*Transcript of OSEP’s Webinar of February 3, 2021*

**Stakeholder Engagement in SPP/APRs: What Parent Centers Need to Know**  
***Editor’s Note*** | The original transcript of this webinar was provided by RealTime Captioning. CPIR has edited that transcription for accuracy and added a minimum of formatting to improve readability. We’ve also indicated where unfortunate technical difficulties occurred. These are best skipped over, and we have given the time in the recording to skip ahead to (example, *2:35 minutes*), where the intended content is again being presented.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**CPIR Host** | Good afternoon. I would like to welcome you to today's webinar: *Stakeholder engagement in state performance plans annual performance reports: What parent centers need to know.*

*[****Time:******0:00 – 2:22 minutes******can be skipped*** *| Housekeeping details for attendees, explaining the webinar platform’s interface]*   
Before we get started, I would like to go over a few items so you know how to participate in today's event. To the right of the go to webinar PowerPoint viewer is the go to webinar control panel. This is where you have the option to select the way you hear the Governor. Raise your hand and ask questions by text. You have the opportunity to submit text questions to today's presenters by typing your questions into the questions for staff pain of the control panel. You may send in your questions at any time during the presentation. We will collect these and address them during the Q&A session. You can also download the webinar slides on the go to webinar control panel. You will notice on your screen a screenshot of an example of the go to webinar interface. You should see something that looks like this that is in the upper right corner. You are listening and using your computer system by default. If you prefer to join over the phone, just select telephone in the audio pain and dial in information will be displayed. Be sure to put in your unique pin. Also, the control panel will collapse automatically when not in use. To keep it open, click the view menu and uncheck or hide control panel. Today's presentation will be recorded and will be available on the website.

*[Transition into the webinar content]*  Now, you have Carmen Sanchez to introduce the topic.

**Carmen Sánchez** [of OSEP] | Hi everybody, hello parent centers. Welcome to this webinar where we are going to be going over having Christine Pilgrim, a colleague, go over some changes in stakeholder engagement. As she presents the information, I want you all to think about how this can inform your work, not only with parents directly but also inform you work with states and how you can support states as they gather more stakeholder engagements and fulfill the new requirements in the state performance plans, annual performance reports about this. Think about how this can be applicable to you.

We welcome questions, which will be addressed toward the end and then we will be able to get to that.

Christine Pilgrim, my colleague in the monitoring state improvement and planning division, is an assistant director with that office. She has been with the department for 11, 12, closer to 15 years. More importantly she is a huge fan of everything having to do with fantasy and sci-fi. We have a lot to communicate about in addition to parent engagement when we’re in the office. Without further ado, I am going to turn it over to Christine for the presentation.

**Christine Pilgram** [Presenter] | Thank you so much Carmen. It is a pleasure to be with all of you today. You can switch to the intro slide for me.

*[****Apologies*** *to all attendees and those listening to this archive: There was a* ***technological issue at this point*** *and confusion over how to advance the slides. The presenter kept talking, which appears below in light gray, but we recommend skipping ahead in the soundtrack of the archived webinar to the* ***7:00 minute*** *point.]*

Myriam is muted but I can keep going until you switch over. So as I was saying, you know, obviously I am pleased to be with you today and I do hope it is one of many opportunities to connect with you regarding stakeholder engagement. I have had the opportunity to touch base with Carmen about what is happening with the new package and being very intentional about our connection with the Parent Center program and all of you. Hopefully this is one of many.

While I focus our time together, I will focus our time together on the changes to the new package that are most pertinent to you and the space you occupy. I encourage you to be aware of all the changes within the package just for awareness, what we have changed in each indicator. As you are called on and sort of having a more engaged role, we hope moving forward in terms of working with states and target setting and thinking about improvement activities, etc., your awareness of all of the changes would be helpful.

As noted on the agenda, which would be up on your screen, I can't actually see your screen right now because I am looking at my screen. I know Carmen or Myriam can jump in if for some reason I am off from you. You should be looking at an agenda right now. *[The technology problems continue, and no agenda is on the screen]*

We are going to walk so some of the changes related to stakeholder engagement. I am going to share a few resources with you and hopefully have time at the end for some conversation around what you are thinking. I think Carmen framed it nicely in terms of things you can have top of mind and you can be thinking about as I talk and we will have some time afterwards to discuss that. If for some reason we get hot and heavy in the conversation and went out of time and there are still questions, I am sure that you will be able to connect with Carmen, she will be able to share that information with me and we will make sure we have a good mechanism to get feedback back out to you. Before we start and get into content, I really just wanted to get a sense of your awareness of the changes to the new SPP/APR package.

*[The technology problems continue, with various people and information appearing and switching in and out as CPIR continues to try and solve the “advancing the slide” issue]*

**Carmen** | Christine, this is Carmen. I think we are having a little bit of difficulty having the slides on now, and Myriam is trying to take care of it.

**Christine** | I can pause while Myriam is figuring that out. I wasn’t sure who was doing the poll, but maybe folks can put in the chat their awareness of the new package. That might work, we can sort of troubleshoot that way. We all love education so we are all going to be flexible and pivoting when something is occurring with technology.

