WA 3.0 District Advisory Group - Consolidated 3.0 Workgroup-20261106_120630-Meeting Transcript

November 6, 2026, 6:06PM

58m 36s

LaBounty, Steven started transcription



Doyle, Sean 0:03

team member's name and title have been added to the report. And this pulls from the student's current IEP team. And when you run the report, you will see that each team member is listed with each of the student services to mimic the reporting. So if a student has four services on their current IEP,
you would expect to see eight rows or records for that student in the report where each service is listed with each of their team members if they have two team members currently.
We also included the service begin and end date. Previously, we just had those IEP dates, but we obviously know services do not always match the IEP dates. So now you will see each distinct service start and end date for each of the services reported that are on that currently valid IEP. And again,
These updates are available to you all now, so you can go and run that caseload report IDP services with location. So we're excited about that.



Gregoire, Kris 1:09

Before I move on to the next screen, I was just going to check the notes or ask if there were any questions.



Doyle, Sean 1:15

Yeah.



Gregoire, Kris 1:20

We have, is the student ID the SSID number?



Doyle, Sean 1:25

There are both the SSID and the internal student ID included in the report. So you'll have both IDs now.

Gregoire, Kris 1:37
And, Kimberly, you have your hand up.

Kimberly Coryell 1:40
Thank you. Can you clarify too? So this is a canned report. So this pulls data if they change a case load or case manager this morning, I pull the report in 10 minutes. That's going to be included on there.

Doyle, Sean 1:54
Yes, yes, it will.

Kimberly Coryell 1:56
And same with team members. If a team member, if an SLP changes, it's as of whatever's in the system when I run the report.

Doyle, Sean 2:02
Yep, those team members pull right from that team page for those students. So it's always up to date if you change them.

Gregoire, Kris 2:14
I think, Anne, Lizzie, you are next.

Ficklin, Analisa 2:18
I have a question about the testing accommodations report, and this might be something you're going to get to later, but I'm curious about where you are with the, where testing accommodation data is entered into IEPs. I believe that somebody was working with Sue Ann Buby on that, and I just wonder where that stands.

Gregoire, Kris 2:37
We're gonna get, can we, we're gonna wrap up this report and then we're gonna move on to testing accommodations.

Ficklin, Analisa 2:43
It's great. Just wanted to make sure it was, we were going to talk about it. Thanks.

Gregoire, Kris 2:46
Perfect.
Paige, I think you're next.

Paige Williams 2:52
Hi, I just ran the report, but I don't see like it hasn't created yet. So I have a couple of questions about what's not listed here that's needed on the safety net report. So like the minutes in school and the service minutes per week aren't listed.
On this report.

Doyle, Sean 3:13
The frequency of the service and the duration, so we have those minutes are listed on the report, as well as the total service minutes per week are listed on the report for each service.

Paige Williams 3:23
Okay.
Okay, and this, okay. I just, I ran it and I didn't see it listed here, so I just wanted to make sure that information would be on the report.

Doyle, Sean 3:33
Yeah, yeah. These items on the slide are just fields that we've added. So those were already existing on there, so you should see them. And definitely reach out if you have any questions as you're checking out your report.

Paige Williams 3:38
Got it.
Okay.
Okay, thank you.

Gregoire, Kris 3:51
Thank you all for your questions. I'm going to go ahead and move forward to the next slide.



Doyle, Sean 3:59

Yeah, and then I just want to keep the right back on here because we know that's a big priority in terms of reporting. So I just wanted to recap kind of where, what has happened since last meeting and the beginning of the week with us providing a data dictionary.

and the standard write back report for you all to run. Those were made available at the beginning of this week to support your reporting. And in terms of our testing and validation with our pilot districts in coordination with WSIPC, there were two items that were found this week that

were found by some of our pilot district testing, one related to denial of consent for services or those rejected IEPs that you might see in the system that were created from the migration. And we found that some of the data associated with those rejected IEPs were not being properly picked up. So we've

made an adjustment for those to ensure that all of the data for the rejected IEPs are being pulled into the report appropriately. This does impact quite a few IEP related fields in the write back. So we're just being very cautious in our testing and making sure we're not having any downstream implications for that in the report.

And that is in the process of our internal testing now before releasing it to both our pilot districts and with CPSE to continue their testing. But that will also be available on that standard write back report that you can call run on your site. The other item is around the eligibility type, specifically for transfers.

And we found some discrepancies around students' eligibilities that were transferred from one site to another that were not being picked up with the correct eligibility type of a transfer. And again, we've implemented updates to ensure that eligibility types are properly reflected as transfers in the report.

and we're wrapping up that testing as well before release. So those are kind of those two items that were found through testing this week. And I know you all have been running your standard report, so definitely feel free to reach out if there's anything that you see as you're running those standard reports as well, and we can work together.

to resolve those.

I think that was the last reporting item. If we just wanted to pause for a second to see if there was any questions and I think we'll get into that.

I think testing accommodations might have been next, I'm not sure, but that was the

last reporting item, so...
Will there be some sort of exceptions journals for the write back like we had before?
Joy, if you could put what your SIS is.
If it's Skyward, then yes.
Yes, yeah, and I don't know if I think we have Dana and maybe Patti want to speak to that around the exception journals for the right back.

