

ROUGHLY EDITED COPY

ACDHH

JUNE 8, 2022

TASK FORCE MEETING – SENATE BILL 1092

Captioning Provided By:

Caption Pros

20701 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 107-245

Scottsdale, Arizona 85255

www.captionpros.net

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. CART captioning, Communication Access Realtime Translation, is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. It is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.



>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Hello, everyone. Okay, is everyone ready? Hi. I'll just go ahead and get started in the interest of time. I do see a few of you online. Hello there, Tawny.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Hello, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon for me, I suppose. Welcome, everyone. I hope you've had a good start to your Wednesday. I'd like to ask everyone, except the interpreter, who is voicing for me, to turn your cameras off. Great. Thank you. I'll wait a moment for Chyla to let me know if we are ready for the live stream. Perfect.

With your currently livestreaming. I am Tawny Holmes Hlibok. This is our final task force meeting, but not the last meeting overall, for the purposes of this bill. We will have some more work to do after the task force is complete, but this is our final task force meeting, so I would like to thank everyone for being here today, and for being prepared as we focus on the final phases of our report related to the language acquisition for deaf, hard of hearing, and DeafBlind children here in the state of Arizona.

I am very much looking forward to that report and the recommendations. It reflects the hard work that all of the subcommittees have been performing, and the entire task force as well. So I look forward to seeing the fruits of our labor.

I'd like to make sure everyone has access to our PowerPoint. I will place the link in the chat and everyone should be able to access it on the website while streaming this meeting as well. So, I will mention what slide I'm on, but I will not be sharing it in the Zoom meeting. So if you have questions, feel free to put them in the chat, or to reach out to the ACDHH staff.

I'd also like to remind you to please mute your microphones, to make sure that we have no background noise for the interpreting process. And if you have a comment, you can go ahead and unmute to make your comment when it's your turn.

We also have captioning available. If you'd like the captioning, you can select that button on the bottom of the screen.

Okay. I'm just getting my PowerPoint ready. And I'm going to go ahead and skip to slide four at this time and talk a little bit about the agenda for today.

Okay, hopefully you can all see the agenda. We are tracking our process for the final recommendations, and I will talk briefly about that. And then we'll get reports from each of the various subcommittees related to the template and any other concerns, questions, or information that you'd like to share with the task force and the general public.

And then the third thing on the agenda is that we will review the forum agenda, which will be happening on July 18th. So don't forget to mark your calendars for that, if you haven't already. Most of you hopefully will be able to join us at that meeting as well. So we look forward to getting the public input for our considerations and to share our progress with them as well.



Now I'd like to move to slide 5.

As far as tracking our progress, you might see that we've had a number of recent subcommittee meetings throughout the month of May, and I also see a question in the chat asking if the public forum is in June or July. And I do want to clarify that. Yes, it's June 18th. Sorry if there was confusion on that. It is June 18th. It's a Saturday. June 18th.

In terms of tracking the progress, the subcommittees did meet, and talked about what needs to be on the report, and I did participate in the meetings with all of the subcommittees to observe a little bit, and there was some great discussion. So today's meeting is the final task force meeting, and I would like to talk a little bit about what I saw in each of the various reports, and then have an opportunity to put them all together in one place. So that the subcommittees and task force as a group can look through all of that information in advance prior to the forum that we will be having, so that we can share a draft proposal with the recommendations for the three subcommittees all compiled into one report.

And that will be available in both English, Spanish, and then in ASL translation as well.

The last thing on the slide is that after that public forum on the 18th, we will take a moment to have a final subcommittee meeting with each of the subcommittees to see if we need an opportunity to finalize any specifics on the recommendations, and that will happen between June 22nd and the 30th. So after those subcommittee meetings, I need to complete the report by June 30th.

I see another question on the chat, and I'll let someone from the ACDHH staff respond to that regarding the invitation for the public forum and whether or not that was going to go out.

I'm currently on slide 6. And we are talking about the building blocks. This is a nice visual on how we've been able to gather and pull all of our information together. We've had task force meetings. We've had discussions and share-outs with information, concerns, challenges, frustrations. And we've also identified some terrific resources that we've been able to share.

And the subcommittees have had more participation from the community and experts to talk a little bit on a deeper level about some of the opportunities we have to fix the system for language acquisition for all, and I'd like to emphasize the "all" in that. It's not just some or few. It is all deaf, hard of hearing, and DeafBlind children in the state of Arizona.

So, we are now approaching the end of our work so that we can submit our recommendations, and then return to the task force for our final recommendations for ACDHH to review, and then those can be submitted to the Arizona legislative body. So it's an exciting moment for the state of Arizona. And we know that we're not going to be able to resolve all of the world's problems overnight. And that's not how this system is designed to work. But it is amazing that we've been able to share and learn more about this process, identify gaps and challenges, and find some terrific benefits in our system as well, as well as opportunities.



So I look forward to the work we have ahead going forward as well.

Now, with that, I'd like to go over to Slide 7. And before I turn it over to the subcommittees for updates, I'd like to just check in to see if there are any questions.

Okay, it seems there are none at this point. They are welcome at any time. I would like to hand it over to our subcommittees. And we'll start with the assessment review committee, please. I'm not sure who... okay, hello, Jennifer.

>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: Hi. We do have Michael Olivier here as well to support with this report. So I guess I'll just go ahead and begin.

We did have a subcommittee meeting a few times, and we do have a variety of people who were able to meet at each of those subcommittee meetings. So we did put together a template, and we filled in as much information as we could about our findings for the data, or assessments that we do offer currently.

But we prefer to persistently offer those options for all deaf, DeafBlind, and hard of hearing individuals and children across Arizona. And yes, I do agree with the emphasis of "all."

I don't know if you prefer that I share the template, or you can do it --

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Sure, I'll go ahead and turn my camera off if you'd like to share it.

>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: Yeah, you know, since it's on your phone.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I actually don't think I have access to it. If you don't mind, if you have access to it, you can share it.

>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: Sure.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Let me just make you co-host. Actually, Chyla, can you please make Jennifer co-host?

Okay, Michelle and I will turn our cameras off so it's easier to see.

>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: Okay. Can everyone see this? This is the report on the assessment subcommittee. So we do have the findings here. Some are still labeled, but I do want to double-check some of that information, just to make sure that it's all accurate. The highlighted information. There are some areas that are left blank, so we are still in the process of researching that information of the areas that are blank.