***[Time: 7:00 minutes]***

*[Poll supposedly appears at long last! However it doesn’t show in the archived webinar. The poll was asking attendees how familiar they were with the new requirements for stakeholder engagement. Possible answers include VERY familiar to NOT familiar at all.]*

**Christine** | Ah, here we go. So I will give you a minute or two to respond to this. No judgment. Feel free to be honest if you have no clue, not aware of any of the changes at all, it is helpful information for us. If you are somewhat aware, you are kind of in the middle or you are very aware of the changes.

**Lisa** [CPIR staff, describing the poll results as they roll in] | So far we have about 50% who are “somewhat” aware… 47 “not at all” aware. A small amount, 10% are *very* aware.

**Christine** | So that means I have work to do. We have some work to do to make sure we are raising awareness. That’s helpful.

**Lisa** | I will close the poll now.

***[Recommended to skip from this point in the tape to 9:00 minutes]***

**Christine** | Myriam, if we go back to the slides are we in a good place? Do I need to pause?

**Myriam** | I transferred power to Maria, so she can pass the slides. For some reason it is not working.

**Christine** | I will wait for that to come up.

**Lisa** | I could do it too, Myriam . Okay, I think I have it now.

If we could go to the slide that has, maybe not.

What are you seeing?

I am seeing was green. I am seeing a PowerPoint. I am seeing the slide that says stakeholder engagement in the new state performance plan annual performance report. Maria screen I think.

I am viewing Lisa's screen. Okay. Awesome.

If you can go to the next slide.

I will do that. Come on.

**Christine** [at 9:00] | Awesome. So Carmen and others, feel free to jump in like you did if I am talking at a mile a minute and you all are not with me.

So the FFY 2020 to 2025 SPP/APR package was approved at the beginning of October. I included a link where you can find both packages.

*[For your convenience, that link is:* <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/grantees/#SPP-APR>]

The one for part B and part C, they are on our website. The first submission that is going to fall under this new package is the February 1, 2022 submission. Next year. There is some nuances with particular indicators in terms of timelines about when those indicators are going to hit—like when state will first have to report under new requirements but I will flag those for you as we go through. Ultimately, next year's submission will be under the new package.

So I wanted to start our discussion today about changes in the measurement table and the SPP/APR general instructions that affect both part B and part C, which we call typically “crosscutting changes”, and then discuss specific changes in either package. You can go to the next slide.

So I recognize that this slide and maybe the next one break all PowerPoint 101 rules about how much text we have on there and probably the font size, etc. However, I wanted this to serve as a resource to you so we will walk through it together fairly slowly. I beg your grace in me breaking all these rules for PowerPoint.

So when we look at the current language that is in the SPP/APR , so through this year's submission, this is what is included in what states submitted to us two days ago. The language was around stakeholder engagement and setting targets. Sorry. The language was the state must describe its stakeholder input process in setting targets and describe the stakeholder input process if the state revised any targets from its last submission. That is all it is saying. What states gave us this year, so when we lay out the instructions, “Here are all the things you have to tell us about as it related to that stakeholder engagement language”, All we really said was “tell us about your process in setting targets and describe your process if you revised any targets from last year's submission.” Just very, very minimal.

But in the new package, we really wanted to shift and create more intention regarding engaging stakeholders throughout the entire process. I think sort of anecdotally and from what states reported to us, some states just talk to their state advisory panel or their state interagency coordinating council when setting targets. While critical stakeholder groups, to be sure, you are talking to just your state advisory panel and your SICC is not enough. We are wanting states to develop a broad and meaningful stakeholder development processes with a variety of folks for the life of the state performance plan. So that’s how some of the thinking and how we got to the language in the instructions now.

For the new package, which would hit for the 2022 submission next year, we say that the introduction of your SPP/APR must—*must*—include a description of the mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR, including any revisions to those targets and including the development and implementation of the SSIP, which is B-17 and C-11.

Then it goes on to say, and this is a critical piece, that this description must include, and it has 4 sub-bullets under it. The first sub-bullet talks about it has to include (remember, when we say “must,” must is must, which is different than “should” or “can”, it’s *must*, so states have to include this): The number of parent members and a description of how the parent members of the state advisory panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in target setting, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

So think: We went from language that was just “Hey states, tell us how you engaged stakeholders to set targets and revised them” to now really listing out what we want these descriptions of the broad stakeholder input process to include. You can go to the next slide.

We are also saying that this description has to include description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development and implementation of activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. This bullet is getting at states, what are you doing to make sure that your diverse group of parents, that you build their capacity to sort of support these endeavors, all the activities you are doing around improving outcomes for kids with disabilities.

We are also saying that this discussion has to include the mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for target setting, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Finally, the mechanisms and timelines for making the results of target setting, data analysis, the development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

As you can see through this language an increased emphasis on stakeholder engagement and that elevation of parent voice throughout. I think for many of you these are exciting changes and even for some of you that weren't aware that this happened, I hope you are sitting in front of your computer screen now just wowed and amazed and energized at the opportunity that this brings. Next slide.