Patti Hughes 7:04
Yeah, the journals will be the same and they'll be located in the same place that you normally get them from.



Doyle, Sean 7:19
Start the list.



Gregoire, Kris 7:30
You can jump in on that one. There is a question about the list and it says, for example, if you want to run a pair, a one-on-one pair report that just will support.
This report, the report that Sean just mentioned, the caseload report or safety net report,
Sorry, I better snooze that. It's going to be very similar to the case manager and supplementary provider report in 2.0, where you should be able to filter the services that are, so if you have it listed as adult support, one-on-one support, how it's listed, it should pull those services.
And you should be able to get that report from there.
You may also be able to, and that may also be something that I would need to double check with Sean on that migrated data piece, but if that's something that could be pulled from advanced student search.
if it's a related service or an SAS.



Doyle, Sean 8:32
Yeah, you can use the Advanced Student Search to search on both special ed related and SASes.



Gregoire, Kris 8:41
Hey, thank you.

Are there any other questions before we move on?
I think this was the next slide, actually. The system stabilization. There were a couple of releases last night. The IEP meeting date timeline. Previously, the meeting date was included in that IEP process. We've pulled that timeline out.
to reflect the correct meeting timeline from IEP meeting to IEP meeting due date. That has been released last night and is currently in process of being validated. And then the skeletal record process, we have added related and SAS, SAS to that skeletal process. So when entering in a transfer skeletal, you're going to be able to add your SDI related as well as your SAS as well as all of your timeline dates.
The one that is still in development is updating the functionality for consent to be finalized outside of the re-evaluation process. We are currently completing that development and are in the process of getting ready to move to UAT. So that is looking
like it's coming down like soon. So Mark, I think you have a question.

Mark Miller 10:22
Yeah, the IT meeting date timeline, will that retroactively pull it out of any 3.0 records that have been locked between August and now?



Gregoire, Kris 10:35
That's a great question.
I do not know the answer to that. Mike, do you happen to know the answer to that? Or anybody on the PCG team?



Howard, Michael 10:47
Let me research it and I will find out.



Gregoire, Kris 10:57
And there is a question about receiving a copy of the PowerPoint. I believe we do send out the follow-up after this and will include the PowerPoint.
Of this.
Find a question timeline on the consent fix. I've got a couple different questions in here.
I don't think I have that on this slide. Anybody on the mic, do you happen to know the timeline on the consent fix?



Howard, Michael 11:34

Sorry, I was tracking down an answer on the meeting timeline. Yeah. Yeah. So I'm catching up here.



Gregoire, Kris 11:36

I'm sorry. I threw two things at you at the same time.



Howard, Michael 11:46

On the consent, let me pull up my other screen.
Give me a second and I'll come back. Come back to me rather than holding and waiting.



Gregoire, Kris 11:54

Alright, no worries.
Okay, while he's working on that, I'm going to jump to some other questions. In regards to the caseload report, it would be helpful to have a report, the actual meeting dates of the documents that not have yet been finalized. This is a long question, sorry.
Hold on.
Not been finalized, this would help us verify the caseload report accurately reflect student eligibility. For example, if a re-evaluation meeting was held on 10-23 and the student was determined no longer D&Q, the student would continue to appear on the caseload report until the re-evaluation is finalized. Previously, the meeting date field
in the draft versus finalized report appear to reflect the date the document was drafted or finalized rather than, sorry, this is rather than the actual meeting date.
Now that the meeting dates and the timeline report have been corrected, does that also mean that the meeting dates in the draft versus finalized report are accurate?
Having an accurate meeting date and finalization status would be incredibly helpful.
Sean, do you know that the impact of the draft versus final report and the new timeline report timeline?
deployment, how those two interact.



Doyle, Sean 13:30

If it's just, I'll have to look, but I don't think that since the draft first final report doesn't have the
It's just the created date now. It would have to be updated to include the.
Meeting dates.



Gregoire, Kris 13:53
In regards to the IEP meeting date timeline, will that show on the event history? From my understanding, yes, it will. I do want to also let you know that we will be sending out detailed release notes on everything that was deployed last night, today with our Friday update. So instead of just receiving the updates similar to this, that these have been deployed, you will actually be getting detailed release notes on how the functionality of those deployments will work.



Doyle, Sean 14:27
And I can add a little bit to that. It is going to add a new compliance symbol. So you'll be able to see that on that student profile, similar to where you see if their compliance for that eligibility and IEP. You'll see a new symbol for that meeting timeline, as well as on the student search. You will see that new compliance symbol.



Gregoire, Kris 14:51
It looks like, Michaela, you have a comment. Do you want to talk a little bit more about your comment, need caseload ASAP in full functionality as we for safety net polls in a few weeks? Do you want to talk a little bit more about that?
And I guess my question would be just in regards to what would be different than the...
Then, what is what was released last night?
Concerned it isn't. She's concerned it isn't working. Are you referring to the new report that was released last night isn't working?
Okay, she's gonna check the next. Sorry.
Ohh.
And I may have.

Ficklin, Analisa 15:44
First, I don't know if you missed Betty's comment in there, but that one might be related as well.



