

WA 3.0 District Advisory Group - Workflow, Improvements, and Training-20261016_120423-Meeting Transcript

October 16, 2026, 5:04PM

1h 0m 0s

● **LaBounty, Steven** started transcription



Hayes, Heather 0:03

So if there are kind of ghost goals and errors finalizing your IEP because there were post-secondary goals that are asking for goal information that they shouldn't be, they can be deleted very easily from that standard goals page. And I think, Chris, do you want to jump in on any additional? where to go for guidance. I know it was in the weekly update.



Gregoire, Kris 0:28

Yes, it is in the weekly update last Friday, and I believe that Emi added this to the admin or the section in resources on the homepage of 3.0.



Hayes, Heather 0:40

The second one that we decided to move forward with last week was adding custom fields for modifications and supports. So adding the ability to type in those types of options.



Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 0:49

It's yeah, he's just terrible, negative things.



Hayes, Heather 0:58

Thank you. So we will be moving forward with that enhancement, and we hope to have a timeline for you on that by next week. So we're going through the process of writing those detailed specifications, getting it submitted to our development team, and then getting a time estimate so that we can then prioritize it. The next one I'm going to pass to Kris, because I know she has been doing a lot of work here, but We are getting reports of districts saying they need additional testing

accommodations. The main item, I believe, that we've heard from since last week was about WIDA alternate assessments. So, Kris, I'll let you kind of get that quick update.



Gregoire, Kris 1:34

Yeah, thanks, Heather. I am going to steal the screen for a moment.

So we've had lots of conversations. Hold on. Am I sharing screen? We've had lots of conversations based on, you know, the current testing accommodations that are already in 3.0, how we pulled that from the guidebook for testing accommodations from OSPI. We have heard from different districts that

They are specifically missing WIDA specific for the alternative access test. We have had guidance that we need to add the domains and I think there's like listening, speaking, reading. So I came up with this list and it was pulled specifically from when I went to the Ospi site. It directed me to the WIDA.

Site, and using these accommodations, we I have gone in and...

created this list and they're a little bit long because I did add the specific test name to this. But this is what we're looking to add to 3.0 for those specific WIDA testing accommodations. And I wanted to run it and bring it here, run it by you guys and bring it here to review, to have any concerns, questions.

and make sure that this is what you were actually looking for in regards to adding those specific WIDA accommodations.



Dr. Sue Bube 3:06

So, Chris, I'm going to chime in unless someone else has a comment on the on these. I would not put these in IEP Online 3.0 yet. There are some of these that overlap with SBAC and they don't need to be this long and this confusing for parents. So I've been working with a couple of test coordinators. I would like us to work offline to come up with something.



Gregoire, Kris 3:25

I.



Dr. Sue Bube 3:31

I wanna run up by a set of test coordinators first before it goes live, because I think in your rush to get something done, you're gonna upset a bunch of people still, so I'd like to take this along with some of the work I've already done on mapping.

and try to put it together for you, but also then get some field input. And so once we have the field input, then I think you can go live a lot faster and make more people happy versus trying to rush to get this on with what you have here on this paper.



Gregoire, Kris 4:07

No, and I appreciate that. I appreciate that, Sue Ann. And we're I know Jennifer and I are talked this earlier this morning and we're going to connect with you or send an e-mail to see what your availability is. So I'll reach out to you after this meeting.



Dr. Sue Bube 4:07

Toll.



Meller, Jennifer 4:19

I appreciate that, Sue Ann. And I think I think what you are hearing and probably all of you will continue to hear in these meetings is the balance that we're trying to strike of moving quickly, but also and trying to be and being responsive, but also not wanting to cause more concerns or questions in our attempt to be responsive. So I think even as we get additional requests, I think the indication that we are doing a comprehensive analysis, there will be updates, will be helpful.



Dr. Sue Bube 5:04

And back to testing just a second before you jump on. The bigger issue is making sure, and I'm going to look at my notes here because I was talking to districts this week about this, making sure, just like in 2.0, we were able to say which test a kid is taking. And then the test coordinator was able to pull results of going, oh, these kids are taking LEDA. These kids are

Taking all access, these kids are taking SBAC, these kids are taking Wa Aim.

And that's very helpful for us to be able to figure out what tests the student is taking versus just having testing accommodations that are blanket without knowing what tests the kid is taking. So

I think we would like to be able to say, here are the tests, just like we did in 2.0, and then be able to run reports on that. And.



Hayes, Heather 5:54

It will. I'll get to that update in a second.



Gregoire, Kris 5:55

That's actually it. Yeah, we're going to get to that update. Thanks. Yeah.



Dr. Sue Bube 5:57

Okay.



Meller, Jennifer 5:57

We've got, yeah.



Dr. Sue Bube 5:59

Okay, and then along with that, if you run your testing accommodations report, your accommodations are where there's two of them in IEP Online, one says accommodations, participation, the other one just says accommodations. You do not get the same data when you pull those. And



Hayes, Heather 6:00

It's perfect.



Dr. Sue Bube 6:18

on one of the reports, it loses out your health impairment kids, your orthopedic impairment kids, your EBD kids are missing on some of those reports. So those two reports do not give you the same thing and actual data is missing.



Meller, Jennifer 6:35

You could put a pin in that just for a second, Sue Ann, because that is part of what we want to talk about. Because I think we need some clarification or I don't want to say we don't need clarification. We need to talk through as a group what



Dr. Sue Bube 6:38

Sher.

Perfect. Thank you.



Meller, Jennifer 6:50

updates we think could be made to make further clarification between those two

things. We weren't planning to talk on the missing data, but that's, I think, we'll certainly include that as a follow-up item to figure out what. What's happening there, so...



Hayes, Heather 7:14

Certainly.



Meller, Jennifer 7:15

It's like the last piece that data migration guidance.



Hayes, Heather 7:15

Um...

Yes, so that was that was the last thing we started to discuss last week, where and how to delete some of that migrated data, for example, those goals, those post-secondary goals that we added. We also got another kind of clarification question after our Medicaid Advisory group that we that we held about the.

related services, special ed services, supplementary services, pages that are only available to admins under that IEP information dropdown. And one of the main reasons for giving all of those kind of back end kind of standard pages was to help delete incorrect information or anything that did not come over the way that you would want it to in 3.0.



