



Governor's Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens (GACEC)

GACEC Advisory Committee for the Education of Individuals with Hearing Loss

June 17, 2011* 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM

George V. Massey Station

516 West Loockerman Street

Dover, DE 19904

MINUTES

PRESENT: Wendy Strauss, Chairperson, Executive Director of the GACEC, **Nick Fina**, Choices; **Jill McKinney**, Child Development Watch (CDW); **Tina Fredrickson**, Coordinator, Statewide Programs for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing; **Della Thomas**, Director, Statewide Programs for the Deaf, Hard of Hearing and Deaf-Blind; **Mia Papas**, Coordinator for Guide by Your Side (GBYS), parent of a child who is deaf, and member of Choices; **Kyle Hodges**, Director, State Council for Persons with Disabilities (SCPD); **Debra Trapani**, Elementary School Leader, Statewide Programs for the Deaf, Hard of Hearing and Deaf-Blind and Delaware School for the Deaf (DSD); **Mark Campano**, Coordinator, Statewide Programs for the Deaf-Blind; **Martha Toomey**, Director of Exceptional Children Resources, Department of Education (DOE); **Thierry Morlet**, A.I. DuPont/Nemours; **Loretta Sarro**, Council for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Equality (CODHE); **Janella Newman**, GACEC member and Director of Special Education for Caesar Rodney School District; **Freeman Williams**, Assistant Superintendent of Christina School District

MEMBERS ABSENT: Cindy Farrell, Teacher of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing for Cape Henlopen School District; **Brian Touchette**, DOE.

OTHERS PRESENT: Fran Fletcher, Facilitator, University of Delaware; **Rob Hemenway**, CART services, Karasch and Associates; **Eileen Reynolds**, Teacher of the Deaf; **Donna Ellis**, American Sign Language (ASL) Interpreter; **Pamela Whitney**, ASL Interpreter; **Kristin Mullen**, GACEC Staff

Committee Chairperson Wendy Strauss called the meeting to order at 10:04 AM.

Introductions were made. During the five minute public comment period, Eileen Reynolds spoke about the democratic process, and how the public is free to express concerns without fear of retribution.

The agenda was approved by the committee.

The May minutes were approved by the committee with the following modifications:

- Eileen Reynolds wished to be classified as “Individual”, rather than “Itinerant Teacher of the Deaf and Member of Choices.”
- Page two, fifth paragraph. Mia Papas requested that the second sentence be re-written to state, “She shared that **Guide by Your Side (GBYS)** will now be the initial referral for families of children who are identified as having hearing loss.” “**Guide by Your Side (GBYS)**” replaces “**Hands and Voices (HV)**” in this sentence.
- Page two, fifth paragraph, third sentence was requested to be changed to, “From there, **GBYS** will be the referring children to Child Development Watch (CDW), their home school districts **and** Statewide Programs.” In this sentence “**GBYS**” replaces “**HV**”, and “**and**” replaces “**or**”
- Page four, fifth paragraph was requested to be re-written as follows, “The GACEC approved the list of Listening and Spoken Language (LSL) Sub-Committee recommendations for the Pilot Preschool Classroom in March. **It was the opinion of some committee members that this list should be revised before moving forward.**”
- Page four, sixth paragraph, first sentence, request was made to change the word “**compromise**” to “**resolution**”.
- Page five, first paragraph, first sentence, request was made to re-write to read, “The committee requested that Statewide Programs and Christina School District place a parent of a child who is deaf **from outside of Statewide Programs who is a parent of a child who is deaf and who uses spoken English** on the hiring committee.”

Mia moved to accept the minutes with the aforementioned changes. Tina Fredrickson seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Overview and discussion of the LSL/Auditory Oral and Statewide Programs instructional approaches

Martha Toomey stated that the Department of Education (DOE) will most likely use discretionary dollars to help provide training for A.G. Bell certification for new hires at Statewide Programs for the Deaf, Hard of Hearing and Deaf-Blind (hereafter referred to as “Statewide Programs”). Martha says she does not see a need to require LSL Certification, but that nothing would preclude DOE from using discretionary funds to provide the required A.G. Bell training if necessary. Martha also stated that DOE discretionary dollars could possibly be used to create a program for new families, since it is critically important to reach children prior to age three. It also may be possible to use these discretionary dollars to provide services for kids ages birth to three in Kent and Sussex Counties as well.