Gregoire, Kris 15:48

Yep, I'm trying to keep up with the chat and facilitate, so I'm just gonna...
I don't see. Oh, there's Betty's. OK. The added feature to pull additional team members in the caseload report is resulting in a line item for each service with each team member. Yes, that is correct. For example, the adaptive service, adaptive service being repeated five times. Yes.
That is similar to how the report worked in 2.0. So you could filter by the case manager if you're looking for the case manager. Or for example, if you're looking for a caseload for an SLP, you can filter by SLP either user's title
or by service, and then you can filter by the actual SLP. So it's doing what it is intended to do, where it does repeat those services multiple times for each team member. So then you can use the filter to determine if you're looking for an OT caseload, if you're looking for an SLP caseload, or you can actually pull.
the primary case manager.



Doyle, Sean 16:59

And I think to just add on that sort of for the why is because the services don't have a direct link to the actual team members. So when you create the service, you don't have that team member's name associated with it. So the report is intended to pull each team member with the service so that you can
directly filter for those team members that are providing the service on their current team.



Gregoire, Kris 17:32

I might have missed.
I think I have them off.
Right.
Any other questions about...
the status here before we move on to testing accommodations.
Great. And like I had mentioned a little bit ago, you will be receiving detailed release notes this afternoon describing the deployments, impacts, and things like that. So it's going to be more detailed than just that update that we've been providing. It will be actual release notes with additional information.

Kimberly, did you have a question before we moved on?
You're on mute if ever.

Kimberly Coryell 18:22
Should probably unmute first. Sorry about that. It's A clarifying question and it might be addressed in your guys's release notes, but I just want to ask. So, and it was on one of my things, Kris, that I need to follow up with you about anyway. The workaround, I think, I don't even know if it's really a workaround.
When we unlock a record.
Like if we have to unlock an amendment for any record, and we have to then all, and before we could edit, we have to inactivate or delete the previous record. Will that affect any of these reports? I just want to make sure.



Gregoire, Kris 19:05
Anytime that you inactivate a record that will have some downstream effects, what those are specifically, it would be, it would determine on what you're inactivating. Our continued guidance is to not to inactivate those records because there is that downward
impact. So I don't know, Sean, if you have any information on how inactivating an event may impact a report. Kimberly or Kimberly, did you?

Kimberly Coryell 19:39
Well, that's our, we were, we like, for example, we have a ticket in, we were told to, we had to update an LRE for some reason, it didn't populate correctly. Probably user error on that one, but so we had to unlock it in order to update it because it had just been locked, it wasn't.
an extended amount of time that was recent. But when we unfinalized, I should say, when we unfinalized it, then we still were not able to edit it. And the Zendesk response was in order to edit what you need to edit, you also need to go in and inactivate the previous record.
And then you can edit it, and then you have to...
Re-finalize.
and then reactivate the previous record afterwards. It's very convoluted and very confusing. I worked on it with my team this morning. I don't understand. It's one of the things I have a follow up with you on that I need to talk to you about, but I just

want to make sure if that's what we have to do in order to correct things when we're on finalizing, will that affect any of these?
reports down though. I just want to make sure there's no other.



Doyle, Sean 20:50
Yeah, yeah, that makes sense. So the reports will always report on sort of that, say, current IEP event in the system. So if you inactivate that event, it's no longer going to be reporting on that event. But say you're going, you inactivate it to update the LRE, you update that LRE in the workspace and refinalize the event.
and it creates a new active event, it'll continue to pick up that active event. So when you...

Kimberly Coryell 21:19
I understand that. But my question is, because we have to do the previous one, not the one that we're trying to update, in order to allow us to fix what we need to in the current record, we have to inactivate the previous IEP. I don't understand why.
Well, that will that um inactivating so we can fix the current one and then finalizing the current one and then having to re.
activate the previous one that I'm worried about because it's previous data. I just don't.



Doyle, Sean 21:52
Oh, I see what you're saying. No, yeah, yeah. No, that should not impact reporting because the data will stay associated with the event as it moves between active and inactive status.

Kimberly Coryell 21:54
Gym fan.
Understood. Thank you.



Gregoire, Kris 22:07
And I do want to just... Oh, go ahead.



Tyree, Lori 22:07
And Kris, I'm happy, sorry to interrupt. I was happy to read some chats for you so

that to help. Of course, of course. So first of all, there was a confirmation just so everyone saw from Mike that the consent will be updated this weekend. But the next question that came in is based on our



Gregoire, Kris 22:14
Perfect. Thank you.



Tyree, Lori 22:30
You know, to an earlier question regarding the dates, the student record report has a meeting date on the report. However, that date is the date that it was finalized and not the meeting date of the IEP to confirm.



Gregoire, Kris 22:40
That is.
Yep, and that is correct, and that is in development. We have a ticket in for that.



Tyree, Lori 22:48
Perfect. And then, I'm sorry, go ahead.



Gregoire, Kris 22:48
And I do, can I just add, I just want to jump in real quick too, but I do want to make sure that we stay on topic with this advisory group and not get too far in the weeds with support. We do have office hours this afternoon that I want to make sure, you know, districts can come to. So we, if we want to really start talking specifics, but I want to make sure that we can get
to the advisory topics that we want to discuss. So I just, I, that's just my, I want to make sure we stay on topic. So go ahead, Lori. I appreciate you reading those, but I just wanted to say that.