Meller, Jennifer 8:04

I was going to make one last point about this. Any of those updates do not change any of the records that came from 2.0. So this, you know, this lot, the guidance is about how to clean up records in a way that reflects where you're headed with a new IEP.



Hayes, Heather 8:08

Wa.



Meller, Jennifer 8:24

not necessarily to be the existing carryover of that student record that will still always be static and always be historical in 2.0. So just wanted to clarify that piece.



Hayes, Heather 8:38

Jennifer.

Okay, so the next piece we wanted to just make sure that everyone has seen or received the communication. I think, Kris, this went out a little bit earlier in the week, but these are the items, critical and or blocker items that were released last night.

They're currently all being actively...

tested and validated in production today. So they are on production, they are in use and available, but we are validating that everything still does exactly what it did in our testing environment and making sure that nothing else was impacted. So those items are on this list. I do not, these are, this is an example of where Sarah knows all the details, but.

This was the information that I was provided that was also shared out in that kind of update e-mail that went out as well. So age appropriate transition, oh, go ahead.



Gregoire, Kris 9:28

I think.

I just want to, before you get started on that, I also want to clarify too that during office hours this afternoon, Emi will be walking through these as well. And then this will also be included in our Friday update as well.



Hayes, Heather 9:43

Thank you, Kris. So that first one about eligibility updating, so the correct ROC messages display for the age appropriate transition evaluation areas. In the IEP, the explanation for alternate assessment field, printing on the document, updating it so the text prints on the testing page of the IEP Pdfs.

In the manifestation, updating the workflow and removing a rule of completion, allowing the creation of the manifestation for both the IDEA and or the 504 processes. The FBA consent document, updating it so that the district name correctly displays on the consent page of the FBA.

In the prior notice document, updating the language so the correct meeting title appears on the PDF. And then the release of records document, adding the student signature so that there could be a student signature line updated and added to that document. So those were a list of items that were released last night. There are additional items.

released last night. So these are also being actively validated today. There were some typos being resolved in the special education referral document. The prior notice date field, the update was made so when the initiation date was blank, the correct rule of completion message would display.

Also in eligibility, the re-eval and consent document updated to resolve some typos. And then the final document event name in eligibility, when a record is finalized, the hyperlink on the student history page would display the correct title of that document name. So again, all of those items were released last night. Hopefully we are able to validate.

and confirm that all of them are working as expected today, and that will go out in that communication, and they would also be reviewed on his hours.



Meller, Jennifer 11:35

Chris, there are some questions in the chat about office hours this afternoon, so asking for timing and link, so.



Hayes, Heather 11:39

Great, ask this question.



Meller, Jennifer 11:45

Oh, you're on mute, Kris.



Gregoire, Kris 11:47

Sorry, I'm on mute. Yes, we did move office hours to later in the afternoon on Fridays in order to have those deployments validated during the morning, because we were doing them at 10 o'clock while they were still being validated. We wanted to make sure we pushed it out a little bit so we had that confirmation.

I believe I want to say it's at two. I might be at one. Hold on one sec.

I should know this off the top of my head, but since we moved it, 1 P.m. today, Pacific Time. So we will have office hours moving forward on Fridays at 1 o'clock, and that is to specifically go over those items that were deployed overnight.



Meller, Jennifer 12:27

And where can they find the link? Yeah, the link to the...



Hayes, Heather 12:27

Do you have a link?



Gregoire, Kris 12:31

Yep, let me, I will put it in the chat here.



Hayes, Heather 12:35

Crouse.



Meller, Jennifer 12:37

I saw Margaret pop off mute, probably to ask the exact same question that Heather and I were saying. So, great. Thank you, Emi.



Gregoire, Kris 12:43

And look, Emi already put the chat in there. Thank you, thank you, Emi.



Hayes, Heather 12:49

Okay, so we want to also look forward and let you know some of the top priority items. These are not all of the items that are in development or that will be released in the next one to two weeks, but these are some of the top issues that we have heard and or been discussing and working on. So the Caseload Report, one of the top priorities expected to go live next week. The Caseload Report, IEP services with location, we needed to add additional fields for the safety net requirements. So that is actively in testing right now. The second one on the IEP information from the transition plan is missing or incomplete on the document. That is also in development and should be released by next week.

On the skeletal records page, we're adding related and supplementary aids and services fields so that you would be able to capture and document that information in that page. Two of the ones that we have talked about in this work group, the IEP meeting compliance. So adding that compliance symbol and timeline tracking, that is actively in development as well.

Well, and then the consent for re-eval and revision, moving the creation of that consent document to the first step, allowing ability to document the parent response, and then also seeing on that page the calculated projected due date. That

task is in development. And then let's talk a little bit more about this testing accommodations. I know.

I think there's two things, what I was hearing earlier. The first one that is already in process is adding the assessment name so that you would be able to run a report that says, here are the students with these tests. And then on those tests, here are the accommodations that they should be receiving. It sounds like there is a second version of the report that is, I'm assuming, and we can, when I'm about to get to the I have some other questions about accommodations, but a classroom accommodations report that would pull, so there's two sections where accommodations are being added. And maybe, I don't know, Jennifer, should I just skip to that piece since I know it was kind of a top of mind? I could skip over to that item.

Here we go. Since we were talking about it. So in the current state, users can add, this is one of the confusions we got at, or someone asked on our compliance and reporting group on Wednesday. And I think that I'm understanding there is a testing category under the accommodations page and folks can add accommodations there. But then on the testing page, users also then have to select applicable accommodations for each individual state and district test on that page. So I guess our question kind of is, users are unsure which page supports reporting and accurate reporting. I had one potential suggestion. I don't know if this matters, but to me, it was a little confusing to see.

the same just testing in both places. And if the intent on the accommodations page was classroom testing, and then on the testing page, it's state and district standardized assessments. I don't know if that would help resolve any confusion or not. That was that was one thing I wanted to ask if you felt it would or not. And then the second piece, it sounds like

We need just a differentiation and clear guidance on a testing accommodations report versus a classroom accommodations report. So I'll stop there, open up the floor, and see if I've kind of accurately captured the issues, and we need to make sure that

All accommodations would print for a classroom accommodations report, as well as all accommodations and tests would print from that testing accommodations report.