For example, the communication spreadsheet, we are making sure that -- what the challenges are for that specific leader communication matrix, rather. For that specific assessment, we are thinking of what the challenges are. So that's currently the only assessment that's offered specifically for multiply disabled children.

We do want to emphasize that we offer that assessment across the state of Arizona.

So as you can see, some of the assessments, we explored and added some things -- we explored current assessments and some things that were not already added to the system. Or offered.



For example, the ASLAI Assessment we would like to offer. However, it's not currently offered in Arizona. It would be for older children, for students. It is currently on hold because of the COVID pandemic. So we did kind of put in that we wanted to have that assessment, and it is something that we would love to offer, and there are a lot of pros and also some cons because it is on hold.

There's another assessment that has a huge con, is the ASL-EST, and that assessment, we would like to offer all over the state. However, there is -- so there's only one certified person in Arizona to administer that assessment.

So our recommendations we left blank because we actually have a lot of recommendations that we just have to write down on paper. Just give me one second.

So these are our current recommendations. I'm just looking at the first one here, the first bullet point. We did explore some other examples of assessments, as you know. We did get state samples for Pennsylvania, California, and a variety of other states.

And we took a look at what would best fit us here in Arizona. Some did and some did not. In Arizona, we previously had some sort of system for assessments and a team that would go all over the state, set up across the state, and several people have been in discussions about the idea of restarting that process, restarting that group. So that is another question we have.

The group did come together and wanted to reestablish themselves. So we are offering that possibility. So that's our number one recommendation, to start up a statewide team for assessment.

A really big positive thing for that is the team would all have different varieties of expertise related to language and assessments, because we do see that there is a wide list of assessments, and it is really challenging to provide all the expertise in each of those avenues, so we need a lot of people to bring bear their specialty and their professionalism to that area. It is required especially for language, for skills, and we want to be able to provide support during the IEP process and IFSP process.

So that support does not replace parents. It is just providing feedback for the team as a whole. It will also include the students when they have an IEP, the 504 plan, as well as -- please correct me if I'm wrong. I think there are four specific areas or categories for students. It's the IEP, the 504 plan, those students who have ADA accommodations, and finally, those students who don't have accommodations at all.

So that means we would support all students.

Next, we have recommendations for the frequency of assessments. We do have birth to 3 as well as kindergarten. Birth to kindergarten will be offered -- the assessment will be offered twice a year. And kindergarten through 12th grade, it will be offered once a year.

We did take a good look at the evaluation process, and what skills and qualifications are needed to define here.

We did point out different roles, because we didn't want to limit the certified teachers. We do



recognize that several staff, a wide range of staff do qualify for being a part of the assessment process for language, for children. So that's why we did want to make sure that we had a really comprehensive and inclusive process to this.

So the next point does include information on the expansion of what we have for that matrix and each assessment and it has information related to the assessment. We do have another data form that goes more in-depth on each assessment, so I will continue to add some of that information within the recommendations, so that we can have it all in one.

The ASLAI assessment will be included in our recommendations, but we do have a backup assessment if it is still on hold at the time when we are ready to move forward, or sometime in the future.

So if something happens where we are ready to move forward and start the assessments and what we come up with in the future, but the ASLAI is still on hold. For whatever reason, we do have a backup plan prepared for that type of situation.

>> MICHAEL OLIVIER: This is Michael. We do want to provide tests plus an assessment, and many assessments do require us to watch and take notes after the assessment. So, with the ASLAI, that is a computer-based test, which means that it is one positive that would not just -- we can't just send the link. Because it is a big state, so we can just easily send it virtually, and then give a brief description about how to administer the tests and how to facilitate, something like a proctor and it would be an automatic access to the system, and I'm thinking some sort of test would be -- someone would have to physically be there -- someone would not have to physically be there because it is a computer-based test. That is one recommendation for that one.

I think that's all I wanted to add for that part.

>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: We are looking for certified and qualified individuals to administer the tests or the assessments. So that was something that we did recognize, that we can run the tests themselves. Yeah. Good point, Michael.

Were there anything else you wanted to add about this one?

>> MICHAEL OLIVIER: One thing I did want to kind of touch on is a testing center. The staff are required to be a part of the team. Experts are going to be pulled in and trained professional development opportunities -- trainings and professional development opportunities will be offered.

So, just to get some specifics, and we can watch Jennifer go ahead and explain about some of the students all over the state, when they will be able to start figuring out the testing centers and how many people and staff are required to be there once we are ready to get that started, and how we will have the outreach to the community to let them know that this is available. In the rural area.

And I think it will provide more equitable access across the state.

>> MICHAEL OLIVIER: Exactly.



>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: So we did define how the system would be established from all of the assessments, the agency and leadership, the commission will kind of be in charge of that, and the agency's responsibilities, and if we were to coordinate with other agencies, how we could work that out. ASDB can have a team of leaders to kind of manage that, and oversee the assessment team.

And once we establish that team, we will share that information with others for the age-specific assessments, or the age-specific students that we have, whether it's kindergarten and up, or birth through 3. Also, for example, the transition groups for adults, students who are coming out of high school and things like that.

So we will have information shared with all of those teams.

Of course, all of this information should be shared with the families, so how can we summarize a report and get that information to the family, so we have to scroll down the system for the state legislators as well to give them the information. So that means we're responsible for clarifying the reports, and that means can we have this system set up online? Can we post the data online? Is that possible? So those are some of the things that we're looking at, how to share this information that we are gathering. We do want to take a confidential approach, but at the same time, we want to share the information with our communities. And to just be in compliance with the law as well.

So we do have to have some sort of summary that's part of another recommendation. Anything you want to add?

>> MICHAEL OLIVIER: I would like to add one thing. Based on some tests that we've already used so far, which we can take advantage of, because at the national level, the data we have collected, we can see how it compares -- we can see how it compares nationally. And then narrow it down to Arizona and what fits for us, and make it a little less broad.

So, some tests are not really given an individual score. Some are just based on national and how it compares to students all over the U.S. So that's something to keep in mind as well. And just to have a balance. That's the only thing that we are thinking of while we're having our discussions and our committee meetings.