Martha shared a survey that she conducted which polled other state's Departments of Education regarding programs for the deaf, hard of hearing and deaf-blind. These states included New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Utah, Missouri, South Carolina, Oklahoma, New Jersey, North Dakota, Colorado, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Texas, Massachusetts, Minnesota and Alaska.

The survey asked "Does your state have a LSL classroom for children who are deaf, partially deaf, or who have cochlear implants?" Of the sixteen states surveyed, 5 replied "yes." These were New Jersey, Michigan, Texas, Massachusetts and Alaska.

When asked, "If you have such classrooms, is there a specific certification required for personnel such as LSL certification through A.G. Bell?" Of the sixteen states surveyed, three replied "yes". These states were New Jersey, Alaska and Massachusetts.

The three states which require LSL certification elaborated as follows:

- New Jersey: "Certification is teacher of deaf oral/aural. Some teachers have pursued additional certification through A.G. Bell."
- Massachusetts: "Teacher of deaf and hard of hearing auditory/oral."
- Alaska: "Also must be American Sign Language (ASL) Certified and do signing."

A copy of this survey was provided to committee members at the June meeting. For additional copies of Martha's survey, please contact the GACEC office.

Sharing of Delaware Statistics and Comments

DOE:

Martha provided information on the Federally-required Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) December 1 "snapshot" of children with disabilities in each state. The "snapshot" data Martha provided was broken down by age. By DOE's calculations, there are 64 children in Delaware who require services from Statewide Programs. Mark Campano stated that this number is closer to 79 or 80, by his count of children he knows Statewide Programs serves.

Martha noted that if a child's primary disability on an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) form is not identified as Deaf or Deaf-Blind, then they would not have shown up in the December 1 count. For instance, Martha said, "there could be a child with a physical disability or a severe intellectual disability who also has Deaf-Blindness, and they might have [some other disability] listed as the primary disability." Wendy noted that while this is currently the case, DOE has stated that they are planning to make changes within the IEP Plus software system used by Delaware schools to reflect more than one disability.

A.I. DuPont/Nemours data on the number of children with hearing loss who receive cochlear implants each year at A.I. DuPont/Nemours. Presented by Thierry Morlet.

Thierry provided information to the committee regarding the number of cochlear implant surgeries performed by A.I. DuPont in Delaware from 2003-2010. A copy of this data was given to each committee member.

Thierry noted that the numbers he was discussing were only representative of children who live and go to school in Delaware. The numbers also only reflect children who were receiving their first cochlear implants. Children who received bilateral implants, done at different times (for example, one implant was performed out of state, and the second was done at a later date at A.I. DuPont in Delaware) were not included in the numbers. The numbers Thierry presented were not disaggregated by age, due to concerns about personally identifiable information.

The numbers provided by Thierry are as follows:

**Number of Cochlear Implant Surgeries
Performed by A.I. DuPont in Delaware 2003-2010**

- 2003- Two
- 2004- Nine
- 2005- Six
- 2006- Two
- 2007- Seven
- 2008- Four
- 2009- Three
- 2010- Ten

Thierry shared that most of these surgeries were performed before the child reached the age of three.

Kyle Hodges asked for clarification on the number of children with cochlear implants in Delaware who were reflected in Thierry's numbers. Due to the number of children with hearing loss with cochlear implants who currently live in Delaware, but who received their implants in a different state or who only received their second implant at A.I. DuPont, would it be possible that there were actually more children with cochlear implants in Delaware who could benefit from a LSL classroom and who are not identified in the numbers Thierry provided? Thierry answered "yes". He also noted that these

numbers do not include children who use hearing aids, and who could also benefit from a LSL classroom.

Statistics from Statewide Programs for the Deaf, Hard of Hearing and Deaf-Blind.
Presented by Della Thomas.