Meller, Jennifer 16:25

Thank you.



Hayes, Heather 16:25

Tracy?



TS Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 16:28

In 2.0, the way it worked was you on the accommodations page, you had to choose it for a testing accommodation. And then when you went into the SBA and set a plus accommodations, it would only pull through those accommodations you had listed as testing. So you didn't have the full list of options on the



Hayes, Heather 16:45

Mm.



TS Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 16:50

SBA or WCAG or whatever that page, whatever the tests are collected for. So I have not been that far into this, but it would be confusing if you have the full list in both places.



Hayes, Heather 17:03

And I think that is, Kris, how it is right now in 3.0.



DB Dr. Sue Bube 17:09

Yeah.



Meller, Jennifer 17:09

No, and Sue and you want to join in? Yeah.



Hayes, Heather 17:09

Right.



DB Dr. Sue Bube 17:11

Yeah, so the idea is that you first pick testing accommodations that can be used in the classroom. And if you're not using them in the classroom, you're not allowed to use them on state testing. So that's why the state testing page needs to keep the smaller subset.



Hayes, Heather 17:11

Yeah.



Dr. Sue Bube 17:27

And then, you know, being able then to go, okay, the students taking SBAC math. So now which of these accommodations am I allowed to use on math? Because what I see a lot of times is just districts in the past have just clicked everything that they had in the classroom and then you end up with calculators in English language arts class. So

And we can fix that on our end, but we just need to make sure that the testing accommodations page, like it was in 2.0, is all the possibilities for the classroom. And then there's a subset that they pick for each of the tests.



Hayes, Heather 18:03

Yes. And so I think that's hopefully Sue Ann and Kris and Jennifer, what will make sure that we can limit for each test, what's allowable for each test to help with that and then keep the full list in the classroom accommodations page.



Meller, Jennifer 18:21

How do we feel about changing the name?

So, renaming the category to classroom.

Testing, or does it do we land on?



Hayes, Heather 18:31

Or does it not matter?



Dr. Sue Bube 18:34

I think every if the link keeping the language like it was in 2.0. is good enough.

Because people are used to that.



Hayes, Heather 18:42

It wasn't just testing. OK.

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 18:48

That's my two cents.

 **Hayes, Heather** 18:53

And confirmation that we should have two reports, one that's already in process, which is testing accommodations that will list the specific assessments for each student, as well as those testing accommodations. And then a second classroom accommodations report that would pull any category, any of those three. Let me pull it back.

classroom, custom classroom, or testing, it would pull all of those, anything added on this page, into our report as well.

Does that solve what our current known issues or are we missing anything?

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 19:28

As long as all the disabilities are being pulled through.

 **Gregoire, Kris** 19:34

I do want to jump in and ask a question, Sue Ann, and I'm blanking on how it worked in 2.0, but you had said that you need a report for kiddos, like all of the kiddos taking Wa Aim, for example. I can't remember off the top of my head, and I have to go back and look at that. When you run the testing accommodations report in 2.0, Is it just pulling and like I said, I have to run it again, but I'm not sure if it pulls even those kiddos that are participating and then you have the kiddos that are participating with accommodations. Do you need a report that pulls like all the kiddos taking Wa Aim, whether they're using accommodations or not?

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 20:12

No, so in 2.0, we would go in and pull all the kids, and I mean, you would, there a screen would pop up, and I'm just trying to visualize it here. It would have all the tests listed, and then I'd go through and say, okay, today I just want SBEC or I want SBEC and Wa, and I checked

 **Gregoire, Kris** 20:13

Okay.

Yeah.

Mhm.

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 20:31

the test that I wanted it to pull, and then it would pull all the accommodations for those kids. And if a kid didn't have an accommodation, it still pulled that name, and that's fine, right? Because our data people in our districts, they're smart enough to be able to filter. Once it's in Excel, they can filter it and do what they need to do.

The bigger question is, just, we don't need you to create 10 reports for us. Just one report that has all the data and then we can filter. Like that's not a big deal.

 **Gregoire, Kris** 21:04

And you answered my question, thinking back to 2.0. So it did pull those kiddos who took the Wa aim but didn't have any accommodations. It did pull those kiddos. Okay, thank you.

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 21:12

Yeah.

 **Meller, Jennifer** 21:16

Tracy had a question in the chat. Is the testing page still going to have the full list?

 **Hayes, Heather** 21:22

We'll have the full list for each allowable for each test.

So it would not include all of the things that are in the testing dropdown on the accommodations page, but it will have a subset that are allowable for that test.

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 21:37

But again, if they haven't chose it for the student in the classroom, they can't use it on the test either.

 **Hayes, Heather** 21:43

Understood. Yeah.



Meller, Jennifer 21:43

That's what I, yeah.



Hayes, Heather 21:45

But unfortunately, unless the names are exact, which I don't think they are, between the two lists, then we can't do that link.



Gregoire, Kris 21:52

OK.



Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 21:54

I don't understand that. So, so before it would filter, it would filter from what was...



Hayes, Heather 21:54

Something we can explore with that soon.



Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 22:02

in the accommodations page, and those were the only available options on the testing page, but now you're saying they can put it on the accommodations page, or they cannot put it on the accommodations page and still put it on the testing page?



Dr. Sue Bube 22:06

Yeah.



Hayes, Heather 22:20

It is, as it stands right now, yes, if you, if we want to have, if we want...



Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 22:22

That's that, but that that would then be illegal because they're not using it in during classroom testing.



Hayes, Heather 22:26

Understand. Understand.

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 22:29

Yeah, so...

 **Hayes, Heather** 22:30

But there has to be a one-to-one match in wording. So every test and every wording on each test, if we can match that wording exactly to what is in the testing list on the accommodations page, then we can explore that link. But right now, the words don't match. And so that's why there is no link.

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 22:35

No.

Okay.

 **Meller, Jennifer** 22:47

Why we're talking through this 'cause we had concerns about that too, so...