So, yeah, unless there are any questions, I am done.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Great, thank you. Thank you, Jennifer and Michael, for explaining all of that information. One thing that really stood out to me from the subcommittee meeting -- I see I've been spotlighted. Okay. I guess not stood out, but I'm trying to think of the right way to say it.

One thing that kind of took me aback a little bit was the comment about the research and knowledge of the field and how districts tend to vary in the assessments that they use for that deaf, hard of hearing, and DeafBlind students, which ultimately could mean that we don't have a current capability to relay a statewide report based on the progress of our deaf, hard of hearing, and DeafBlind students, and I think that is something vital and something that needs to be considered,



because obviously if we're using a wide number of assessments, they may all be good, but we're unable to track and compare among students, and so we don't have a baseline or a way to know how well we're doing, or areas that we can improve upon.

So I think that that recommendation tied to the statewide assessment team really makes a lot of sense, and I'm curious what the public will have to say about that recommendation, or anyone else on this task force based on that recommendation as well as the other recommendations that everyone has been working on thus far.

So, we can take any questions, comments, or thoughts at this time from the task force. I see a lot of agreement in the chat.

So we'll see if there are any other questions or comments.

>> MICHAEL OLIVIER: Yes, this is Michael. I can see the comment in the chat. I'm agreeing with that.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I do see one comment in the chat that says I think the data group will bring new information to light about ongoing processes and monitoring for children who are deaf and hard of hearing and special education preschools, so being able to monitor that will be interesting.

Yeah, and I think when we can see from the data committee report if there's any tie to that comment as well. Anything else for this committee? Okay. It seems we are done, and I appreciate your report. Thank you very much.

>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: Yes, thank you so much.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: And I look forward to hearing more. So we will be compiling all of that information into our draft.

All right. Terrific. Next, I think we'll go to Systematic Connections and their committee report.

>> MOLLIE HARDING: Hi, everyone. I want to warn the task force here that my family and I have just moved and we're in a temporary situation, we're at an Airbnb here, and I'm having intermittent Internet issues. So my Internet seems to be going out about every 30 minutes. So I'm sorry if that interrupts my report.

My baby has also woken up about an hour earlier than expected, so I have her next to me eating some Cheerios. So you might hear her as well. So I apologize if that is -- if that interrupts as well.

Okay. So, we met recently, this systematic connections subcommittee, and we had been talking about all the agencies and how they were involved in serving deaf and hard of hearing children from birth. We finished discussing all of those agencies that are involved from birth all the way through high school graduation.

So, recently, we had talked about specifically the agencies involved in K-12. And what we came up with was the fact that this group of students is really the -- I don't want to say the least served,



because they get a lot of support in the schools, but outside of schools and a couple agencies on the side of schools, there aren't as many agencies invested in family success.

So maybe the support is the same, but the number is smaller.

So late in May, we talked about specifically the K-12, as I mentioned. So we found that schools, of course, are heavily involved in carrying out the laws pertaining to the education of children by creating IEPs and 504 plans. Raising special kids is involved as well as other advocacy groups, and they help families navigate the IEP and 504 process.

Vocational rehabilitation is involved. Of course, helping to transition students from the end of high school to higher education, over into the working world, or work training.

And then we also have ACDHH providing education and resources, as well as, of course, [indiscernible] as parents can be involved in that as long as they would like.

Finally, we did identify one more group called Elite Community Services, which is a company that I believe partners with VR to help provide work training and preparedness for teenagers transitioning out of high school.

Is anybody aware of any other agencies or groups that are involved in providing the services to students in the K-12 range, other than those that I mentioned?

Okay. If you become aware of anything or if you think of something later, feel free to email me. But I think we found just about all of them in our subcommittee meeting.

We had some time to get started on our committee report. So we really just started on our findings and we have not yet compiled recommendations. But as I'm kind of looking through the work that we did in our last meeting, I'm seeing that we sort of lumped in recommendations in with our findings in some occasions, so we might have more done in that regard than we have realized.

But we still have a lot of work to do. We have one more subcommittee meeting left to finish this report. But I will show you what we have.

So a lot of what we have pertains to the birth to 3 age range. For example, we have a lot of -- we found a lot of gaps in the supports for families. A lot of the materials, educational resources have not necessarily been updated recently, and we have lots of professionals who are involved in helping identify and intervene and provide services to families.

But they might not be doing as comprehensive work as we would like. So, so far so good. Does anybody have any questions about where we are so far or have any thoughts on our report? How about anybody else on the meeting from the systematic connections subcommittee? Would you like to add anything?

We have a lot of time to take advantage of, and I hope that we'll make a lot of progress on this report. We certainly have so far. We had a really lively meeting last time and a lot of input from the subcommittee members. So far so good. We'll keep working on it.



>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: You can go ahead and stop sharing screen, please, Mollie. Great. Thank you, Mollie, for that in-depth report. I agree, when you said that recommendations often are -- often include what we've been doing already, and I think the same thing's been happening with the other committees, because some people have talked about not knowing what to recommend, or what to share.

But that is a part of the recommendations, the things we're already doing. And I think that we've talked about some additional issues as well, and some considerations of where we can improve and how we can address that. So it's really been amazing to see how we've been able to pull these experts and knowledgeable people together into one room and compile so much information in one place.

So I'm very grateful and appreciative to everyone that has been involved. I would like to allow an opportunity again for any questions for the Systematic Connections Committee.

Great. It seems there are none at this point, so I'd like to thank you, systematic committees, for your recommendations and your work.

We will also talk a little bit more about how we can incorporate more of your recommendations into the draft as well. Yeah, I see Suzanne Perry from the Arizona Department of Education who's made the comment that, I like that thought that recommendations could include things that we are continuing to do, things that we need to stop doing, and things that we need to do more of, as well as things that we need to start to do. And that's very well said.

All right. And with that, we're ready for our third subcommittee. That's Data and Demographics. If we can have someone from that committee report. Hi, Kendra.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Hi, how are you, Tawny?

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Good, thank you. And you?

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Good. Let me share my screen here. Can you see that?

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Sure. I'm going to turn my camera off.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: All right.

So this is the first draft of our report using the template that was recommended we use. This is fairly brief. About five pages. I have outlined our findings, and a little bit of the data we've collected in the form of tables and graphs, and then recommendations at the end.

