year Indiana was denied the 1% waiver, which requires additional steps for future work. This year's waiver must focus on making meaningful progress in reducing alternate assessment participation rates and meaningful effort toward progress. This involves:
    - Demonstrate meaningful progress:
      - No greater than 1% identification
      - Decrease in total percentage of IAM participants
      - Decrease disproportionality in any subgroup
    - Demonstrate meaningful effort:
      - Improve implementation of guidelines for participation
      - SEA will take additional steps to support and provide oversight to each LEA that the state anticipates will assess more than 1%

- Describe how it will monitor and regularly evaluate each LEA to ensure the LEA provides sufficient training to CCC participants, implements IAM Guidelines, and that disproportionality is addressed
- Action steps
  - SEA collaborative effort: multiple IDOE teams are working together to build resources to provide to parents who have questions about IAM participation and eligibility
  - Training regarding: graduation pathways, accommodations, alternate assessment/diploma linked together and shared cooperatively
  - Communication: The team is sharing updates in multiple avenues
  - Effort/ impact evidence: Collect more information about how data and resources are being used.
  - Monitoring: Looking at updating steps where needed
  - Data collection: ELA, Math, and Science assessments are reviewed. There is some lack of clarity for LEAs on how those numbers are used.
- LEA Accountability
  - LEAs must submit assurances (50% response rate), justifications (97% response rate), and training participation. These documents are available online for public review.
- 2024-2025SY confirmed 1.25% participation as a state; 58% of LEAs exceeded the 1% cap.
- Council discussion: Are there certain LEAs driving up these numbers, that may require more targeted support?
  - There are some outliers, but they amount to a small number of the total 1% percentage. OSE supports anybody who is reporting over 1% to assure we are providing appropriate guidance.
  - Assessment participation is a CCC decision. The three eligibility questions that CCCs must discuss are in the IEP system. However, lack of knowledge can lead to misidentification.
  - This same information has been shared with INSOURCE so they are prepared to support parents and CCCs participating in these conversations.
  - The waiver is not an IDEA requirement, this data is sent to OESE.
- Council discussion How do we explain to CCCs that these assessment decisions are still a CCC decision if the work that OSE is doing is to get to a collective 1% as a state?
  - With parents, don't approach 1% or cap requirements. We don't want parents thinking a number is tied to their child, rather CCCs should determine the best assessment and approach for that individual student. If, as a state, we are over 1%, there is a plan to put meaningful effort into

meaningful progress. At no time should that conversation be presented to a parent. It is out of the child's control. This can't be an administrative decision, per rules.

- Council discussion: What subgroups are defining disproportionality? How is that information used?
  - This is listed in the waiver.
- Council discussion: Patty Hartman (as a director) was never over 1% before the updated diploma rollout. CCCs are making good decisions. The Alternate diploma is viewed as a vehicle to provide some students with a diploma, which offers a pathway to gainful employment. This 1% cap seems like a penalty. This information was shared in the LEA justification. How do we tell our teams that the alternate diploma is not meant to provide students opportunities for gainful employment?
  - The rethinking high school diploma options offer more ways for students to earn a diploma. CCCs do want students to be marketable with a diploma. Lots of LEAs might have chosen the alternate diploma for this reason, but the federal and state law must be implemented.
  - NCEO is looking to find what confusion states are experiencing. IDOE can speak to what is provided in the justifications to help inform updated guidance/ legislation.
- Council Discussion: What diploma options are available?
  - State is moving to one diploma with different seals.
  - Certificates of Completion are still an option, but these are now a locally developed diploma. If a student was not meeting criteria for other diploma options, they could exit with a COC. This is not a diploma, so students may not be able to gain employment due to employer perception. This might need to be an opportunity to build community awareness.
  - Alternate diploma has criteria to meet, including participating in alternate assessment. This option is for our most significantly cognitively impaired students. This is a more rigorous diploma than the COC.
- Council discussion: There are reasons why some LEAs are over more than others: Some residential placements take students from out of state, or support students who are in a specific eligibility category; co-ops also may concentrate students in the alternate assessment to one LEA's location as a way to pool resources.
  - Noted that if there are changes to what students makes up the percentage, it changes the dynamic of the group.
  - Indiana is not determined to get our numbers to 1%.
- Council discussion: What is 1% of?
  - 1% of completed and valid statewide assessments, this percentage considers all test takers whether it is IAM or other statewide assessments.

