

SEAC Meeting Notes

October 7, 2026 | IEP Online 3.0 Conformity Progress

Purpose and governance

Dana Anderson clarified that SEAC's immediate focus is shifting from general product enhancement to assessing whether IEP Online 3.0 has reached **conformity with essential district needs**. SEAC will provide representative district feedback, PCG is responsible for corrective work, and WSIPC retains responsibility for determining when contractual conformity has been reached.

The meeting was framed as a **progress review, not a declaration that the issues are resolved**. PCG presented work completed, work underway, remaining gaps, and the evidence that will ultimately be needed for closure.

Evidence Required to Close Corrective Actions



Today's review

Assess remediation and validation evidence.
Record gaps against agreed acceptance criteria.

www.pacificcommunitygroup.com



18

Corrective actions move through defined gates: identify and validate the problem, develop and test the correction, obtain district operational validation, and complete stakeholder review/formal closure. Development or deployment alone does not constitute closure.

Why the transition has been difficult

PCG acknowledged that the move from IEP Online 2.0 to 3.0 was more complex than anticipated. More than **9 million historical records/items** were migrated, and PCG

acknowledged it did not adequately anticipate the scale of resulting migration issues or their operational impact. Cohort 1 also represented smaller districts and did not expose all of the complexities experienced by Cohort 2.

[Mike Howard](#) acknowledged in hindsight that smaller/additional cohorts or migrating less historical data could have reduced risk. PCG's position is that returning to 2.0 is not a practical path, so the focus is now on making 3.0 functional and reliable. PCG also committed to providing more detailed technical information explaining the 2.0-to-3.0 transition and why reverting is not viable.

Workstream 1: District workflow functionality

DW - 00 | District Workflow Functionality and Process Gaps

Related to the Corrective Action	Beyond the Corrective Action
Description of the Corrective Action: Workflow and usability gaps require coordinated prioritization, documentation, remediation, and district validation across the full user experience. What the workgroup identified at the outset: Prioritize complete, accurate system-generated documentation to ensure districts maintain compliance standards. What PCG accomplished: Continuous defect resolution of workflows impacted by system-generated documentation. Why it matters to the district: Accurate documentation supports district compliance.	What we heard from tickets/advisories: System-generated documentation was not functioning as intended. What PCG accomplished: Deployed resolution for 17 out of 27 workflow-related items reported. What PCG will do: Complete the remaining 10 workflow-related items reported and provide continuous monitoring for stabilization. Why it matters to the end-user: Reduce rework, provide confidence in system-generated documents.

Reliable documentation reduces rework and supports compliance.

www.pacificcommunitycollege.edu



PCG reported **17 of 27 identified workflow/document-generation issues had been released**, leaving 10 still in development at the time of the meeting. Remaining work included transition planning, skeletal-process fields, initial-extension documentation, FBA, Prior Notice, ESY, and release-of-records documentation.

Evaluation-to-IEP workflow

The original approach of directly "promoting" evaluation data into an IEP was reconsidered because it could create synchronization problems when evaluation information changed afterward. PCG is instead developing a solution allowing evaluation and IEP records to be drafted concurrently while maintaining compliance checks before finalization.

Consent

For reevaluations and assessment revisions, the need was narrowed to three functions:

- Record consent attempts.
- Record the parent's response.
- Track the required consent timeline.

The parental-response functionality was in final testing, while the ability to finalize consent earlier and provide timeline tracking remained under development. The initial timeline solution will rely on a generated date/report rather than a full compliance indicator in the workflow.

IEP meeting-date tracking

The meeting date itself already prints on the IEP. The missing functionality is treating that date as a **distinct compliance event** separate from IEP start/end dates. Development was underway on a dedicated compliance indicator, leveraging functionality previously developed for Virginia.

Workstream 2: Reporting, lists and compliance

Historical progress-report data

Historical progress-report data cannot currently be fully brought into 3.0. As an interim solution, districts have expanded administrative access to 2.0 and PCG has provided district data extracts. The CAP calls for a longer-term reporting solution.

Write-back

Write-back remained one of the most important unresolved areas. PCG reported correcting migration/data issues and conducting regression testing across approximately **140,000 records**. A multi-week district pilot had begun, including multiple SIS environments, with initial testing occurring in replicated rather than live production databases. Broader activation was dependent on successful validation, not simply reaching a target date.