Della stated that the statistics she was presenting were from e-school. Currently, Statewide Programs serves 113 individuals with hearing loss. The numbers include individuals with hearing loss from birth to the age of 21, whether they receive center-based services or not.

Della said the number of students who are deaf-blind who are not served by the center-based program is **54**, according to the December 1 count. Statewide Programs also has 10 children who are deaf-blind but Della didn't want to "double count". The number of students with hearing loss who use a cochlear implant is approximately **12**. Use of the cochlear implant varies, with the students using it some days and not using it on others.

A discussion then took place regarding the benefits of cochlear implants, how to identify the necessity of a hearing aid, cochlear implant or FM system in an IEP, the importance of presenting research-based facts, and how to present useful, cohesive data that everyone can understand.

Martha stated that she was not sure if there was any advantage to seeking more data or statistics. It has already been agreed that there will be a pilot auditory-oral classroom at Statewide Programs in the fall of 2011. Martha stated that she supports moving forward with exploring how we can get a classroom that can serve kids in Kent and Sussex counties.

Wendy posed the hypothetical question of what would happen if the parents of a two-year-old child who attended center-based preschool at Statewide Programs wanted only one or two days of auditory-oral instruction and the rest of the child's instruction to be conducted using ASL. Della said that Statewide Programs would absolutely honor and accommodate that request. Della noted that Statewide Programs offers many different configurations of services for children with hearing loss.

A discussion took place about how to secure data to identify more children in the state who have a hearing loss. Martha stated that districts have this information and know their population. DOE is not able to share much of the data because it is personally identifiable.

Mia stated that some useful information for Delaware could be inferred from national statistics. For instance, Mia said, 10 % of the national population who are hearing impaired are classified as being profoundly deaf. If national statistics of individuals with varying degrees of hearing loss are considered, then 15%-20% of those populations are viable candidates for a cochlear implant.

Mia also shared the December 1, 2009 DOE count of children with hearing loss in Delaware. According to that count, Mia said, Statewide Programs serves 28% of children identified on their IEP as having a hearing loss. The remaining 72% of children identified on their IEP as having a hearing loss are served within their home school districts.

Martha stated that she was surprised by Mia's statistics. Martha stated that many of the children who make up the 72% who are served in their home districts may have a very mild hearing loss and function quite well in their home district classroom. Martha stated that many of these children probably receive educational supports in the manner of FM systems or aided support. Martha stated that she feels this explains why the percentages are skewed.

Mia asked for clarification on educational supports and services. Martha replied that under IDEA, supports and services are comprised of whatever the student needs to make progress in their education.

At this time, Martha said that she did not feel as if the preceding discussion was helpful. Della expressed concern that Statewide Programs would not have ample time to present information on their programs. Wendy requested that Martha share any information she may have so that she could distribute it to the committee.

Sharing of ideas for the Delaware Program. Presented by Nick Fina.

A copy of Nick's presentation was given to each committee member.

Nick said that the Choices group has discussed the committee's work over the past six months, and that the group does not feel that the program proposed by Statewide Programs is right for what is required in Delaware right now. Nick spoke about the Clarke School in Pennsylvania, and their method of LSL instruction. He went on to say that the Clarke School does not offer instruction using ASL, and that doesn't mean they are a bad school. Similarly, the fact that Statewide Programs has a different approach than that of the Clarke School does not make them a bad school. Nick elaborated that Statewide Programs/Delaware School for the Deaf (DSD) is a good school that is right for some children.

Nick noted that the Clarke School and other schools in the Option Program who offer LSL programs have an approach that he feels Statewide Programs is not going to follow.

Nick proposed a program separate from Statewide Programs, run by DOE. He suggested a charter school or a program run within an existing facility. Nick went on to say that the program described by Statewide Programs in the Family Advocacy and Educational Services (FACES) is not a true LSL program. Nick noted the differences between a true LSL/A.G. Bell certified program and what he feels Statewide Programs is planning to offer.