So in reviewing our findings, again, not only anyone on this committee, but anyone in the task force in its entirety, please chime in at any point in time, especially when I talk about our desired state.

And I think this is something that we as a collective group really should state. In my mind, based on all of the work that we've been doing the last few months, our desired state is an understanding of how children who are deaf and hard of hearing, birth to 21 in Arizona are acquiring language at what



rate and to what level of competency.

We really don't know that. We have a lot of assumptions that we make based on anecdotal and some data that in itself is -- a lot of it is not reliable or valid. So I think we need to start with where are we. Or we will not be able to measure our success.

And in order to do that, then of course, we need a means by which to gather, analyze, and respond to child level data that's reliable and valid.

We went ahead and took a look at a number of different types of data. Nationally, state, and at the child level. We didn't dive deeply into the national level data at all. I just put the links there where you can find it. It's available. Because it connects directly to our state level data that we are able to obtain from the Department of Health services.

It's fairly complete and valid and reliable, we feel. It's coordinated by the CDC. And, Fran, I'm not sure if she's on, but please feel free to jump in at any point in time.

I will go ahead and scroll down to the most recent report that's available from the Department of Health services in regard to the screening, diagnostic, and intervention of children who are deaf and hard of hearing in the state of Arizona. This data is from January 1, 2020, to December 31, 2020. So, of course, we all know what happened that year.

So this data should be interpreted with caution. And perhaps going back a few years, which you'll see later on, I recommend that we do. Looking back at data, perhaps from the last ten years in the state to see any trends which will help us then plan for the future.

So you can see there the total number of births in our state. The total number that were documented as having been screened. Of those that were screened, approximately 2% did not pass their hearing screening and were referred for subsequent diagnostic testing. After that testing was conducted, they found that 32% of those children did not have a hearing loss. Of those children referred of the 1,212, 54% did not have any diagnosis.

That may seem like an alarming number, it was to me, but when you look further down the report to see why -- what contributes to that number, included in that are children who perhaps had additional complicating medical factors and passed away, families that moved out of state. There are a number of different reasons for that -- that contribute to that number.

Of those 1,212 children referred for diagnostic testing, 16% were identified with permanent hearing loss. Of those children, 100% of them were referred for early intervention services. And of those children, 69% subsequently enrolled in Part C.

The reason why you see discrepancy between the 100 and the 69% is due to either children not qualifying, families perhaps moving, families perhaps declining services. There are a number of different variables for that.

Any questions so far? I can't see everyone or the chat, so if someone -- if anyone has any, if they



want to pop on...

All right. I'll go ahead.

Then next we looked at child level data. Sorry, making everyone dizzy. The child level data is available to us, again, from AzEIP, from the department of ed, a number of different sources. And in the current state summary column, and then if you look to the right in the identified gaps and challenges, I've split those up because we feel confident with the validity and reliability of the data in the current state, where in the identified gaps and challenges, we have concerns about what data is available, the paucity of data available, and of the data available, what is its reliability and validity.

So looking at some of our Part B data available, we can't ignore the pandemic in 2020. Let me scroll down and give you a minute to look at this graph. Every school year on October 1st, the Department of Education takes a student count of total enrollment in schools across the state, and that is an account of children with all disabilities, all disability categories. You can see that there was a dip in 2021, and there continues to be a dip in '21-'22. And again, this is as of October 1st, so it's very possible that by the end of the school year, in May, that number did increase. This is simply reflective of October 1st of the school year.

So by October 21st of this past school year, the number of children identified with disabilities receiving special education services continued to dip. Now, if you look back up here, which I thought was interesting, the number of children identified within those disability categories as deaf and hard of hearing also dipped in 2021, but then you can see that just this past school year, already by October 1st, we began identifying children again, and at a rate higher than we had prior to -- perhaps ever. I don't have the data for before 2016. I don't know what that really tells us, but I think it's worth taking a look at, as it could -- it will, again, impact how we plan for the future.

Placement. And again, Suzy -- I'm sorry, Jennifer? Yes.

>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: This is Jennifer. I do have a question.

>> Actually, Tawny asked a question in the chat.

>> It says, what is the primary way for early intervention services to initially contact families to gauge interest in services, and how often do they attempt to contact the family before they close the case?

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: That is a really, really fantastic question. I think one person we're missing is -- oh, I'm blanking. Our AzEIP representative here today? We do have someone from AzEIP on the task force. Is she here?

I will summarize it. It's a somewhat complicated process. AzEIP has been working hard to streamline it. I will say that when I stepped into this position three years ago was when the referral process was in the middle of changing.

Right now, referrals go all the way -- are channelled through AzEIP, and raising special kids.



Raising Special Kids is the agency that AzEIP has designated as the central referral source. Once Raising Special Kids receives a referral, and referrals can come from parents, doctors, therapists, anyone, the referral is received. Raising Special Kids assigns it to a service coordinator with one of AzEIP's contracting agencies.

And then depending on what the potential diagnoses are on that referral, the referral is then passed on to ASDB, if there is a suspected hearing or vision loss.

And other agencies depending on what the potential diagnosis is. From there, we get in touch with the families. I will say the service coordinator is who is to get in touch with the family first, because the family needs to be provided with their procedural safeguards. And after that, we can come into the picture. That was a source of great discussion a number of years ago when the referral process changed. Because many of our deaf and hard of hearing teachers felt that they were more equipped to encourage those families to seek services. Sometimes a family gets a call like that out of the blue. You know, they're in the process of just learning that their child has a hearing or vision loss, going through everything that is associated with that.

And so there was a lot of debate over who should be that first phone call. As it stands right now, that is the service coordinator. And they do make a number of assessments to bring that family into services. Does that answer your question, Tawny? Okay.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yes it does, thank you.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Jennifer, did you have a question?

>> There's another question in the chat that says thanks. Do the agencies contact families by phone, email, or mail, or in-person?

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Phone initially.

Jennifer, did you have a question?

>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: No, I didn't. Thank you.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Okay. Next, if you take a look at placement, once children have transitioned from Part C to Part B, and we do -- let's see here. Looking back up at the table that I showed you earlier, 191 children with hearing loss in the year 2020 were referred to Part C. 131 were enrolled. Depending on when they enrolled, they can potentially be in Part C services for just under three years, of course, depending on when they're referred.