Tyree, Lori 23:20
Yeah, no, certainly. Of course, and this one might be one for...
for the next meeting as well, but they just wanted to highlight the progress reporting. Major concerns still exist around post-secondary transition plans. And just a note on revisions. This is why they were talking about the timeline to note. And

they have submitted Zendesk tickets.
So...



Gregoire, Kris 23:47
And I do know that a ticket has been submitted to development to remove the post-secondary goals from the progress reporting wizard. I do have that information.



Tyree, Lori 24:01
Perfect.



Gregoire, Kris 24:03
Great. With that, I'm going to actually move on to the next slide. Actually, not the first one's disability list. One of the, we have OSPI guidance, I did reach out to OSPI in regards to, we've had some comments and tickets, emails about the disability.
list that is in 3.0. Like I said, I did reach out to OSPI. They've given us guidance on that the disabilities must align with the WAC and the corresponding reporting to CEDARS. What we have found is that the WAC disability list and the CEDARS disability list,
are slightly different. As you can see, the WAC list has deafness with including hard of hearing, where the CEDARS list has deafness and hard of hearing in two separate as two separate options. Our question for you and some guidance for you is how do you reconcile the category of
deafness, including hard of hearing for the Cedar State reporting. Is there another way we can capture the information for state reporting if it is not dependent on the disability codes list?
We have had some questions about that and that is the one that we are looking for some guidance and having a conversation with you all.



Landwehr, Michelle 25:43
I don't know how it gets coded.
ultimately federally, but we always go out off of the Cedars appendix. And this actually has come up extensively in Bellevue. One of our board members has a real interest in this area and has asked us to explain why.
there's this mismatch and we don't really understand either. So, gosh, I wish I knew the answer to this question.

Gregoire, Kris 26:17
Yeah, and that's, you know, with trying to align both when you have the WAC descriptions and then you have the CEDARS description. So we were having this conversation yesterday that if deafness and including hard of hearing is selected as a disability, is there an option for your CEDARS reporting to select one or the other? Um...
you know, just how it's been done. In the past, they asked the question, you know, obviously if there could be multiple disabilities within your district, I mean 2.0, how that worked. But now that we've got this list that aligns with the WAC, but CEDARS is slightly different, how can we capture that information so it's correct?
For both.
Of less.

Landwehr, Michelle 27:07
This might be a good question to ask special ed data at OSPI, I wonder.

Gregoire, Kris 27:12
Ohh, I did this top.

Landwehr, Michelle 27:14
Yeah, what did they say?

Gregoire, Kris 27:16
If this is the topic is actually verbatim from what they said, they they both must align, yeah.

Landwehr, Michelle 27:19
Oh, oh, got it, got it, got it. Okay, I wasn't tracking, sorry.

Gregoire, Kris 27:23
No, no, I'm sorry.
I thought I'd said that, but maybe I didn't. So this is their guidance, which is where it leaves us now trying to figure out how to manage both lists, aligning the disability

list with the WAC disabilities. But then again, how do we capture that for state reporting?

Connor McCroskey 27:45
I think what you're hearing people say is that we have to align with Cedars because that's what we're reporting through. And so we have to make sure our data matches up with what the Cedars codes are.

Siwiec, Alexander 28:00
I'm also not 100% sure that the WAC itself is clear. I mean, it does say including hard of hearing under deafness, but it also has a separate line that defines hard of hearing separately. And it says that you would use that
when it affects a student's performance in a way that's not included under the definition of deafness, which does make it seem kind of distinct to me.
Like maybe they're saying you can use deafness for students that are hard of hearing if it's a profound impact to them, but there's also this separate definition if it's not.



Gregoire, Kris 28:42
And I know what you're talking, I saw that Alex in the Cedars, we were looking at the Cedars manual last night and I know what you're referring to and I saw that. And so my question was, you know, if again, if you pick that deafness, hard of hearing as the disability category, and then
Do you use that determination? I think it was the Washington Sensory. I can't remember off the top of my head.

Siwiec, Alexander 29:05
And I'm actually referring to the whack. That's a whack quote I just put in the chat. It is written both ways in the whack is my point.



Gregoire, Kris 29:08
Oh, a whack, okay.
Oh, okay, thank you.
Okay.
And I'm not sure how the Cedars reporting works just within the system. So I don't know if it's that something that if you choose that disability within the within within

3.0 and then how that's reported to Cedars, is that a district that the district says, well, I'm going to use deafness.
The student qualifies as deafness, or the student qualifies for hard of hearing, and the district selects one or the other.
I'm not sure how that piece or do they map? I'm not 100% sure how that works.
Or is that done in your in your SIS?
Because obviously deafness, including a hard of hearing, would be the disability that would write back to your SIS.

Siwiec, Alexander 30:07
Yeah, I'm not sure how it works from the SIS side. I mean, it looks on the screen here like there's potentially different codes in Cedars for them to be distinct. And I guess that would be my preference is for IP Online to reflect that as well.



Howard, Michael 30:22
Looks like in the chat that's somewhat of a consensus. I mean, it's not an overwhelming consensus, but that we need to have it aligned to Cedars and separate the two.



Gregoire, Kris 30:33
Okay.
I appreciate that, saying that, Mike.
Because I can't see the chat.
I can't keep up with the jet.