Della requested that Nick refrain from forming and expressing an opinion on Statewide Program's FACES program until Statewide Programs was given an opportunity to present their revised brochure and a full, detailed description of the FACES program.

Kyle suggested that Nick hold his comments until after Statewide Programs had an opportunity to present their information. Freeman Williams reminded everyone that they need to agree to disagree, and remain respectful to one another at all times. Wendy agreed, and stated that Della and Deb Trapani should proceed with their presentation, after which Nick or any other committee members could provide feedback.

Review and discussion of programs currently offered by Statewide Programs and Review and discussion of Statewide Programs Pilot Preschool Program. Combined presentation from Della Thomas and Deb Trapani.

Due to the length of this presentation, a summary of bullet points is provided below. Copies of this presentation were emailed to all committee members. For a copy of the presentation, please contact the GACEC office.

- Presenter Deb Trapani is a person who is Deaf, and has 20 years of experience in the early childhood field. She is currently the elementary school principal for Statewide Programs/ DSD.
- The proposed new preschool pilot program will be called family Education and Child Education Services, or FACES.
- The FACES program serves children with hearing loss and their families from the birth of the child up until the time the child turns five.
- Deb says the focus of the program is to make sure that families have sufficient information to make informed decisions, and to make sure that they are supported through the process.
- The program's focus is on the whole child, not just on how well he or she can hear.
- Children's progress should be monitored by families not just by what is in the child's IEP, but how the child is developing physically, socially, and emotionally.
- The FACES program has two family educators at this time. The family educators work very closely with families. The family educators work on the family's relationship as a whole, and strive to ensure that parents feel informed and confident.
- Family educators have to possess sociolinguistic diversity. This is comprised of a variety of skills, content knowledge, and background areas to fit with the diverse different families they serve.
- FACES defines "natural environment" not just as the home environment, but also a center based environment where families can interact with one another.
- This definition of "natural environment" is supported by the 2007 paper by the Joint Commission on Infant Hearing Screening. Discussion in the paper about natural environment came to a general consensus that students derived the most benefit from an environment where families met other families and other members of the deaf community and experienced bonding between families.

- At the age of three comes a “transitional piece.” This does not necessarily mean that a child is relegated to one particular program. This is a point in time that they begin to look at what the options are based on where a child is “leaning.” This is done in conjunction with CDW.
- The programs offered by Statewide Programs, in a nutshell, involve family advocacy, educational services, home or agency based day care, site-based and school-based programs.
- Three different groups, all beginning with “PIP” (Partners in Play). These groups are divided into birth-18 months, 18 months-age 3, and then age 3 to age 5.
- Home care services are available for any additional immediate or extended family members, day care providers, who are caregivers, even if they are not living in the home with the child.
- Statewide Programs gives families a chance to meet with other adults with hearing loss, who use different types of communication.

LUNCH BREAK-12:19 PM

- Statewide Programs offers comprehensive programs with related services, physical therapy (PT), occupational therapy (OT), early education and intervention along with audiological services.
- Statewide Programs assists families of children with hearing loss with a number of things resulting in a holistic approach to providing what is best for their child. This can include explanations of terms and acronyms, spending time with the child’s family and siblings, helping to locate and provide related service providers, information on hearing health, different technology options and how to use them, and more.
- Three parameters: signacy, oracy and literacy. All families do not attend to all of these. Some may only wish to focus on literacy and oracy, so Statewide Programs’ development and concentration will be on the things the family has requested for their child.
- Statewide Programs site-based educational services are bilingual. This means that both ASL and English are used, expressively and receptively for both languages.
- Literacy-referring to reading and writing.
- Oracy-referring to English, which includes spoken English and lip reading.
- Typical preschool day at Statewide Programs includes checking of assistive technology (AT) devices to ensure proper function, center time (including reading, writing, science, manipulatives, drawing, etc...), snack time, nap time, small group instruction to encourage literacy and language development, activities to encourage fine and gross motor skills, and large groups for events like story time or concept introduction.
- Language programming for the preschool is based on the individual needs of each child.
- Monitoring assessments are ongoing regardless of which method of communication the child is using.
- There is no ASL used in the spoken English classroom.