They need to be -- the transition process starts at 2-6 for children. And in some cases, they even start talking about it earlier than that. And of those children that later transitioned from Part C to Part B, on this placement chart, you can see the percentage of children that were placed in a regular education setting, deaf and hard of hearing, are compared to the percentage of deaf and hard of hearing students who were placed in a separate setting. A separate setting meaning ASDB campus program, perhaps desert voices, any other private charter, or private school. Perhaps a separate



setting. Suzy, correct me if I'm wrong. Can separate setting be within the district, or is that only out of the district?

>> Yes. So, a separate setting could be a self-contained classroom within the district. It would include a separate school such as what ASDB offers. Or it could be a residential. Although we don't have anybody in a residential at preschool age. So this is the data for the percentage of children who are in regular classrooms, which is defined as the majority of the children in the classroom do not have a disability.

So an inclusion program, if you will.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Thank you, Suzy.

>> Kendra, just one moment for the interpreters to switch. Okay, thank you.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: And Suzy, let me know if there's any questions in the chat, too.

What I want to point out here on this, again, going back to the identification of students who are deaf or hard of hearing in preschool, and then you look at this table, and you see that during the year of COVID, the number of children in separate settings skyrocketed according to this data, and continued to in '21-'22.

Now, what I find interesting, just because I know this personally, are campus-based preschools with ASDB. Even though it looks like this number has increased tremendously, I can tell you we're not up to enrollment numbers pre-COVID. Our preschool on the Phoenix campus had about 60 students at the end of the 2018-2019 school year. I think this year, Michael, correct me if I'm wrong, ended around -- in the low 40s.

So we're still not back up to the level of identification that we were before. Thanks, Mike.

Any questions on that one?

>> This has more to do with -- and I put this in the chat -- with educators or those people who are reporting the location of services where the type of program that the child is in changes in their understanding of the codes, because as you know, there were a number of educators who were saying that children who were in a separate program were attending a regular early childhood program.

So they were mislabeling. So this reflects the changes in understanding of how to code the environment that children are attending.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Exactly. Thank you for bringing that up, Suzy. And again, that goes back to the reliability and validity of the data. And so, with that, just like often happens when you're collecting data, it points to areas of needed professional development. So I think that that's something we really took away from what we dove into, is there are a number of different areas of professional development that the field needs.

Not only those outside of deaf education, but those of us within deaf education.



And then lastly here, as far as the data we currently have, Suzy, I'm going to let you go ahead and highlight this, since this is your baby. And share a little bit more in-depth than I can.

>> Right. So, we are required to assess children's performance while they're in preschool special education programs. The state-identified tool for conducting those assessments or that ongoing progress monitoring of their performance relative to certain standards, and the one we're looking at here is the social-emotional outcomes that we're required to assess, and we also assess language outcomes, knowledge and skills, cognition, adaptive behaviors.

So this is just a small snippet of children's performance with respect to their social-emotional outcomes. And what we've been engaging in is a look at how children perform relative to the location, or the environment in which they're included.

So, children -- so we pulled out -- just for children who are deaf and hard of hearing, if they were in a regular early childhood program, the percentage of children who demonstrated age-level expectations or exited performing much like a typical child, and in this case for social-emotional outcomes, compared to children who receive their special education services in a separate setting, and regardless of the subgroup demographic, ethnicity, gender, and in this case disability category, we are insurgently seeing that children who are in regular early childhood programs have better outcomes than children who are in separate settings.

And Kendra, I'll let you go ahead and talk about some caveats that you believe need to be considered.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Thanks, Suzy. Anyone here who has a passion about data and is a nerd like I am, I'm sure a lot of things are coming to your mind when you look at this. A number of factors that we have to consider. You know, first off, one might assume that children who go into a separate setting, potentially go to that separate setting because they have additional needs.

I can tell you that our preschools with ASDB, the demographics have changed tremendously in the last number of years. The number of children we serve with additional disabilities, severe disabilities, and medical complications has risen significantly.

And you could also dive deeper into this and ask, how many of these children entered preschool with any type of language at all? How many of these communicated with listening spoken language in each setting? How many communicated through ASL? There's so many different things here to consider.

Additionally, this is social-emotional outcomes, which we, of course, know are linked to language. However, based on what we were able to pull together, there's not really any language-specific -- detailed language-specific data that's available, that's collated.

We, in our early intervention program, had individual student files that had the individual data on every child, our birth to 5 program in its entirety is involved in odyssey ODACCE. It's a CDC project



out of University of Colorado, in which they're tracking our students' vocabulary and language. That would represent a small segment of the population in Arizona. So that data is really not available.

Even when you look at outcomes that AzEIP provides, you have to ask yourself how those outcomes are determined, and it is typically at a child's exit meeting, a group of professionals, including the parents.

You know, have a discussion, review the child's present levels, and in comparison to age-expected norms, and make an informed, subjective opinion.

So, hard, fast data on language development, to our knowledge, I always want to give that caveat, too, to our knowledge is not available in one place where we can efficiently access it and then use that to make decisions.

>> Well, each individual program can access that for their children, but may not know how to. But we can look at specific dimensions, such as language, communication, cognitive skills, motor skills. We can drill down to that level using the data that we -- the tool that we currently use.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Right. And I assume you're referring to Teaching Strategies Gold, which is a mandated assessment that preschoolers must receive. And while it does break development into specific areas, I'll just speak for our program, and I'm quite certain that other programs for deaf and hard of hearing that are housed within districts do the same thing. We dive really deeply into the language development of a child, much more deeply than Teaching Strategies Gold would. And we do that because we want to diagnostically teach to where the child is, and sequentially improve their language depending on what their goals are.

We have a pretty good grasp on how to do that with listening and spoken language, along with Michael Olivier and some others within ASDB's preschool. Michelle Ahern. We are working to try and have the same sequence of development available in ASL so that we can teach diagnostically there as well.

So, okay, I guess any questions before I go on to identify gaps and next steps?

I think the big thing here is the reliability and validity of the data. I've looked at it -- I'm sorry, I've said that numerous times today.

I think also the data that we're missing, some of it I don't even know if it exists. I feel we need to really take a look at county and city residents, and if you jump down below my bullet points, that would be largely in part of equity issues. We really need to look at that across our state.