RC – 01 | Write-back Automation

Related to the Corrective Action

Description of the Corrective Action:

Required write-back data originate across 2.0 and 3.0, and automated output must account for field constraints, dependencies, and new start-of-year scenarios.

What the workgroup identified at the outset:

Writeback file continued to have missing information and data mapped from 2.0 misaligned

What PCG accomplished:

Established a voluntary, district-supported pilot to validate writeback results against local records and SIS processing outcomes before broader activation. Changed the Skyward pilot approach so files are tested in replicated production databases, not live production databases.

Why it matters to the district:

Impacts funding and resource management

Beyond the Corrective Action

What we heard from tickets/advisories:

Writeback remains paused while validation continues—manual writeback process implemented

What PCG accomplished:

Corrected migrated-data representation, missing student-record data, and writeback extract logic while protecting work already completed in 3.0 and district SIS environments. Conducted regression testing across approx 140,000 records, supplemented by rules, scenario, and integration testing.

What PCG will do:

Broader activation will be based on documented pilot results and district validation, rather than the target date alone.

Why it matters to the end-user:

Writeback is critical to funding and making sure this is trustable and accurate is a top priority

Writeback automation is being piloted across districts

www.pacificcrossworkgroup.com



Safety Net reporting

District review identified **three missing fields** needed for Safety Net reporting. Those fields were in development, after which the report would move through testing and district validation.

Service lists

More than **230 critical service items** had been added across special education, related services, and supplementary aids/services in response to district and ESD feedback. PCG is not removing items at this stage because existing selections may already be associated with student records. Additional critical missing items can continue to be submitted.

Workstream 3: Permissions, roles and administration

PCG reported implementing changes across key access areas including inactive students, student transfers, compliance notifications, translation, reports, contact logs, and service pages. The team also reported resolving **148 Zendesk tickets associated with permissions**. District feedback indicated significant improvement in this workstream, particularly for inactive-student and transfer access.

A separate clarification confirmed that the previous **30-day limit for unfinalizing records has been changed to 365 days**.

Major district concerns raised

Despite the progress reported, participants emphasized that significant operational problems remain:

- Districts are still experiencing functional barriers that interfere with required special education work.
- Participants requested **longer-term timelines**, not just near-term deployment dates.
- Districts want more detailed technical explanations about why returning to 2.0 is not feasible.
- Concerns remain about documentation accuracy and how finalized records are presented to parents through Connect.
- Districts requested more usable and current training/reference materials.
- Flexible reporting remains limited, including the ability to retrieve meeting-date information for management and follow-up.
- A newly reported issue involving disability information disappearing from IEPs was raised and taken for immediate investigation.
- Spell-check problems remain under investigation because PCG had not been able to reproduce the issue.
- Participants expressed concern that ongoing system challenges are affecting staff workload, compliance work, and ultimately services to students.

Communication and training

The most current quick-reference guides, manuals, and videos should be accessed from the **IEP Online 3.0 home-page/dashboard**, rather than the older Hub. PCG acknowledged the confusion and discussed removing the outdated Hub link from communications.

PCG is also working toward more direct, synchronous support, including "shoulder-to-shoulder" district training, rather than relying solely on documentation, videos, and office hours.

Decisions and next steps

- PCG will continue all three district workgroups and corrective-action efforts.

- Questions not fully answered during the meeting will be compiled into written follow-up/FAQ materials.
- PCG and WSIPC will provide more detailed technical information concerning the 2.0-to-3.0 transition/security questions.
- WSIPC will clarify/confirm the SEAC voting and alternate representatives for each region.
- A follow-up SEAC meeting will occur when PCG identifies sufficient **conformity readiness** for meaningful assessment. This will be sooner than the normal quarterly cadence.
- At that meeting, regional groups are expected to review evidence, discuss the status using a **1-to-5 rubric**, reach regional consensus, and then provide a formal vote. The proposed threshold discussed was at least **6 of 9 regions supporting conformity**. If conformity is not reached, outstanding conditions will be documented and returned for additional work.
- Importantly, the percentage/status figures presented by PCG represented PCG's view of remediation/deployment progress. The eventual SEAC assessment will incorporate **actual end-user experience and district validation**.