- Access to language is essential auditorially, visually, and cognitively. It is not about the mode of communication or if the child can hear or not, it is about the input that the brain receives to encourage development and stimulation. This input can occur through both sign and speech.
- The interview process for the classroom teacher was scheduled to happen the last week of June through July 8, 2011. Candidates are in place, and interview questions are being prepared. Once the questions are prepared, interviews will be conducted. Once the hiring committee has a recommendation, it will be presented to the Christina School District.
- There are currently five four-year-old students involved in the auditory oral pilot preschool program. All of the children are hard of hearing. None have cochlear implants.
- The families of all five children have requested that the children spend part of their day in the ASL classroom, and the other half in the auditory oral classroom.
- For the pilot preschool classroom, one student is from the Brandywine School District, one is from Red Clay School District, one is from Colonial School District, and two are from the Christina School District.
- Mia Papas, parent of a child who is deaf and GACEC Advisory Committee on the Education of Individuals with Hearing Loss member, will serve on the Statewide Programs interview committee.

As the presentation ran an hour and 15 minutes past the allotted time, a discussion took place regarding whether to allow the committee to ask questions about the presentation, or to proceed to reviewing Goals 1-9 as stated on the agenda. It was noted that allowing questions before proceeding to discussion of Goals 1-9 would push the meeting past its scheduled end time. The CART services provider and interpreters were polled to see if they would be willing to extend their services. They agreed.

Question and answer/comment period for FACES and programs offered by Statewide Programs presentation.

Mia-Q: Where is the missing piece for the profoundly deaf children from birth to eighteen months, or 18 months to age three, whose parents want an auditory/oral language outcome? How are they being prepared to enter the spoken English classroom at age 3, 4, or 5?

Deb-A: We are certainly open to expanding and modifying the options that we offer, but we cannot create a class without students. This is an IEP driven process, and currently there is no critical mass of students in that age group who have that identified need.

Martha-Q: The objective is to create, and make people aware of, this auditory/oral/spoken language classroom being available, recognizing that it may take some time to grow, correct?

Deb-A: Yes, if it fits the needs of most of the students.

Mia-Q: Will the teacher who is teaching the five day a week program also be the person who will be providing bi-weekly or monthly services to children in their homes? That seems like a lot of responsibility to place on one individual.

Della-Clarifying Q: Do you mean a therapist who will work directly with the child from birth to 18 months?

Mia-Clarification: Yes. Where is the child-directed therapy from a person who is knowledgeable about spoken language development?

Della-A: That is provided by CDW.

Mia-Clarification: I am not talking about a Speech Language Pathologist (SLP), but an auditory verbal educator, a teacher who understands educational processes of language, such as the things Deb would know about education and language versus speech.

Tina Fredrickson-A: A lot of times when a teacher of the deaf is going into the home and a SLP, pretty much everything overlaps except for the articulation. A lot of times your AT therapists are SLPs first and foremost. They have finally split the distinction so there is Audio Visual Management (AVM) and Auditory Verbal Therapy (AVT) now, but if you look at the majority of LSL licensed people, right now they are speech therapists.

Deb-Point: When I was conducting my research looking at A.G. Bell or LSL certification and Audio Visual (AV) teachers, I looked at Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania and New Jersey there are only 22 certified AVT and Educational Audio Visual (EAV Ed.) therapists. None are in Delaware.

Mia-Point-There is one who serves Delaware, although she lives in Pennsylvania.

Martha-Comment-We need to focus on competencies, rather than any specific kind of certification. We can bind our hands if we do that. When Brian Touchette realized two meeting ago that LSL meant A.G. Bell certified and possessing a certain set of requirements, he had an “ah-ha” moment. When I asked many of the directors in other states about LSL, they were not familiar with the term. But that does not mean that they do not have competent oral/aural programs. I agree that we need strong early intervention.

Mia-Comment-It concerns me greatly that the directors that you spoke with in other states do not know what LSL and LSL certification are. At the very least, they should be aware of the controversy surrounding the subject.