 **Hayes, Heather** 22:48

Yeah.

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 22:48

Yeah, so let's back up. First, you know, again, we can map it on the back end. I don't, and if you look at all the accommodations that were in 2.0, like Bellingham, Mercer Island, and some of the others did match some of the language that was in tide.

But then that confused parents. So we don't need you to match the language exactly, right? If it just says Zoom, we can figure that out and we can match the tied language and we can create a mapping document on the back end because you're never going to match all the tied language.

you're not going to have non-designated supports. And you know, like it is what we have to map it regardless, because there's no way you're going to match all the fields in the tide report. And if tide changes, we don't want you to have to change your program. So I think

and you can tell I feel strongly about this, is that we can create something that's very parent centric, that we can also then on the back end have a mapping document that helps us as districts map it to tide very easily without you having to do that for us.

or to Wea, right?

So I just like to back up because I think you're making an assumption that we're not making and I don't know if I see Seattle on here.



Hayes, Heather 24:12

Do it.

Just responding to the request that when you get to the testing page, the only things you see when you click to add accommodations for Wea are ones you've already selected on the classroom page. And to do that is where I'm saying we have to have a one-to-one match to be able to restrict.



Dr. Sue Bube 24:32

Yeah.



Hayes, Heather 24:38

what you see in each individual test to match the list in the testing. But I agree with you, the reason most of our districts and states don't do that is because it's not parent-friendly in the accommodation section.



Dr. Sue Bube 24:52

Yeah, I think I'm happy to take this conversation offline because I think we need to actually see it on a spreadsheet to figure it out and come back to the team. Is and if.



Hayes, Heather 24:56

So, like, I think we can figure it out.



Meller, Jennifer 25:00

To see all that, yeah.



Hayes, Heather 25:02

So, like...



Meller, Jennifer 25:03

I think it goes hand in hand with the just the updates in general. So I think that would

be helpful, Sue, and if we can just take a look at the whole the whole section or two sections and how they fit together.



Hayes, Heather 25:14

Great.

I think we understand the problem, and we will work towards that solution.

So let me go back. So this one, you know, sorry, I went to the testing so that we could continue that conversation, but now, okay, so this is one that is causing quite a bit of trouble and again, stems from that exact match type issue.



Meller, Jennifer 25:27

I know we're jumping around a bit, so sorry for all the back and forth.



Hayes, Heather 25:45

In order to restrict what users were allowed to select in the services section, as an example, to only those things that were in the current finalized eligibility process, there have to be identical names. So that is causing a lot of challenges because of data migration.

and mapping because of the list consolidation and also restrictions that our system has on having the exact same service name, like occupational therapy, in three different places, in related, in supplementary, and in special ed, for example. So that's the challenge that we're trying to solve. The proposed solution I'd like to put forth. for discussion is allowing users, removing that restriction, allowing users to select from the full services list when they're drafting their IEP. However, adding a rule of completion to confirm that every IEP area or service is present in eligibility before they can finalize. So we're keeping the compliance check.

We're supporting the concurrent eligibility and IEP drafting, and as well as being able to map multiple versions of occupational therapy. I think right now we're up to at least, you know, 10 or 15 based on district's request for critical additions. All 10 of those would be allowable if you had occupational therapy in your eligibility.

So that's the idea. We have not gone further with it yet, but I'd like to open that up for, would this solution work for you? If not, do you have suggestions on how else we could approach it?



Meller, Jennifer 27:29

Maybe we should pause just for any clarifying questions first, because I know that was a lot. And if you need Heather to repeat something, you know, we can certainly do that. So take a second if folks need clarification or otherwise you can just jump in.



Hayes, Heather 27:37

Links.



Dr. Sue Bube 27:54

Can you go back to the eligibility IEP linkage and give us like?

For those of us who are concrete sequential, there's no picture here or direct mapping. I could be helpful.



Hayes, Heather 28:03

I don't have a picture. Yeah, I didn't have a picture. And maybe Kris can help me with an actual like example. But what I noticed when I, you know, my limited interaction in the system, I go to the services page and try to add a service. And when I click the dropdown, there's nothing there. And the reason I was told there's nothing there is because there's not something in the eligibility process that has that exact



Meller, Jennifer 28:04

Yeah.



Hayes, Heather 28:25

link that exact name that fed into the IEP process.

Kris, can you help with any additional kind of example then?



Meller, Jennifer 28:33

Seeing some head nodding too, Laura, maybe if you looks like, yeah.



Gregoire, Kris 28:34

Yeah, well, that's yep, no, you said it exactly, yeah.



Dr. Sue Bube 28:37

Okay, so...

I know you were trying to consolidate what Districts had on the.

on the list, right? Because different districts, some kids, some districts had SDLC, some kids had social emotion and behavior in one thing, some misspelled it, like there were like all sorts of things. So that's.

In order to fix it though, district, what you're saying is districts either have to like open up the, in the past, we'd have to open up an eval and like rename it there, right?

Like, what's...



Hayes, Heather 29:14

That would be, and we're still going to have challenges with, for example, that occupational therapy. There are three different versions of occupational therapy in the list right now, so it's never going to map one-to-one to the eligibility process.

Like this is just an example.

Again, if I'm misunderstanding.



Dr. Sue Bube 29:32

I'm sorry, Julie's got her hand up. I have another question, but...



Webster, Julie 29:34

Yeah.



Hayes, Heather 29:35

Yeah.



Webster, Julie 29:37

Hi, good morning. So the issue for us is when you unlink the IEP from the eligibility, you can add or remove any service you want. You don't have the Guardrails from the eligibility.



Hayes, Heather 29:55

Correct.



Webster, Julie 29:57

that lead you through the IEP process. So you automatically remove your compliance when you unlink those documents. So.



Hayes, Heather 30:07

Right now, yes, but I'm proposing we add a rule of completion so that they can't complete a non-compliant IEP. They could draft it.