Tyree, Lori 30:42
Yeah.



Gregoire, Kris 30:46
Okay, so it sounds like we'll go back. We'll take a look at the chats. We'll see the consensus of, it sounds like the consensus is to divide deafness and hard of hearing within the disability category list to match Cedars.
Any other comments about that, Mark?

Mark Miller 31:07

Hi, sorry, I missed the first part of this, but like, I'm looking at the WAC right now, but hard of hearing is its own disability, but the screen says that currently three-point is aligned to the WAC.



Gregoire, Kris 31:26
You're saying that the WAC differentiates between deafness and hard of hearing? That's not what we found, but again, there's, you know, the WAC, the WAC is very big.

MM

Mark Miller 31:38
Mandy, yeah, I'm looking at it right now. So the different disability codes, I know the WAC, like it gets a little bit jumbled, right? And they have like capital letters and lowercase letters and numbers, but like all the disability codes are denoted by like lowercase letters. And so I see.



Gregoire, Kris 31:38
And this was black.

MM

Mark Miller 31:57
Deafness is letter C and then hard of hearing is letter F.



Gregoire, Kris 32:05
We will check that too as we go back. We were looking at it last night as well, and these were the...
Disabilities that.
were listed for us, so we will go back and take a look at that.
Okay.



Tyree, Lori 32:19
And then Kris, just as a bit of an update, so you don't have to monitor chat. Certainly, there was a request to address the progress reporting concerns. However, I know we're trying to stay on topic here and would suggest that people attend the office hours for that if it's not on the agenda.



Gregoire, Kris 32:23

I appreciate it.
We do not have progress reports on this agenda. We can get through the next two slides, and if we have time, we can definitely open that to a conversation.
And like you said, office hours would be a great resource as well.
Okay, we're going to move on. The next one is parental contacts and meeting participants. This is to review the conditions of clearing parental contacts for all new records and meeting participations when a new record is created. The migrated data from 2.0 brought over
parental contact attempts resulting in manually delete, districts manually having, districts having to manually delete those contact attempts in order to enter new contact attempts for that particular record. And meeting participants are staying in the system between processes, annual IEP amendment, which are actually directly tied to the signatures.
And so it is showing that signatures are complete. We are looking to.
Um...
Our proposed resolution, let me say, the migrated parental contacts will continue to need to be cleared from the workspace for the first record in 3.0, but we are looking to update the functionality to clear the contact attempts as well as the meeting participants when a new process is started.
And I see Connor, you have your hand up.

Connor McCroskey 34:14
That's helpful information, I guess. My wondering about this, and it's related to other aspects, I know we talked about this, Chris, but is there functionality where you update the parental contacts or the meeting participant or most of the meeting participants and it auto-adjusts on the signature?
side of things because right now, right, we'll update the meeting participants and then in the documents section where you're attaching signatures, those participants are not, it's not talking between the two widgets. Does that make sense?



Gregoire, Kris 34:47
Yeah, and what we've noticed, Sarah and I worked on this a little bit the other night, and what we found, because the meeting participants and those signatures are tied together, and if your previous record had a signature, whether it's an attachment or an electronic signature, it does hold on to that meeting participant.

and that signature. If you go in and update the meeting participant, so it's, you change the SLP from Mrs. Smith to Mr. Jones, it's not going to clear that signature. You actually have to delete that participant and add a new participant in order to clear that signature.
And that's for the current what's currently happening. So we're saying let's go ahead and because we have those signatures tied directly to those meeting participants, that they will need to be cleared.

Connor McCroskey 35:38
Okay.



Gregoire, Kris 35:45
Lori, is there anything in the chat about this? Oh, I also see Jasper has his hand up. I'll go to Jasper and then we'll see if there's any. We'll go to Jasper and then we'll see if there's any thing in the chat.



Tyree, Lori 35:50
Um...
Sure. Sean is actually looking into a question regarding the safety net report, and we have lots of additional kind of information on the audiologist, et cetera. So just, I think, more information to take back in our considerations.



Gregoire, Kris 36:14
Thank you.
Thanks, Sean. Jasper.



Tyree, Lori 36:21
And to note that Seattle agrees with the proposed resolution regarding the parental contacts.



Gregoire, Kris 36:27
Thank you. Appreciate that.

Newkirk, Jasper 36:30
So just wanted to clarify in the meeting participants section in the notification tab,

when I like create a new meeting participant and then say I, it wasn't based on a user, I entered the first and last name in wrong.



Gregoire, Kris 36:43
Mhm.

NJ **Newkirk, Jasper** 36:49
I go and I change that, it's still not reflecting on there. And so that doesn't have to do with anything migrated. So I'm just wondering.
Why, that's the case.



Gregoire, Kris 37:01
We'll have to look into that further because we did some testing on that and...
I didn't see that functionality. I saw that if you went in, if you created an SLP with Mrs. Jones, then Mr. Smith decided to come, you could go in and change the name. We didn't come across that, but happy to look into that further.
And this isn't from one like if you created an annual to an annual and you had your student or you had your meeting participant there, you updated the name, you're not referring to that, you're referring to you created a new meeting participant and it was Mrs. Jones, the SLP, but now Mr. Smith, the SLP is coming and it didn't change it on the meeting participant.
On the Documents tab.
Okay, we'll have to look into that one further.