Of course, looking at age of amplification, age of diagnosis -- I'm sorry, additional diagnoses. That data is available in individual student files, on case history reports, but how to go about collecting that in its entirety, that's something we need to determine, I think. Language input. I don't know where they -- again, in one repository collect what type of language the family has chosen, with what frequency is that language being used. Is the child in a Spanish-speaking home and the goals are in



spoken English? Is the home a spoken English home and the child is using ASL? What type of exposure to the quality of language role models is the child being exposed to? It's all very important and I don't think that's something that we collect.

And of course, the early intervention history, not just as a state level, but on the individual child level. When is it initiated, how often did they receive services, with what consistency. And these aren't in an effort to make judgments. I have a lot of teachers who get really nervous about asking families questions, like educational background or addressing how often the family is or is not able to keep their appointments.

You know, those things are important to know so that we can respond so where the family is and work with a family and meet them where they are, so those factors are very important.

I believe probably we could get this information from ADE, but how many children after preschool continued to receive DHH services into kindergarten.

And then I think looking at where children are placed preschool through 12th grade. Again, the individual child level would be very interesting. And then, of course, the biggie, and this relates more to the assessment on the committee that reported earlier. But at the end of the day, what is the progress that these children and what are the outcomes?

Before I summarize our recommendations, are there any questions? Okay.

You'll see I just have a few recommendations that Suzy, Fran, and the others that we've discussed over our time together, I think we should take a deeper dive into the data that is available. I think looking at past trends for the past ten years would be worthwhile. And not just the screening diagnostic and intervention data, but at the child level, determining the reliability and validity of that data.

Research how other states gather and analyze data. And determine how we could oversee the collection and analysis of the data. This goes back to what data we have and what we need. The rows highlighted in gray are the data that we don't necessarily have at hand. Doesn't exist. Certainly isn't collated somewhere in the central repository.

Anyone on the Data and Demographics Committee -- Fran, Suzy, I'm not sure who else is here -- want to add anything?

>> No, thanks, Kendra. You did a great job.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Okay. I think that's it then, Tawny.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Thank you, Kendra. And Suzanne as well for your input. That information was very helpful. I agree that validity and reliability are important because we want to see what data we have, and the data that we need to know. So, thank you for doing the hard work.

I see that you focused a lot on the preschool ages, and I wonder a little bit about the older ages as well. I know that we did have some barriers in receiving data on that age group. So hopefully we'll



get it in time for the final report.

Any questions, comments, or anything from the larger task force or other committee members?

Jennifer, Michael, would you like an opportunity to respond to the data that was shared from that committee, particularly the project with the university of Colorado? It seems like it would be a good start for assessment, and that might be something that we can look at making a connection on.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: I'm sorry, Tawny, was that a question? Or just more of a statement?

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: It was actually a question for Jennifer.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Okay, got it.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I wanted to see if she wanted to respond because she was on the assessment committee.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Go for it, Jennifer.

>> JENNIFER SCARBORO: So, we did consider odyssey when we were putting together our assessment lists. So that was kind of our, you know, initial starting place.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay, that's good to know that. Is something that we can mention in the recommendations. We can talk a little bit about that, Kendra, or anyone else.

Where is the recommendation's starting point? Could you send that to me so that I can refer to it? Clarification to the interpretation. I meant the project with the University of Colorado and the Odyssey. Is there any summary that I might be able to find on that project, so that I can refer to that in the report?

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: We will have our first summary of data coming in next week. We have individual child reports, but they'll be putting it all together, that I have to give to my board the following week. So I can send that over to you when we receive it. We expect that next year, it will be all that much better. There were a lot of kinks to work out. It's a very overwhelming project. And Mike can speak to that as well. Yes, I can have that for you next week.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: What I mean is a summary of that project, what their aim is, what their expectation, expected outcomes are, et cetera, so that I can refer to it, if anything on their website or announcements that they've made about their project.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Yes, there you go. Mike just put the link in the chat.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Perfect. Beautiful. I can see that data and demographics has been working very hard, and I've noticed a huge change from previous meetings for various reasons, change in measurements, change in the data, clarification of some measurements, many factors that we are able to consider.

I'd also like to recognize that, yes, we don't know what we don't know. And it's important work that you all have been doing. And I look forward to additional recommendations coming from your committee as well.



I do want to mention that I've had one challenge with the public forum on June 18th. It was supposed to finish the PowerPoint draft recommendations by June 15th for that public forum, so I'm wondering if somehow you might be able to beef up or add some recommendations. We do have notes of some of the preliminary recommendations, and I can show you more in the PowerPoint as well for the public forum.

So I don't know if it's possible by the end of this week or Monday, if you can pull together some additional recommendations and information, and when I have access to it on Monday, I can incorporate it into our draft of recommendations.

Obviously, it doesn't need to be a complete list, but if you would like to use your final subcommittee meeting to do that final review, that's fine. And hopefully that will give me a little bit more information to incorporate in the draft PowerPoint for that public forum.

Okay. Any questions on that, or comments?

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Tawny, was that in reference to just the data committee, or all of us? Is there something specific that you saw we were missing? Okay.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah, sorry. That was for all three committees. All three committees. Because some had said that they left recommendations blank or that it was in a separate document, and that's fine. But I just do hope that if there are any gaps still there, that those can be completed for PowerPoint.

I can look at other documents as well. That's fine. It's not an issue. But let me know what your preference is, but as long as I have information to pull together that PowerPoint by next Monday and Tuesday, so that I can send it over to ACDHH, so that they can check for accessibility and post it to the website for the general public prior to that public forum.

We want to make sure that everyone has access to that PowerPoint, including those who speak Spanish.

And then let me know if you do have questions or need support in that area, or let ACDHH's staff or liaisons know, and they can communicate with me as well, so we can see how we can work together going forward. I'm sure we'll make it work, and I can see that you have so much information there, so it's a good time to really pull those things together.

Great. At this point, do we have any questions or additional comments? I'm going to refer back to my PowerPoint.

>> Tawny, this is Suzy from ADE. And I just wanted to say that this has been a lot of work in a short period of time, and, I mean, the extra hours that we have spent digging through this and pulling data and discussing the implications, and the meeting times. It has just been a lot.