Webster, Julie 30:14

Right. So what we're experiencing is like we have multiple areas that aren't coming through at all. I mean, we don't even have a disability for our hard of hearing students right now. So those services have to all be under either communication or audiology. So on the back end, if you could at least update the eligibility categories to pull through, that would be one area that would help us link our documents. We do not want to unlink. We use that linkage for compliance review and we have for 10 or 15 years. We can't possibly compare the two documents now.



Hayes, Heather 31:04

You don't need to. So that's what I'm saying. I think you're missing the second-half of the proposal, which is to add a rule of completion that will not let them choose something that is not ineligibility from a group of mapped things. That is my proposal. So all I'm saying is that the check happens before you finalize instead of up front.

That's kind of the difference. We're just, we're pulling it, pulling it back. You still have the compliance. They cannot finalize an IEP without that check. So the compliance is still 100% there.



Webster, Julie 31:25

Yeah.

What?

That would be great. That would be great. What I'm saying is on the eligibility side, I'm not getting the actual services even pulling over. We're already doing a workaround. So on the eligibility side, would you have hard of hearing? Would you have those specific areas that would provide those Guardrails?



Hayes, Heather 31:57

I'd have to look more into the eligibility side. I was kind of more focused on the

services and I don't know if Kris knows more about the things in eligibility. So I can take that back and we can look more into that additional area to link or that's involved. Absolutely.

 **Webster, Julie** 32:00
Yeah.

 **Gregoire, Kris** 32:03
I don't.

 **Webster, Julie** 32:11
OK, it.

For SDI and related and SAS. I mean, like we can't even add an SAS for para support right now because it's not available. So I'm just saying on the eligibility side, you know, that eval drives the IEP. So I need that evaluation services to populate. And then if you do provide the Guardrails on the IEP, that's great.

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 32:14
Is.

 **Webster, Julie** 32:35
I just need those services to come through.

 **Hayes, Heather** 32:39
I think I do, I think I understand now.

 **Webster, Julie** 32:41
Yeah, okay. Great. Thank you.

 **Hayes, Heather** 32:42
Yes. Okay, thank you. No, thank you.

 **Dr. Sue Bube** 32:46
Yeah, I get you're trying to clean up the data, but...

Why not just let us have access to how how we've had it and then do the clean up later with the with Seac?



Hayes, Heather 33:00

I can't add 4,500 services to all the lists.

That's what it would be. It would be adding 4,500 services to every single list of services in every place in the IEP and eligibility.

Because that's how many versions we have right now.



Meller, Jennifer 33:24

We hear you, Sue Ann. We've been brainstorming as well, trying to find that balance.



Hayes, Heather 33:25

I did try.



Meller, Jennifer 33:31

Around, yeah, not overwhelming folks, but also solving for this, so.

Julie, do you want to?



Webster, Julie 33:40

Yeah, I, yeah, I get that with the services, but you know, we are re-entering every service for social emotional to match the way it existed in 2.0. And that's just social emotional. Like we are re-entering every service for reading because when I migrated, there are typos. So I hear what you're saying, and I like the fact that there's Guardrails to finalize the IEP, but if I have to re-enter every service matrix, we're missing.

We're missing the air here. The migrated data that I'm getting in 3.0 is forcing me to enter what was originally in 2.0. So I guess I'm just wondering where the efforts are going. You know, like with Sue Ann, if I have to...

continue to enter every service matrix, not edit it, not go in and edit. I have to re-enter it to correct the migrated data issues. Why not just give me access to that and let me do it on our end.

It doesn't sound like that's an option.



Meller, Jennifer 35:03

Can you clarify what part that you would want ability to edit?



Hayes, Heather 35:03

Mike.



Webster, Julie 35:07

Yeah, can I edit the service matrix in 3.0 instead of re-entering it?



Hayes, Heather 35:16

I think you have to enter the services to get the matrix, if I'm understanding correctly. Yeah.



Webster, Julie 35:18

Yeah, yeah, I do. Yeah, you're right. And the current guidance right now is that we create an assessment revision to correct that or re-enter the service matrix. And we're not, you know, we're not going to, we're not going to edit or create an assessment revision to add OT.

Services, I mean that has to start coming through, so...



Gregoire, Kris 35:43

That is something.



Webster, Julie 35:44

So, I, you, I, you all know, you all understand the issue, I know you do, so that's just my two cents.



Gregoire, Kris 35:51

Julie, thanks for bringing that attention because we did, Edmonds brought that to my attention and I was working with one of our subject matter experts around that assessment revision. So it is on our radar and we are looking at that.



Webster, Julie 35:57

No.

Yeah, yeah. No, I know. I know you guys hear us. Thank you.



Meller, Jennifer 36:13

I want to make sure that we get to some questions in the chat. So I think Tracy needed some help in understanding what the rule of completion, what the difference it would make. Because it is true, you can still present a draft of parents with areas that don't have eligibility, but you can't finalize.

the document, right? So maybe, Heather, if you could talk through that one more time about what this would solve for.



Hayes, Heather 36:39

I mean, it basically just gives you greater flexibility in the drafting process, which again was another thing I think that we heard as a very clear need that you need to be able to draft your IEP and choose your services sometimes in an initial before you've actually finalized your, or your re-eval maybe. Either scenario. There was the a very strong request to be able to kind of push the data, even though an eligibility is not finalized yet, so that you can make some selections in the IEP. So this does help solve for that too. The rule of completion, when they're on that page even, it's going to show red, it's going to display the error anytime they try to move forward, which is fine, they can still draft the IEP and share it.

But what it's going to allow us to do is create an actual map for all of these variations. So right now, like I said, the way that the system works is it only pulls through direct matches. And this would allow us to create a rule of completion that has more flexibility and can say, all right, if we have.

occupational therapy and eligibility, and we have 15 versions of occupational therapy in our services list, any of those 15 satisfy the linkage, and so check, that rule of completion won't fire. But if it's physical therapy and occupational therapy is the only thing they have in eligibility, that rule of completion would fire and say,

This is an area that is not in your eligibility, and you would have to go back and correct.

Does that help? That's the idea. Again, we haven't gone through the whole technical specification yet. I'm just trying to figure out how we can make it work.



Meller, Jennifer 38:17

Margaret?



Margaret Harriss 38:18

Will this then also assist with the services in Medicaid when it comes to the provider is not showing a service or a student on their list because all of the different variations of OT and maybe that one isn't marked?