Nick-Comment- I agree with Martha about competencies. I had a conversation with Kathleen Treni, who runs the program in Bergen County New Jersey. She has a real LSL program which follows the specific standards, so she hires people who have the A.G. Bell certification. She often has difficulty finding them due to the scarcity of individuals with that certification. There are 22 people in four surrounding states. There are 500 nationwide. If she cannot find someone who already has LSL certification, she finds graduates with initial certification and re-trains them.

Martha-Comment-Again, I believe the focus should be on competencies. I believe there is more agreement than disagreement in this group. I for one am ready to move forward.

Let's get this classroom up and running and begin to have our discussion about how to build the program in Kent and Sussex, as well as strengthening the birth to three piece.

Nick-Comment- I would like the opportunity to review Deb's Power Point presentation slides in detail. I don't know that I am in agreement, necessarily, with the program that has been proposed. I would like to opportunity to review the slides and respond in writing.

Kyle-Q: If there was a parent out there who wanted their child to be in a spoken English only classroom, would there be an option available for that?

Deb-A- Absolutely. We can look at a spoken English class all day. But, at the moment, we have five students who will be in half a day in an ASL classroom, and half a day in a spoken language classroom. If there are other students who come and require an all-day spoken language classroom, we can certainly create that.

Mark Campano-Comment- I feel that we should not hold up the process of moving forward, so that any individual can review the program to their personal satisfaction. There comes a point where we have to move on.

Della-Comment- This has been a lot of work to create. And I don't think we can anticipate all of the things that are going to come up right now. I think we've put together a very reasonable, logical, methodical approach. And as time moves on, we will review it, and will continue to do assessments to be sure that we are doing what needs to be done for the kids.

Kyle-Q: When you expand this program to Kent and Sussex, I assume that the spoken language only classroom will be an option then, too?

Wendy-A- Yes.

A motion was made by Della Thomas to accept the Statewide Programs proposed plan for the auditory/oral classroom as presented by Deb Trapani. Tina Fredrickson seconded the motion.

Discussion took place about final questions and concerns about moving forward. Issues included children in Kent and Sussex counties, children who are identified but are not being served by Statewide Programs and parents who are unable to advocate for appropriate services for their child.

Nick-Comment- We are not supposed to be voting. We are supposed to achieve consensus before we vote, it's in the committee's charter. We should not be entertaining motions right now. We should be working toward consensus. There was no search for consensus in the process we followed this afternoon.

Fran Fletcher-Comment- As we discussed previously, in January, consensus does not mean getting everyone who is sitting at the table to agree. You don't have to agree, but

you can support. Voting is the only way to know for certain what other committee members thoughts are.

Della-Comment-I have looked up the definition of consensus that we discussed in the charter. It is “a decision where most members of the advisory committee are in agreement. And the members not in agreement can still support for the common good.”

Nick-Comment- There were many good things about Deb’s presentation, but there were also many things that I would not advise for this program. I do not understand why we are not doing the true LSL program as defined by A.G. Bell’s standards. What is wrong with that, and is that something we could have or should have done? I do not understand why we did not consider this as an alternative to what you are offering.

Freeman-Comment-You have a right to disagree. As I understand it, “consensus” as we defined it means that you can say there are many things we discussed that I can agree with. There are many things we discussed that I agree with, and many that I don’t. But the question each individual on this committee has to ask his/herself is am I willing to accept the entire package as presented. We are never going to have total agreement across the board, because we are very diverse people.

At this time, Deb noted her concern for the CART and ASL interpreter service providers, as they had been working for many hours without a break. Deb suggested voting on the motion which was mentioned before.

To re-state, the **motion was made by Della to accept the Statewide Programs proposed plan for the auditory/oral classroom as presented by Deb Trapani. Tina Fredrickson seconded the motion.**

Votes:

IN FAVOR: Freeman Williams, Della Thomas, Loretta Sarro, Janella Newman, Deb Trapani, Martha Toomey, Mark Campano and Tina Fredrickson=**8 in favor**

OPPOSED: Nick Fina and Jill McKinney=**2 opposed.**

ABSTENTIONS: Kyle Hodges, Thierry Morlet and Mia Papas=**3 abstentions.**

Motion carried.