- The RDA dashboard shows the highest percentage between math and ELA, but not reflecting science assessments.
    - Council discussion: Look at legislative guidelines to see what Indiana can change based on what we have learned. If there are unintended consequences, our legislators will want to hear about this.
      - The system is working to maintain high expectations for students, LEAs must have practices and procedures to check that students are appropriately placed in their assessments.
    - Council discussion: Has there been an evaluation of the long term consequences (after graduation)?
      - Look at the adult population, and post-graduation outcomes. OSE does a post-graduation survey one year after graduation, and is trying to improve the response rate. LEAs will attempt to gather this data to improve the response rate.
- Educational Benefit Review Pilot grant award announced. This pilot will look at the process of developing an IEP. Participating teams will look at all components of an IEP determine if there is a cogent defense for meaningful education progress for students. Over time, we see lots of cutting and pasting in IEPs. By piloting with 15 LEAs OSE hopes to develop statewide guidance and highlight the experiences of the 15 LEAs. This is technical assistance provided to support LEAs, not a punitive measure. The pilot is a 1 year process. LEAs choose teams (special education, general education, admin, counselors, etc. represented) and IEPs for review.
  - Council discussion: How are LEAs chosen?
    - Application submitted with assurances and budget. \$5000-\$25000 available for stipends, subs, materials, etc.
    - Anyone could apply. Selection based on completion of application, budget related to the process.
    - After 15 LEAs provide feedback, there is an option to use discretionary funds to continue EBRs.
    - Technical assistance specialists will be meeting monthly to bring LEAs through the process. EBRs are not just about fixing IEPs. EBRs teach educators about analyzing, evaluating, and synthesizing data to be able to create policies and procedures, develop PD for incoming teachers, and apply this information to IEP development.
  - Council discussion: Kudos to Nancy (SEA director) for changing the approach of SEA. Offering more support than previous directors. Partnerships between SEA and LEA feel more open. Support is the focus of SEA.
  - Council discussion: Kristi wonders how we can use this process to come alongside LEAs who might need support with decision-making.

- Monitoring team reviews IEPs, expulsion, suspension, graduation, and drop-out data to determine noncompliance. TA team works with those LEAs to complete Root Cause Analyses and Corrective Action Plans.
    - Other supports include the Behavior grant, which was released because of the many students referred to residential placement, requiring special education excess costs. \$6 million set aside for this grant to contract with mental health providers, BCBAs, RBTs, and more.
  - Council discussion: Is there a plan to scale up EBR to more than 15 LEAs? Yes. The goal is to have participants to share their experience with other directors and become supports to other LEAs who want to implement.
- Part B Application posted on webpage, which is open for public comment. Two grants (611 & 619) are included. OSE doesn't set aside any 619 early childhood funds, all funds go to LEAs (\$9.7 million). 611 formula considers new charters and proportionate share, which are pro-rated in the budget. Within Part B package there are admin costs and discretionary funds, the remainder goes to LEAs.
  - Discretionary funds go toward projects outlined by federal government. Indiana funds Crossroads ATLAS project, AEM project through ISBVI, EImagine-Dispute Resolution Database. PASS, ASELI, ASSETT, IEP system, CEC, INCEC subgrant, IEPTA Center, Cambium, ISPROUT, ISEAL, Pyramid Model, Microcredentials for Indicator 13, INSOURCE are all provided through discretionary funds.
  - The remainder, ~\$270 million, is sent to Indiana's 428 LEAs. This is based on a formula provided by the federal government. Must be submitted for approval.
- Staffing Updates: Assistant Director for Technical Assistance, Amy Selby. Lindsay Chase, Technical Assistance Specialist.
- Child Count Updates:
  - School Age: Notice there is an overall increase, but some eligibility areas experienced decreases
  - Early Childhood: Overall decrease
  - Council discussion: This makes sense since there are less children in Early Childhood programs overall. This data aligns with health information as well. Overall, state enrollment is down.
  - April 1 count information will be available at the next meeting.

### **Discussion Items**

- Kim Dodson, For 18-22 year olds. Damar is reporting that they are no longer accepting 18-22 year olds in residential placement. Where are recommendations for these students who need residential placement? Dr. Holsapple will have further discussion on this with DCS. There are limitations on day treatment and residential placements.
- DOH update: New initiative, Alliance Support Care Network through IU Health. Anyone who provides care support to individuals with extensive health care needs. Participants earn badges by completing modules. There will be different levels of badging. Could

include school staff. Looking for more interested participants. After earning badges, participants may join a Community of Practice with others who have similar practices.

- Dr. McGrath will attend June SAC meeting before her retirement at the end of June. Tiffany Neal is also prepared if she is appointed to attend.

### **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

### **Next SAC Meeting Date**

The next meeting is scheduled for June 12. Materials will be emailed to council members prior to the meeting.

### **Adjournment**