So I just want you to know that. Like, we have really done our level best to pull forward what we have here, and I know that there's probably more to go, and maybe that will end up being our



recommendation -- you know, that more studying needs to take place on what is this situation.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yes, thank you for reminding all of us that. I know that you were all treading through a lot of data and you had a lot of work and information to assess, so I appreciate that, and we are working with ACDHH because we do have this strict timeline due to the fiscal year.

So I do recognize that our hands have been a little bit tied, but I absolutely agree that we can identify that there is data that continues to need further exploration and we can put that into the recommendations, or we can say that we wanted time to explore such and such area or situation further, and we recognize that our time is very limited to -- and we weren't able to complete everything that we wanted to.

But I would rather we be honest and transparent and we can continue to add resources or specific committees or hiring an agency or team to complete that job. But we do want to emphasize that ACDHH did not expect that all of the issues would be resolved at this time, and we are just doing our best. That's all that we expect.

Okay. I am back to my original PowerPoint on slide number 8. In terms of the public forum. I'd like to let you know a little bit about what that forum will look like on the morning on June 18th. We will have opening remarks and a welcome from the ACDHH staff, and then I will come on and provide an overview of the work and an explanation of the task, how it works and how it's been going.

And then I'd like to hand it over to the three subcommittees to share a little bit about your journey. Similar to what Suzanne just mentioned. You can mention the challenges and frustrations that came about. And then we'll allow the public -- we'll give each committee a couple minutes. You don't have to go into depth there, because after that forum, we will have the draft of recommendations available on PowerPoint to go through those as well. Actually, during the forum.

And then after that, we will open it up for public input, which is the heart of this public forum. We'd like to allow people to come forward on Zoom to make their comments. We will have ASL, English, and Spanish available for that forum. And as we collect their input, after that is complete, we will then wrap up and be prepared to complete our final subcommittee meetings and make our final draft to ACDHH so that they can determine the next steps.

Any questions about the public forum?

Okay. I am now on slide 9, which is some save-the-date and reminders for the public forum on June 18th, first of all, at 10:00, from 10:00 to 11:30 a.m. on Zoom. And as Nikki mentioned earlier, we did send out some information on social media, and we have emailed the task force and subcommittee, so feel free to forward to everyone you might want to attend. Everyone is welcome.

After that forum, we will have our final subcommittee meetings to focus on reviewing any input from the public forum in determining how to incorporate any of that into the final recommendations. And that will be a good opportunity for subcommittees to add any final considerations or further



assessment as needed.

I am now on slide 10. I'd like to thank everyone for your input, and remind you all as needed, if you need support, information, or have any questions, you can contact the staff at ACDHH, particularly your committee liaison. And thank you for joining us today. I appreciate your commitment to providing input and information to ACDHH on the various needs. And thank you for helping us ensure quality language acquisition for deaf, hard of hearing, and DeafBlind children in Arizona.

Great. Thank you for coming. So long.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Hi, Sonia.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Hi there, everyone. Can you hear me? I'm just minimizing my notes here as I'm taking them. I think that went really well.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah, I think it went pretty well.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Perfect. Anything else that you need from me. I will not be at the public forum. I know you guys have been working on all the other things.

We have our invite that was sent out specifically to our group, but do we want to share that with all the task force members, or are we just going to have that shared as we have in social media and everything?

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I'm not sure. I think Nikki had something in mind on that.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Yeah, I can go ahead and send the meeting invite to everyone in the task force, when I get that done.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Is that correct, or will Sonia be doing it?

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Oh, no, Sonia can do that invitation. Thank you for catching that.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Yes, perfect. So I will do that. We do have the invite already here. So I will go ahead and send that out to the task force members.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Perfect.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Can we include registration link as well? That would be great for them to have that registration as well.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Yes, I will connect with Chyla. I did request that in my original request, but this is just a Zoom link, and I know that it looks like Laricsa or Shari has that. I will make sure we have the registration in English or Spanish, and also that I have access to edit this as well.



>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Awesome.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Great. And I think I should be able to access that link. I'll test it and make sure that I register first, and that should be fine. I'm trying to think if there's anything else we need to discuss about registration.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: With the registration, it also gives us the ability to have a waiting room. I think that was one of the reasons we wanted to have that as well, so that we could have everything prepared and then you guys can let everybody in from the waiting room.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay, perfect.

All right. Were there any concerns about today's meeting? I know that I had two. One was some of the recommendations weren't fully completed, and I didn't expect that. So I know that we had a lot in the preschool age, but we didn't have the ability to go beyond that age group.

So I know that some people wanted to wait for that final subcommittee meeting, but that's why I made those comments about needing it a little bit sooner, maybe perhaps by Friday or Monday by the latest. So I'm hoping that I'll get that information in, but we'll see what we have at that point.

The other possibility is that I might need more time for the final recommendations as well due to the subcommittees doing their final meeting, and then handing that over. So I know that we want to make sure that we incorporate the complete task force information on that. So just the timeline is something of a concern for me, so I wanted you to be aware of that.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Yeah, it's good that we shared our concerns, because I did want to let Shari know that, again, if they are not there, then that means part of the recommendations, they need more time to collect more information and more data for you to be able to compile that information.

So it is a little bit stressful for them, maybe because they are volunteering their time. So, I mean, I know that it's a big request for them to continue with this. And we really do appreciate their work. And it really benefits us and children all across Arizona.

So I really just want to emphasize that we are so impressed with what they're doing. I know that we have some things that we need to fill in the gaps for, and whatever is left.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah, the reason I said that is because it wasn't only the data committee, but the Systematic Connections committee said that they weren't complete as well. And I know that we were talking about trying to go from birth to 21, but they were really focused on just those first six months, and they didn't have recommendations for beyond 6 months old.

So even if there's something about needing more time, that's okay, but I hope to get that language even into the final recommendations, because I think that they have some recommendations in mind. They said that there were some things that they had discussed and made notes of, but that might be on another document that I don't have access to, or maybe just as a part of their thoughts that haven't actually been documented in to Google drive, or maybe they've taken notes or something of that



nature. So that's where I'm feeling a little bit of a pinch in not fully meeting the expectations.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Yes, I do have to follow up with Mollie and some other group members and see where they are in the process. For that input of the recommendations.