In a sense, on the Easytrac side, I, I'm just, I'm wondering if that's where that connection.



Hayes, Heather 38:47

Yeah, that's a great question.



Meller, Jennifer 38:50

Yep.



Hayes, Heather 38:51

Unfortunately, no. Easytrac is its own. Yeah, unfortunately, no, I wish that was possible. Easytrac is a one-to-one for each individual service. So we are still exploring for those of you, I think you might be on that group, Margaret. There is a subgroup that we met with last week about Medicaid and looking at these lists and really trying to figure out



Margaret Harriss 38:51

Ann.

No.

Mhm.



Hayes, Heather 39:11

a way to consolidate at least the ones that folks are needing to log for. Because when we have 15 versions of occupational therapy in the system and folks could choose any of those 15, that means there's 15 different certifications they have to enter. And if you don't check one off the right way, a kid is missing from the logging wizard. So there is a parallel kind of work group.

 **Margaret Harriss** 39:17

Yeah.

 **Hayes, Heather** 39:35

looking at a proposal to try to consolidate at least the OTPT, audiology, speech, those services in a way that will still work for the IEP writing side and the Medicaid writing side.

 **Margaret Harriss** 39:48

So then if we are looking at consolidating the services or, you know, the way that it's mapped out, so we've got 15 versions of OT, what is it going to look like on the evaluation? And then what are we pulling? Is it only going to show those 15 versions when we're looking for OT or is it going to be requested?

Testing what we have on the evaluation.

 **Hayes, Heather** 40:19

Not sure yet. Again, just an idea. So all great things for us to consider as we're trying to like detail technical, how would it work?

 **Margaret Harriss** 40:19

I'm sure.

Uh-huh. Okay.

 **Hayes, Heather** 40:28

That's a good point. Thank you.

Before we would move forward with any of this, I just wanted to see if this was even a road I should go down. And if I do go down that road, we would create technical requirements and some mock-ups so we can have some visuals of here's how it would look. And we could have further discussion on how, very specifically, how it would function if this is something we think.

It is a is a path I could go down. If not, that is also OK, and we will go back to the drawing board, but this one, this one's tough.

 **Meller, Jennifer** 41:06

Do we think folks could give a thumbs up or some sort of indication if this is a path that we should continue to explore and come back, like Heather said? That would be helpful to us in terms of the input from this group about what we're trying to solve for and whether this is.

This is the path to go down.

Are there questions still or is it you don't feel comfortable? I'm just trying to gauge what, you know, what where we're thinking for next steps.

We can move ahead with it in terms of the exploration and come back to the group.

Seems like maybe there's more understanding that a new conversation that would need to happen before this would be enacted, but.



Hayes, Heather 42:02

Not.



Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 42:08

I guess I would like to see a visual representation of what we're talking about before I would say do it because I feel like it's still, it's solving a piece of a problem, but it's not solving the root problem.



Meller, Jennifer 42:17

Ann.



Hayes, Heather 42:19

Yeah.

And when you say the root problem is that this is essentially the data migration and having the 4,500 services.



Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 42:35

I mean, I don't, I don't, that's a that's a pretty big number, and so.



Hayes, Heather 42:40

Asg.



Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 42:45

I think.

I think there's a different root problem than what you think there is.



Hayes, Heather 42:51

For mapping, what is the what, in your opinion, what is the root problem?



Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 42:55

Well, I think Julie said it earlier. She really verbalized it better than I can, actually.
So I mean.



Meller, Jennifer 43:04

But Julia had your hands up.



Webster, Julie 43:05

Yeah, yeah. I guess I'd like to see, I mean, it...

I don't really have an option, right? You're not, like, we don't really have an option right now. Right now, I can't enter several areas of services under related or SAS or even SDI. So we're having to put them in the prior written notice to explain them to the family.

which then isn't going to pull that service when I run a report. So, I mean, I don't, I'm not sure we're solving the root of the problem because the data in 2.0 that came over is not what's in 2.0.



Dr. Sue Bube 43:52

Yeah. Can we see a...



Webster, Julie 43:52

Right. So, I mean, I guess if this is the only option I have to move forward, then, you know, I don't have any other choice. You know, so you're not really giving me a choice, but I do appreciate the efforts. I really, really do appreciate the efforts.



Hayes, Heather 44:02

Yeah, no, I understand.



Meller, Jennifer 44:04

We hear you, yeah.



Dr. Sue Bube 44:07

Yeah.



Webster, Julie 44:11

It's just I am re-entering social emotional every single time. So.



Hayes, Heather 44:16

Right.

So I think one thing, and I know this does not take away the pain, I know 100%, this is just this year and it is just this transition period because we can't alter the data that was migrated. So that has been done. So we're trying to figure out how to help you just again for the rest of this year, but then also going forward so that



Webster, Julie 44:23

Yeah, yeah, I know.



Hayes, Heather 44:39

you know, you shouldn't ever have to do all of this again, any of this re-entry or mapping or any of it. So it's both trying to solve the short-term pain, however we can figure out how to do that. And then also make sure that we're setting it up, setting you up for success next year when all the data is in there, you don't have to do this anymore and you just get to.



Webster, Julie 44:42

Yeah.

Mhm.



Hayes, Heather 44:59

You know, cleanly before her.



Webster, Julie 45:02

Yeah, yeah. I mean, I guess I would be interested in seeing a mock up of what this would look like and seeing how it is going to help, you know, with those Guardrails on the IEP.

Yeah, I mean, again, I'm just curious how many people in this Zoom actually use the software versus oversee the software or oversee the development of it. You know, I'm in it every day and supporting every single teacher every day. And so It's just a lot of data entry and it increases the risk of the compliance piece of it. But we don't have any other choice. So yeah, if you have the time to mock it up and share that, I would be interested in seeing it.



Meller, Jennifer 45:54

I think what this conversation is also producing is just a reflection on maybe this isn't the only option. Maybe there are others. I think Heather's been brainstorming. Maybe there are others. And so we'll go back and build this out further. I think It sounds like most of you are visual. It helps to see it. I'm with you as well, particularly talking about logic and flow of data and information. So we can do that as the next step. Doesn't commit to anything. It's giving all of this group additional information to reflect on. And I want to thank.

deeply as well about the point Tracy's been raising about the root cause and are there other other options that we can continue to think through.