Tyree, Lori 37:51
And then, Sean, just to note that there was additional information on the safety net report put in the chat for you.



Gregoire, Kris 38:02
Thanks, Lori.
Okay, any other questions related to this or we can move on to the next?
Okay, come on here. So testing accommodations, this has been brought up in the past. We did have some conversations outside of the advisory group. We do have, just to reiterate, we do have districts asking us to add those WIDA accommodations to the testing accommodations within a 3.0.

We have the guidance from OSPI to use the WIDA.
excuse me, to use the WIDA accessibility and accommodations manual. However, what we're finding and what we want to align and work with you on is we know those accommodations that need to be entered. We're looking for a balance between what is inclusive enough for all districts,
and but not go to the extent of the WIDA accommodations because they could be quite long, especially with the different domains. So it's more about, is there a standardized naming convention that we can use to...
reflect those WIDA accommodations. And I think I might have put those here. Yeah. Because as you can see, these can be quite long. So we want to make sure that we are using a naming convention that is inclusive for all districts without being too wordy. And I'm going to, Michaela, I think you had your hand up.

Michaela Clancy 39:46
I'm sorry, everybody. I'm messed up barricaded in my office. So if you can't hear me, apologies. That's why I've been texting instead. My voice is going. So Kris, were you given the list out of Tide of what we've used in the past so you can align to this? Is that what you're showing us? Because that would be my biggest example of what have we already put in.



Gregoire, Kris 39:53
Not worth.
Mhm.
You know.
Yeah, if anybody wants to forward me that list, I would be happy to review that. You had mentioned tide is, so is, are you, I just want to confirm, so you're saying that the WIDA naming conventions are listed in the tide?

Michaela Clancy 40:42
I need to look, no, but what I'm saying is let's look at what we've used and get it to you as a summary, because I think if we get a write-in option, I'd be concerned too, because that's the next option is give us a write-in so we can do that, then that creates payoff on the other side too. Anyone else have a suggestion? I don't think this goes into Titan. I can't remember, honestly.

Gregoire, Kris 40:57
Mm.

Connor McCroskey 41:02
Well, I'm just, I guess I'm just wondering, I agree with Michaela, but like, why, why are we proposing to deviate from the actual guidance like manuals and documents?

Gregoire, Kris 41:15
And here's the, and Connor, I can answer that. We can enter these specifically because these are the, that's the verbiage that is in, that's on the tide. Can I go backwards?

Michaela Clancy 41:26
And that's what we enter in Tide, and then we spend a lot of time, Kris, on the back end cleaning it up. So I agree with Connor, like why would we, this is one of those where we actually, I've written script with Sue Anne about how to do this, right? So we then align to what we can actually put in. So it's one of those moments.

Gregoire, Kris 41:26
Um...
Mhm.

Connor McCroskey 41:44
Yeah, and my teachers, right, are also working off of the guidance manuals for accommodations for testing. And so if the options in IEP Online are going to deviate from that, that's going to create a lot of confusion on their end in selecting the correct accommodation for the domain or the area of assessment that they're trying to support the student around.

Gregoire, Kris 42:05
And I agree with you all. I mean, I'm one of those that let's not deviate from. from the guidance, because that's, you know, obviously what we should be doing. We just have heard that different districts that may be too long of a naming convention. So if we're, if that's the guidance that we're going to go with those

naming conventions that are in the guidance, we can enter those.
That would be my suggestion. And if that's what the recommendation is that we're talking about, staying in line with that, we can definitely move forward with that.



Tyree, Lori 42:40
And Kris, just to highlight, I think the chat is in alignment with that. They've noted some missing services in the chat, but I think they're saying it should be exactly whatever is available inside.

CM

Connor McCroskey 42:54
Kris, Kris, related to this, is there functionality so that if a particular assessment is selected, we'll use WIDA as an example, that only the WIDA accommodation options are showing up for users so that it's not overwhelming?



Gregoire, Kris 42:54
Intact.
Sarah is actually working on that. We have had conversations around that and that's the that is functionality that is available. So we she's working on that. So yes.

CM

Connor McCroskey 43:21
And then sorry for not the lighting. So and then I've talked about this before, but where are users supposed to enter the testing accommodations? Are they listing it on the accommodations widget or are they listing in the testing widget or both?



Gregoire, Kris 43:21
Yes.
Right now, from what I'm seeing, and we may need to bring this up next week when Jennifer and Heather are here again, right now we're seeing that those classroom accommodations and testing accommodations are being entered in the testing, excuse me, I'm sorry, in the accommodations tab, and then aligning those accommodations to the test that it's going to be associated with in the testing tab.
Sean, please correct me if I'm wrong, but the testing accommodations report is going to pull from the testing tab, correct?



Doyle, Sean 44:13

Correct, yes, so we'll not be pulling from the accommodations tab for classroom accommodations.



Tyree, Lori 44:22

Just want to highlight that there's been a request for a search option rather than a drop-down that's been heavily liked and added to.



Gregoire, Kris 44:34

And can somebody speak more to that? That would be, like, since I can't see the chat, it would be great to hear. And I know there's a couple of hands up, but I, that would be great to talk through that a little bit when you say a search option versus a dropdown.