And my understanding is we did plan on having it all incorporated in the report.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: That's what they were saying they would do at the final subcommittee meeting. So that is the last week of June after the forum.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Right, the 22nd.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Uh-huh. That's where I was a little bit concerned. But I just wanted to give you that heads-up, because sometimes, you know, two weeks can make a world of difference, and we might be surprised and be able to complete all of the recommendations. And I'm okay with that but I wasn't sure if -- how that would work. If I sent the invoice before July 1st, maybe I could still have the time to complete it.

And then, you know, the check could be processed or on hold until the project is complete. So I'm okay with that. If I submit the invoice and you print the check for fiscal year and then hang on to it until the report is complete.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Okay. I will go ahead and check on that.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: One other thing that I wanted to mention, Tawny, as you just brought that up is, I was noticing that they were still kind of focusing on birth to 3, and then K-12. So there really wasn't a transition for all children, and we still have that gap from 3 through preschool. And in our state, children are not required to be enrolled in school until the age of 6, so we continue to have this problem in our state of that 3 to 6 gap. And so I think that's one of the things that was concerning to me was that they're really focusing on the birth to 3 group, and then K-12, but we're really not looking at the entire population of children being represented in their state.

So that was one thing that stood out to me.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Thank you for mentioning that. I think that that's something that I can share with the subcommittees as well at their final meetings to see what considerations related to that issue can be shared, and then make sure that we incorporate that in the notes to emphasize as a part of our final recommendations.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: I am thinking the goal for the public forum is to share, you know, the beautiful things that we have leading up to the finalization of our recommendations.

So it would be something light to share to have the community feedback as well. And if we don't complete that before the forum, or before we post online, we do have to make note that there are some areas that we haven't incorporated within our recommendations yet. But they will be in the future.

Or maybe something of that nature. At least share to the community what the plans are to



incorporate that information. Just so that they're aware -- that we are making considerations for that.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I agree. And I did think about the possible solution being -- I can make note, as we said, that we will be posting something by such and such date that will have a more complete list of recommendations on the website, and that we can make sure it's available in various formats so that there might still be some time for people to read and respond or view and respond the final recommendations and bring that back to the task force.

So I don't know, it might be worth considering one more meeting in July based on how much additional recommendations or feedback we get. Or it might not be necessary. We might have people review the report and be completely satisfied with it and no further changes are necessary and no further meetings are necessary.

But there might be something that we do need to meet and discuss prior to that final submission. So I suppose we can wait to see what I receive by Monday and wait for the type of public input we get from the public forum. But if we get a wealth of information in those final two things, then we might need to consider adding one more task force meeting mid-July, like around the 12th or 13th. So we can see.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Okay. Because I really want to finish before then. So I'm just thinking... gosh. I doubt that we'll complete it before the task force meeting for the final one. So if we can agree to have them sign up and complete it by June 30th. I don't want to have too much of -- overload them with something more than that or before that.

So just to give them enough time.

But I will talk with Shari and maybe the finance department to see what options are available.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I agree, it is an obligation, but I do think the task force would appreciate some sort of final review of something that has their name on it. If we complete recommendations without them, they might not be too pleased with that. So I want to be mindful and respectful of that as well.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: I appreciate that. I will write that in my notes just to keep that in mind.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: And the assessments seem to be pretty much finished. They're pretty satisfied with their recommendations. Data seemed to have focused mostly on preschool. I'm not really sure why they honed in on that area. And then systematic connections focused on the newborn hearing screening.

So it's just that we kind of need to broaden our age group to cover the whole spectrum rather than these few specified groups. So hopefully we'll need to make that clear for the final recommendations. But I do think that, you know, there's a chance that they wanted to really focus on perfecting the recommendations for that specific age group rather than broadening it to the other groups.

So, something worth recognizing.



>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Yeah, we will use that going forward when we go to the legislative board, but we just want to make sure that we have all of the ins and outs and all the information that we need to complete as much as possible.

Because we know they have the information. We've talked about it, and we know it's there. It's just a matter of putting it all in the report.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah, and again, I'm just being a little bit more proactive here, trying to anticipate things based on what we saw today. And I know that we do have three weeks left. So we'll see. It could be that they'll put a day's worth of attention in completing it, and that we'll have some things done, but I do recognize that we are in summer and it's vacation season, and people have trips planned.

So I know sometimes these final phases can add some pressure this time of year. I hope that everything will work out, and we won't need any additional extension. But I'm just trying to be proactive in case we do need that extra time.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Sure, we do appreciate that also. Yeah. You know, we've had great feedback during our time. So, having -- hosting the educational task force and having all this information ready within a specific timeframe. So it's been a year.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: One last comment I wanted to share was I really see the work that's happening, but also I really like that they are identifying the gaps. As we know, we've continued to say we have several gaps in our state, but as today, you know, even Kendra reported out saying we've identified so many different gaps. Mollie said we have so many different gaps.

And I think it's important to make sure they bring those things forward in their reports. You know, because we know those gaps exist, but that also needs to be part of their recommendations.

But I just was -- it was good to hear through all of this they have identified some gaps, while they might have been in this field for many years, a lot of times we don't delve into other areas and we don't necessarily know what's going on, other than what we have to focus on in our role. And I think has really allowed them to see what else is happening and where we might need some additional supports.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I agree, 100%.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Well, seems good.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay, so, I suspect a phishing attack in my email because I saw a calendar invite from Sherri Collins asking for a monthly meeting, and I was like, huh, okay, and when I clicked "accept" to see what the meeting was about, nothing popped up, so I thought, I'm not sure if this is a phishing attack, or if it was canceled, or if I can't access my Google Drive.

So hopefully someone from the tech team can help with that, because I'd like to work on the draft



recommendations and I currently can't access that.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Yeah, that happened to Sherri once before. Something happened, someone sent an email on her behalf, but it wasn't really her.

So I can connect you with Shari Burda, and she'll be able to direct you to the right person, to get your email all squared away.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay, great. Should I email Shari, or will you?

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Well, do you have Shari's information? You know what? I'll go ahead and just cc both of you and have both of you in the email, so that -- and I'll ask, do you mind if I connect you to Tawny and such. And just be able to introduce you two.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Great, thank you. So that's all I need. I think everything else looks good, and I'm excited to pull this draft together with the recommendations.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Wonderful. Thank you so much, Tawny.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: And thank you, interpreters. You did a great job today.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Thank you, interpreters. Have a good day, everyone.