Sue Anne, I saw you come off mute. Did you want to add anything else in there?



Dr. Sue Bube 46:49

Well, I put in the chat, I think it's helpful when we can see how things are being mapped, right? You've got people on here who are data miners. You know, we like to see that. And it was very helpful for me to see when Mike provided me the original mapping documents and then I asked for updates.

and he's like, that's not possible. So that's frustrating because it's helpful for me to go, oh, all these accommodations were almost the same, but how the hell did this one get changed from headache to scribe, right? Or whatever. Like.

One, it calmed me down a little because I'm like, okay, on the accommodations, 80% of them pulled the same, but then here are the ones I've got to, I got to figure out.

The same thing with testing, yeah, with testing accommodations and so forth. And so when we're talking about eligibility, I could see in the original mapping,



Meller, Jennifer 47:34

The exceptions, yeah.



Dr. Sue Bube 47:44

how many times occupational therapy was rewritten or typed incorrectly or right. And we get that. But there are some things where you've made some decisions around deaf, hard of hearing or other things that make no sense to the rest of us. And we can't explain it to our team.

And so I think if we had more visibility into the mapping, we would be able to say, oh, all of that's correct. And then here's how we can help you fix the SC. But coming back and telling us what your solutions are.

It is frustrating.



Hayes, Heather 48:22

I hear you, Sue. And that's the very next slide was we were preparing A consolidated file with the full original list of services, those 4500 from 2.0 for each district, the specific service name that it was mapped to and migrated as into 3.0. So I assume the answer is yes, but I wanted to ask before we just decided to go forward and do this.

Would that will that be helpful for all districts? It will be a large file, but you will be able to filter it by your district or by service, or you know, in whichever way you would like.



Dr. Sue Bube 48:54

Yes.



Hayes, Heather 48:58

And we were going to start with services and we assumed there might be some additional ones that make sense to do as well. But I think services was the biggest one that we've been hearing. So we anticipate we would be able to provide this to everyone by next week, by next Friday.



Dr. Sue Bube 49:13

What about eligibility and...



Meller, Jennifer 49:16

I say that too, yeah.



Dr. Sue Bube 49:18

and accommodation, I think everything. I think to be transparent.
Give us a, give it all.



Hayes, Heather 49:23

I will go back and say, I don't think we can give you all of that by next Friday, but I think, you know, we can work towards the additional ones. Eligibility might be a simpler. I don't know. I'm not going to, I'm not the data person. I'm not going to talk for them. I will go back and specifically also ask for eligibility and accommodations and see if we can get that in at the same time. And then we can look at. Additional mapping as well.



Dr. Sue Bube 49:46

Well, and services are mapped to eligibility, correct?



Hayes, Heather 49:51

I think services were only mapped to the services page, but again, that's not my area. So I will make sure we ask that question. And yes, I'm not 100% on that. We'll validate that. And when we send the file out, we'll have details as to where and how it went.



Dr. Sue Bube 49:52

Or no.
Services.
Okay, but.
OK.



Hayes, Heather 50:14

Because I wasn't even thinking of services being an eligibility.



Dr. Sue Bube 50:17

Well, services aren't in eligibility, but they're on the eval page, right? And then that's what tied over to the IEP page is what services.



Hayes, Heather 50:24

Yeah.

I'll try to, I'll get a better understanding of that myself, and then we'll make sure we include that information with the.



Dr. Sue Bube 50:32

Yeah, but I mean, I've personally, I know other districts, we've changed services in the past, but you know, we've done it over a three-year period where we've trained our staff. We're not using this one anymore. Now use this one. And then over three years, then all the old services go away, but we don't make our, we phase it out, but we don't make our staff rewrite or recopy because of the headache.



Hayes, Heather 50:48

Is it out?



Dr. Sue Bube 50:54

that it puts us through. And now you're seeing that result because you've done it to us on multiple.

Services.



Meller, Jennifer 51:08

So I heard accommodations as well, that, is there any other, any other, it just says word.



Hayes, Heather 51:10

And eligibility.



Meller, Jennifer 51:16

On the topic.



Hayes, Heather 51:16

He said, and and eligibility, Jennifer, you were at that one.



Meller, Jennifer 51:18

Yeah, sorry. Yeah, I knew that. Yeah, I yeah.



Hayes, Heather 51:20

Okay.



Dr. Sue Bube 51:22

So services are going to be SAS related and SDI, right?



Tracy Pitzer - SBLSD 51:22

So.



Hayes, Heather 51:27

all three categories.



Dr. Sue Bube 51:28

Yeah.



Hayes, Heather 51:33

While we're on services, keep thinking if there's anything else you want, but while we're on services, because we're almost out of time for today, but this is the last thing I wanted to ask.

Would it be helpful to add a view only field to the IEP? It would not print on anything, but it would be for reference. So just kind of, this one I did try to mock up. I know it's terrible, so I apologize for that. But on your services page, you have your setting and you have your add service button. And then when you add your services or when they were migrated, they show up down here in this table. So my proposal is we could.

Add a view only field and we can put it wherever. I just stuck it at the bottom for now. If you have a better location, please, please tell me. But at the bottom we can say, here are the services listed on the latest IEP in 2.0. And we can pull that over exactly as it was worded because it'll just be a text field. So we're not having to match or map.

you know, to our lists or anything in the system, we're able to just straight pull, you

know, pull that over into one single field for viewing purposes. So that would give you, again, the reference, because I think that Excel file to me, if I was a teacher, right, I'm not going to go to that Excel file to see where we mapped everything. It could be useful for a lot of people, but when in your day-to-day, when you're looking at what was on 2.0, you could see it right here on the page. The idea would be that's just there for this year. And once all students have new IEPs, you wouldn't need it anymore and we could remove it next year. So I'll open it up briefly. Thoughts, questions, concerns. Should we move forward with this or not?