Because I do know, OK.

CM

Connor McCroskey 44:50

Well, right now I have right now I have to manually find separate setting. For example, in the dropdown, if there's an option to type in SEP and that option pop up, that would streamline things.



Gregoire, Kris 44:59

Got it, okay.

Nope. Great. Thanks for that clarification, Connor. And that, I know that we have talked through that as well. So that is a great option. And I know we have talked about that. So don't have an answer directly related to that right now, but I believe there is functionality within the system that could do that. And I do want to get to Paige. Paige is patiently had her hand up, so I do want to jump to Paige.

PW

Paige Williams 45:25

Oh, I ended up, I ended up putting it in the chat. No, no, it's okay. It was just, there are three sections missing from the testing accommodation that was on in 2.0. I put it in the chat, the engagement rubric, ELA, engagement rubric, math and engagement rubric science.



Gregoire, Kris 45:29

Sorry.
Hmm.

Paige Williams 45:46
One of our directors needed to use that function and was unable to add it.



Gregoire, Kris 45:53
Okay, we'll take a look and see, we'll pull that from the chat and we'll take a look at that.

Paige Williams 45:57
Thank you.



Gregoire, Kris 46:00
I know some hands have gone up and down. Anybody have any questions? It sounds like using the naming conventions. Michaela, if you're willing to send me the list that you were referring to for TIDE, happy to take a look at that as well. If that is in alignment with what we're talking about here and going off the WIDA.

Michaela Clancy 46:16
Yeah.
Yeah, Kris, I think you've got it. I think we're all aligned with what you've got. So, but thank you.



Gregoire, Kris 46:23
Perfect. Thank you. Appreciate that.
Great. Before we move on, Laura, is there anything else in the chat that...
Addresses this, and now we're getting close to time.



Tyree, Lori 46:36
Nope, you can proceed. There was additional information on the reporting and such, but you're good to continue here.



Gregoire, Kris 46:47
The last one we have for assessments, we have had districts ask about adding the

SAT to the testing tab, along with the testing accommodations associated with the SATs. Currently, the SAT, there is a checkbox in the transition plan.
that can be marked. Today, we are starting the conversation. We don't have to have a decision today and seek assistance with adding that if that is a test that districts want added to the assessment tab, the testing tab, along with the accommodations.
And as I was looking at the testing accommodations, it looks like there is a lot of overlap in some of that we already have. But then again, if we could actually, or if the functionality is turned on where, like I think Connor, you were saying, you select SAT and then only those accommodations that are associated with the SAT populate, that would be
but there may be some overlap in some of the lists that we have. But again, starting this conversation, don't have to have a decision today, but wanted to see if there was any thoughts, guidance on adding the SAT to that assessment.
Or testing tab.
And Lori, I'm going to count on you if there's anything in the chat about this particular topic.



Tyree, Lori 48:20
Nothing. You're all set. Yeah.



Gregoire, Kris 48:21
Nothing, okay.
So I guess my question would be, are there any strong feelings, it doesn't sound like it may be either way, of adding it or not adding it?
Okay.
We will work with our team to look at adding this as well as the accommodation. So I appreciate you guys hearing that out.
I know we're close to time. What I want to, and I know we have the progress report question, if that's something we have 5 minutes if we want to bring that up here. I'm not sure who brought that to, I don't know if it was in the chat or if, Lori, if you could kind of, if you could go back and see.
if we want to talk about that or who brought that topic up.



Tyree, Lori 49:23

Yeah, I think it was Michaela that originally brought the progress reporting up. Forgive me if I'm wrong. Let me scroll up a bit.

Michaela Clancy 49:32
I did, but I am like, again, I have small and then I have colleagues that have really broad issues. I have seen these same issues, but Tracy, if you're there and you can unmute, but Tracy, she's just done an excellent summary of the issues there in the chat. I realize we don't have time to address this, but we just hit a progress reporting period and it's a major issue. And I also want to highlight the spell check. That could be an easy win, y'all. I spent a half an hour with my ES.

Tracy Pitzer - Sumner Bonney Lake SD 49:56
Cheers.

Michaela Clancy 49:56
SA teams are frustrated, but Tracy, can you mention the progress reporting? You summarize it better than I can.

Tracy Pitzer - Sumner Bonney Lake SD 50:02
Yeah, I mean, there are so many issues. I did put it, I put the summary in the chat, but I also have some screenshots that I put together and I sent it to Mike and Dana this morning. It's just a mess and I've been trying to go about this the right way and go to Zendesk and I've been getting
just put off and put off and put off and they don't have answers. And sometimes I'm being told their feature requests and it shouldn't be a feature request to do something that the system is set up to do. So for instance, I'm able to put in different reporting periods because we have trimesters at elementary and quarters at secondary. And so your standard stock reporting period one, two,
3 doesn't do me any good at all. And so I went through and put in the custom in every single school based on the level and I put in the due date and I've been telling people, nope, this is a due date. This is a hard due date. You have to get them in and it's going to close down at 1159 P.m. on 11-5.
And guess what? It did not. I got up this morning and I put in a progress report. And then I ran a report to see if anybody had, if you know, who didn't finish theirs yesterday. And it was both reports available in your system are useless, absolutely

