# MINNESOTA GOVERNOR'S COUNCIL ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Wednesday, December 4, 2013
12:15 p.m. – 2:40 p.m.
Continuing Education and Conference Center
University of Minnesota St. Paul Campus
1890 Buford Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

#### **MINUTES**

#### MEMBERS PRESENT

Dan Reed, Chair
Jennifer Giesen
Mary Hauff
Loraine Jensen
Matt Kramer
Steve Kuntz
Barb Lundeen for Shawn Holmes
Lynne Megan
Bonnie Jean Smith
Mike Stern
Joe Timmons
Wendy Velzke
Katheryn Ware

## **STAFF PRESENT**

Colleen Wieck Mary Jo Nichol

#### **MEMBERS EXCUSED**

Dawn By
Peg Booth
Tom Holtgrewe
Louis Lenzmeier
Stevie K. Nelson
Carolyn Perron
Scott Price
David Quilleash
Mary Raasch
Bryan Schmidt

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT**

Robbie Reedy, Vice Chair Melissa Winger

#### **GUESTS**

Senator John Hoffman
Hope Hoffman
Breanne Byiers, University of Minnesota,
LEND Program
Eric Kloos, Department of Education
Diane McCarron, Chair, Special Education
Advisory Council

Page 2

#### **GUESTS**, cont'd.

Debra Price-Ellingstad, Department of Education Dr. Peter Scal, University of Minnesota Jonah Weinberg, Autism Society of Minnesota

### I. CALL TO ORDER

Dan Reed, Council Chair, called the meeting to order at 12:20 p.m.

## II. <u>INTRODUCTIONS</u>

Everyone present introduced him/herself.

#### III. COUNCIL PROGRAM

Dan Reed introduced Tom Pearson and Derek Pearson, MarketResponse International, who conducted the *K-12 Education Study for Students with Developmental Disabilities* earlier this year.

Tom Pearson said that he would first provide some background information and then a summary of results of the *K-12 Education Study*. That will serve as background for today's working session where five small groups will come up with strategies based on what was learned in the study and personal experiences about this issue.

Two years ago, in 2012, a general population survey was conducted regarding attitudes about people with developmental disabilities. The purpose was to determine if any changes had occurred in the past 50 years. The results showed marked positive shifts in attitudes.

At the same time, a separate survey of households with individuals with developmental disabilities was conducted to gather insights into three specific quality of life issues – education, employment, and abuse. The results regarding education, whether services would be better or worse in two years, were very concerning as 42% of families expected services to be worse. That strongly suggested the need for a more in-depth study on education and that led to the *K-12 Education Study*.

Page 3

That study was conducted in January and February 2013 using a narrative research methodology; the results were presented to the Council in April 2013.

A total of 200 stories were collected from the 110 people who participated in narrative focus groups, including students, parents, teachers, Partners in Policymaking® graduates, and Council members. The results of this process revealed seven story themes. Derek Pearson described what each of those themes represented and examples of stories related to each theme.

Each focus group concluded with a future back exercise where participants projected a worst future imaginable and a best future imaginable. The best futures imaginable followed two paths – a rise in political awareness and support, and parents getting organized.

Tom Pearson then explained the group process and the steps involved for today's meeting.

Each small group created a list of strategies in a brainstorming session that would enhance/improve the educational experience for students with developmental disabilities.

Each group selected three to five of their best strategies, and each was expanded upon with a brief description, responsible parties, resources/tools needed, and how the strategy could be implemented.

A spokesperson for each group, shared their strategies with another group. That second group then identified all of the negatives and improvements that could be made for each strategy presented. The spokesperson reported back to his/her original group about what was learned, ideas rejected, and new ideas. This process was repeated with one other group.

The spokesperson for each group presented the resulting strategies to everyone.

Everyone offered comments, feedback, and insights into what was learned through this process –

We're not alone. There's still a lot of work to do. Kids shouldn't be cleaning the school as a job or work activity.

#### Page 4

Students are in school to learn; that's what their responsibility is when they are in school.

Special education is services but it's not education.

There's a slippery slope that leads to budget cuts and there seems to be a lot of historical precedent for that.

What is education supposed to lead to? Employment and independent living. So how does funding relate to those end results and what does that mean for students in the future.

Public Law 94-142 is a legal issue. The state is having some of the same compliance issues and we're having some of the same conversations as we did in 1974 and 1986.

Different response patterns relate to individual experiences. You see things differently depending on where you are.

I get a sense of tensions. The "heroes" know something special about my kid; there's also an interest in inclusion.

The DASH Program was mentioned (a Dakota County site based program that provides services to students with severe and/or multiple disabilities). Four people were asked where the DASH Program was in a particular school; the program is housed in the school but it's not part of the school.

Tom Pearson added that MarketResponse International will be presenting the results of the *K-12 Education Study* to Special Education Directors on December 6, 2013 and ask for their assistance in getting information out about the quantitative education study that will be conducted.

Reed thanked Tom Pearson and Derek Pearson for the work they are continuing to do in this area. All small group results were given to the Pearsons for use in creating the quantitative study.

Page 5

## IV. <u>ADJOURNMENT</u>

Reed asked that the meeting be adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen Wieck Executive Director