 **Petrie, Laura C** 53:09

Seattle would rather you fix the error message in the required fields in the service matrix than add something else to the service matrix.

 **Hayes, Heather** 53:15

Yeah.

So this wouldn't be adding it to the service matrix, it would just be a reference and I would probably need, I don't know what the ROCs are in the matrix. I'm sure someone does and we can take that back, someone on the team.

 **Meller, Jennifer** 53:44

I would, Julie.

 **Webster, Julie** 53:46

So you're saying that you're going to pull that field from 2.0 as just a reference, but what happens if a new eligibility has been created in 3.0 and there's different services? So now I've got a new eligibility, but I'm referencing last year's IEP. That's it. I'm just, I'm not understanding the disconnect.

 **Hayes, Heather** 54:14

It's literally just a view only field so you could see what the data was in 2.0 on that last IEP. It would not print. It would not be viewable to anyone else like the parents. This would be just for reference purposes for the teachers as they're going through,

you know, the IEPs and seeing what got migrated and what was on the 2.0. When you do your next one.

it becomes irrelevant. You are absolutely correct. As soon as you do your next IEP, that information is irrelevant. So that's why I wanted to ask, does this even make sense? Or is it helpful for them to be able to see what was on the most recent final IEP in 2.0?

 **Webster, Julie** 54:47

Yeah, I'm not sure that would be helpful if an eligibility was in process or as, you know, a student no longer qualifies for speech this year. I mean, we've already had, we've already gone through some DNQs and I'm not sure that would be helpful. I don't think it would be current information for all of our students. So, but...

 **Hayes, Heather** 55:12

Actually, it won't be current, and it would be labeled latest IEP in 2.0, like very clearly, but I'm hearing you loud and clear, you do not think it would be helpful.

 **Webster, Julie** 55:15

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

I, I'm not sure it would be, yeah.

 **Meller, Jennifer** 55:21

Some other comments it looks like would be confusing.

 **Webster, Julie** 55:24

Yeah, thank you.

 **Hayes, Heather** 55:25

No, that's that, that's why we're asking.

 **Meller, Jennifer** 55:26

Margaret, do you have a what is your perspective?

 **Margaret Harriss** 55:28

Yeah, I was going to say that it's a great thought, but at the same time, I think them using the other tools that are available, kind of like their IEP at a glance, if they're pulling that, they can see what is on the most current.



Hayes, Heather 55:41

Yeah.



Margaret Harriss 55:46

So, yeah, it's a great thought, but I don't think it's, I don't think it's necessary at this time.



Meller, Jennifer 55:56

That's all helpful. I don't, yeah, thank you. Laura, I don't want to lose the thread of the rule of completion. Could you state that one more time? Because I want to make sure either if Kris or others are listening that we're clear on what your comment was around that rule of completion.



Hayes, Heather 55:58

Thank you.



Petrie, Laura C 56:16

Yeah, we're experiencing in Seattle an error, an error with the error message not appearing. So in the service matrix, when there is missing data, there's usually a required field error message that comes up that prevents the case manager from locking the IEP.

because there's missing field in the service matrix. That error message is not populated. There is no error message, so it's allowing the IEP to be finalized with missing service matrix information.



Meller, Jennifer 56:40

OK.



Gregoire, Kris 56:53

Jump in, because Lauren and I have been working together on this, and Sarah and I have been testing it. And when we do that in the testing site, we're able to get that

rock. So any migrated data, if it's missing something, we get this rock that says, oh, you need to go back and add.

 **Petrie, Laura C** 56:54
That that.

 **Hayes, Heather** 56:54
Mr. Megan. Yeah, bye Chris.

 **Meller, Jennifer** 56:55
Hi, Kris.

 **Gregoire, Kris** 57:11
Purple. In Seattle, for whatever reason, it's not, they can move forward with the green arrow moving forward. It just lets them move and it lets them finalize without that rock, even with these missing fields. Sarah and I, and Heather, maybe you and I and Sarah can connect, but we have tested left, right, center, and we can't figure out why. It's not giving that rock in Seattle when it's giving it another place. That's where we're stumped by that. So we can, if you want to connect, Heather, we can follow up on that.

 **Hayes, Heather** 57:38
Sher.
Mark.

 **Petrie, Laura C** 57:41
But the text that falls underneath that data point, like date range, typically it's a red required field. Text shows up there that's missing as well. So that text is missing. It doesn't require the field, and then it'll allow the.

 **Gregoire, Kris** 57:41
Yeah.

 **Petrie, Laura C** 58:00

document to be finalized, causing big issues because the service matrix and the Pdfs is now not correct.



Hayes, Heather 58:04

No, I good.



Meller, Jennifer 58:05

Absolutely.



Petrie, Laura C 58:08

So I think that's a priority over than any other priority currently.



Hayes, Heather 58:09

Yeah, Chris, let's take a look. Did you, and you have examples, Kris?



Gregoire, Kris 58:11

We'll take a look.



Hayes, Heather 58:15

You have specific, sorry, you have specific examples, Kris, that OK. Thank you.



Gregoire, Kris 58:15

Sorry.

Yes, I do.



Petrie, Laura C 58:24

But thank you for asking for clarification.



Hayes, Heather 58:24

Right, I know we're 2 minutes over.



Meller, Jennifer 58:28

Yeah.

So thank you, folks. As usual, there are more topics than we can get to today. But we've got some of the big items around the testing accommodations. So we will

work towards that and have

Recommendations for next week, and then also.

When we send out the notes, we'll confirm, you know, the discussion items. We will not move ahead on the...

the suggestion around the information, like we were just talking about, the information from 2.0 coming in and being a reference point. And then we will come back with more mock-ups on the eligibility and IEP linkages and some suggestions there.

Oh, and the mapping. So service mapping, but also to include accommodations and eligibility. So we will get working on those pieces as well.

Right.

Well, thank you all. As usual, I'll say again, thank you for your input and the time that you are committing to work through this with us. So hope you have a great weekend and stay tuned for notes and we will connect again soon.



Hayes, Heather 59:50

Thank you. Have a great Friday.



Meller, Jennifer 59:51

Great, thanks.

● **LaBounty, Steven** stopped transcription