useless. I did not get any information I needed to be able to go back to teachers and say,
hey, I know this is a new system, but you get your progress reports done. How can I help? Nothing. I got their progress reports in the system from 2005, and then I got, you know, just a whole list of kids in every kid in the system. Also, the post-school transition goals are still showing up to do progress reports on. So
We're going to be out of compliance because people wrote in there, you know, we'll complete this in the time that, you know, before the IEP is done. Well, guess what? They can't. Their post-school goals, they should not be showing up there at all. But you can't lock it, you can't finalize it if you don't put something there.
So there's probably five or six other different things that are in that that I put in the chat, but I have been trying to deal with this since the third week in September so that I wouldn't get to November 5th and have it be a complete disaster and it is a complete disaster.
And I know that kind of in the big scope of some of the right back and other things you guys are dealing with it, this might seem like small potatoes, but we lost a community complaint last year because of progress reports. And I just, I saw it coming. I saw it coming. I tried to be the canary in the coal mine and feel like no one listened.
No one listened. And it's the same with the spell check. No one's listening, right? I mean, how many times do we have to bring these things up? Last week at this meeting, I said, I feel like you're just reverberating back all the things you've told us before, but none of the new things that have come up.
are being addressed. And these new things are things that are impending. They're things that are happening in real time. So we just need you guys to listen and do something about the workflow and the issues that are stopping the work for teachers.
Off my soapbox now.



Howard, Michael 53:25

So, Tracy, I appreciate you bringing this up, and...
It's difficult in a meeting like this to respond to the individual items. Something like the spell check, we've checked that on multiple sites and it works when we're checking it. And so we continue to investigate it and continue to work to replicate it, but have

in multiple environments and with multiple districts haven't been able to replicate the challenge. And so there's some things with local configurations or local issues that we're still trying to sort through. As it relates to the progress reports, I did get your e-mail this morning and have started the communication with my team to basically provide a response or provide some information on it and to provide some timelines on it. And so it, I just want to, I guess, express that it isn't an issue of hearing you because we are hearing you and we are taking these items in and trying to action them as quickly as possible.
It's there is just there's a process behind it that, and so I will respond to what you both put in the chat and the and the e-mail this morning, but in the researching process right now to in order to give you complete answers on them.



Tyree, Lori 54:54
And just to kind of update on the chat, there is confirmation, obviously, that spell check is not working for folks, but then too, that the progress report should be included in workload blockers. But I think, again, you know, thank you all for sharing. We do hear, so appreciate the feedback.

CM

Connor McCroskey 55:12
Right, and I think someone mentioned, sorry, Chris, I think someone mentioned in the chat, like it would be helpful to have you all reach out to us so that we can put agenda items on these meetings because what may feel like helpful, important blockers for you all, it is not always reflective of like what we are dealing with to Tracy said.



Gregoire, Kris 55:12
Yeah, and thank you.
Go ahead, Connor.

CM

Connor McCroskey 55:32
like on compliance timelines and things like that. And so us being able to share what our most immediate needs are so you can work on them would probably be a helpful next step for you all. Because some of the things that are reviewed in these meetings are not hitting like necessarily my radar is a significant workload block for my teams and teachers.

Gregoire, Kris 55:52

I appreciate that, Connor, and I definitely will work with Jennifer and the team as we move forward with these to incorporate that. I think that's a great suggestion.

Michaela Clancy 56:02

A good way to address that is what we're dealing with in our annual reporting timelines and our overall workflow, like progress reporting just happened. What I heard back is, and I just want to echo what Tracy and Connor just said, so you all hear it from major districts across regions, is our teams, and I spent
a lot of time with our teams Wednesday morning directly around this issue again. And they're saying the issues that we've brought forward that we're issuing Zen tests are not being addressed. So literally some of my staff said that felt like Groundhog Day. They just feel like they're back in the same loop that we've been in since August. So I just wanted to elevate the voice.
that Tracy and Connor shared. And we are trying to work on this, but when our teams see this, then we have union complaints. Then we have, like, we just can't address the things that we feel like we've been looping on. And then we are now in the place where, like, Tracy's addressing an issue that was a community complaint for her. So like these compliance issues are stacking.
And that's why I'm suggesting perhaps there's a way to create a shared agenda to make this more useful time. Because again, this does not like it's not aligning with the things that are on the urgent dashboard on my list or on my colleagues list. And again, and the issues continue to be ongoing labor management issues.
Thank you.

Gregoire, Kris 57:22

Thank you.

Howard, Michael 57:23

What I can commit to is that we will send out a, we'll send out an e-mail as part of the follow-up for you to respond to with items to add to the agenda so that we can action those items.

Gregoire, Kris 57:41

Thanks, Mike. Thanks, everyone. We are over time, and I want to be respectful. I know all of you are busy, and I want to be respectful of your time. So thank you all for attending today. Your guidance is appreciated. As Mike said, we will send out a follow-up, which will include the slides as well as
or request for agenda items. But I hope you all have a wonderful weekend. And again, thank you for participating today.

DA **Dana Anderson** 58:12
Thanks, everyone.

 **Gregoire, Kris** 58:14
Thank you.

KC **Kimberly Coryell** 58:14
Thank you.

◉ **Teri Engelbrecht** stopped transcription