Wendy noted that she will take this vote back to the full GACEC. Kyle said that he is also taking the vote back to his council, the State Council for Persons with Disabilities (SCPD), and that this is why he abstained from voting.

At this time, Wendy noted that it was 25 minutes past the scheduled end time for the meeting. The service providers agreed to extend their time to 3:00 PM if they were allowed to take a short break.

BREAK

Re-convene-2:36 PM

Review, discussion and vote on Statewide Programs proposed Goals 1-9

Wendy noted that after the break, five of the committee members left, which left eight committee members to discuss Goals 1-9. It was confirmed that per the committee's by-laws, a quorum is not necessary for the committee to vote on a motion.

Wendy asked Deb if the proposed revisions had been made to the FACES brochure. Deb answered yes.

Wendy said that the remaining business to be discussed were Goals 1-9 as previously presented, and to discuss the progress of a meeting between designees from Statewide Programs and A.I. DuPont/Nemours. Wendy reminded the committee that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is due to the GACEC from the Statewide Programs and A.I. DuPont/Nemours group by August 2011. Wendy also noted that the group has not met yet.

Wendy reminded the committee that they still need to discuss forming a sub-committee to focus on Goal 8.

Della said that the Goal 1-9 document is a working document. This document has been presented to and reviewed by the committee prior to this meeting, and revisions have been made as the committee moved along. Della said that she would like to report to the committee on a regular basis on the progress of the goals.

Della noted some changes, including changing some wording in Goal 7 from "LSL" to "spoken English".

Discussion took place between Della and Martha regarding one of the goals, in which Della had stated a desire to have ASL acknowledged as a world language requirement for admission to state institutions of higher learning. Martha suggested that Della frame the question and send it to Greg Fulkerson, who is the world language person at DOE.

Della said that she would like to add an action step under Goal 5 to require ASL to be recognized as a world language, and that it can satisfy institutes of higher learning's language requirement for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.

Mia made a motion to add an action step under Goal 5 to work toward ASL being recognized as a world language and that it can satisfy institutes of higher learning's

language requirement for deaf and hard-of hearing students. Mark seconded this motion. Motion carried.

Before a motion was made to accept Goals 1-9 with the above mentioned changes, Mia asked if it were possible to explicitly state within the goals document that this is a work in progress, and that it will continue to develop.

Kyle made a motion accept the goals as written, with the condition that Mia's wording be added, and to also state that the goals must be reviewed by the committee bi-annually (every six months). Della seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Regarding forming a sub-committee centered on Goal 8

Wendy addressed the committee regarding forming a sub-committee to focus on Goal 8. Della, Mark, Tina, Deb and Mia expressed an interest in serving on this sub-committee. Martha also said that she felt Brian Touchette would be interested in taking part. Martha also suggested inviting special ed directors statewide. Tina asked Wendy if she could provide the GACEC with a list of names to contact for the proposed sub-committee, and if the GACEC could then send out official invitations. Mia suggested reaching out to A.I. DuPont and the newborn hearing screening specialist.

Wendy noted that for most of the GACEC's sub-committees, staff support, CART and interpreters are not provided. She asked Della what the expectations for this sub-committee were for the GACEC. Della replied, "I would say your time. Statewide Programs will take care of the rest." Della said that she would like this sub-committee to begin meeting in September of 2011.

A.I. DuPont and Statewide Programs work group report

Wendy requested information on the status of the work group. Tina stated that she had made numerous attempts to contact people at A.I. DuPont and had been unsuccessful. Mia suggested that Tina attempt to contact people at a slightly higher level. Tina agreed to try this, and Wendy also stated that the GACEC would be willing to help out in reaching someone at A.I. DuPont/Nemours.

Next meeting

The committee discussed their next meeting. It was agreed to meet again at the already scheduled Wednesday, November 9, 2011 meeting at the O'Neill building.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 PM.

A full 156 page transcript of this meeting is available from the GACEC upon request.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin Mullen
GACEC