So in terms of the SSIP, C-11 and B-17, stakeholder engagement was a critical component of those indicators over the past few years. When you read the language of C-11 and B-17 throughout each of the stages of the SSIP, stakeholder impeachment was woven throughout. While the changes on the slide are procedural in nature, you might be thinking why is she telling us this? I anticipate that this change, especially this first bullet could affect or impact the cadence of your work with states if you are engaged deeply, which I hope you all are, in their SSIP work. Starting with next year's submission, the SSIP is going to be due on February 1, which is consistent with all the other indicators in the SPP/APR. Before, for the past number of years, quite a number of years, it has been due on April 1. In terms of when states are reaching out to you, when you are engaged in this work with them, it might be on a different timeline, but moving to… Next year, everything is due on February 1st, including the SSIP.

The other thing I wanted you to have information on is that OSEP is going to provide a streamlined template. Ultimately, states will be reporting this information in the same reporting tool that they report all the other indicators on. How it is laid out in the tool will be streamlined, and we will make sure that we include suggested sections, recommended page limits, etc. in our guidance and information we put out to states.

States have reported in some cases that the SSIP reporting requirements are burdensome and we have not provided any guidance on the amount of information that is required. We have tried to walk a fine line and balance of this being a state’s plan versus us being overly prescriptive. So I think in our analysis of SSIPs over the years, reports can range anywhere from 50 pages to more than 200 pages. While some reports are quite voluminous, they may not necessarily provide concise, cohesive, easily understandable, and transparent information in terms of sharing what is happening with the state’s progress. Just be mindful of those two changes. Next slide.

So I wanted to take a minute to talk about some changes that were made across three survey indicators. So C4, which is family outcomes; B8, parent involvement; and B14, post school outcomes. There are slightly nuanced differences for each of these indicators that I will cover in a minute when we get to specific changes under the part C and part B package. I wanted to talk generally about the changes that have been made that affect all three of these indicators.

Generally across these indicators, states are going to have to compare the response rate to the previous year for these indicators. Remember these are typically survey indicators and we have never asked states to compare response rates before. Now we are saying states, you have to compare the response rate to the previous year and then also describe any strategies that you are going to implement to increase the response rate. We also want you to analyze the response rate to identify any potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and also promote increased response. So we’re asking for quite a bit of information around this comparison of response rates from year to year.

And then we also are asking for states to describe the metric they are using to describe representativeness. When we look across submissions, there are some states that tell us when we analyze this data to figure out if our response data are representative of different populations, whether it be students with disabilities receiving special ed services or thinking about youth who exited the prior year but had IEPs in effect when they left school, etc., some states might tell us we use like plus or minus 3% to determine over or under representation. Then there are some states that haven't said anything at all and just state in the narrative we think that everything is representative and move on. So we are also asking that this metric be described in the submission.

Then the ***biggest*** change—not that these aren’t all big changes but this is the one that has created quite a bit of energy—is starting with the 2023 submission for part B. That would affect B8 and B14, parent involvement and post school outcomes, and with the 2024 submission for part C, which is family outcomes, states must include race and ethnicity in its analysis of representativeness. So up until this new package, our language regarding demographic categories to include in the analysis of representativeness has said “should.” So states should include race, ethnicity, geographic location, etc. This is the first time we are saying “must” for a particular demographic category. For these three indicators, while it is a different year in terms of when this hits online for folks, you must include race and ethnicity in your analysis.

And something that was retained in the new package that is of importance to you and I really want to flag, the language that we have had in previous packages has been retained in terms of under B8 and C4 that says, it shows under the instructions on the far right column of your measurement table, it is down at the bottom of the indicator. It says that there is language about working with your OSEP funded parent centers in collecting data. That language still remains. Just want you to know in the new package that language still exists in those two indicators. Next slide.

So now let's talk a little bit more about changes specific to each package that are relevant to you. Next slide.

So we just talked about C4, B8, and B14 altogether and the changes that affect all three indicators about this comparison of response rates, identifying any non-response bias, tell us about the steps you are going to take to increase response rates, tell us about your metric and race/ethnicity. We want to go a little bit deeper into C4 for a minute. Up at the top of the slide, it has the current language for the indicator, which I won't read to you but I will point out that, in the last sentence, that is the “should” language I was talking about. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location. In the past, some states collect this information and give it to us in their analysis. But some may not and it wasn't a requirement. It didn't say “states must.” If they didn't give it, there wasn't much we could do about it. Now we have moved from *should* to *must*.

It is always helpful to me when I am thinking about these indicators and grounded myself in the foundational principle of IDEA, which is to enhance the capacity of all parents to meaningfully participate in decision making. In the case of C4, it is decision making regarding their infants and toddlers with disabilities. What is happening with families writ large, we know that research and experience have demonstrated that decisions regarding infants and toddlers with disabilities can be made more effective by strengthening the role and responsibility of parents and ensuring that families who have infants and toddlers with disabilities have those meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children and at home. This is sort of like preaching to the choir. You guys know this, you probably ground yourself in this every single day. It is just helpful always for me to anchor myself in that.

So, when we are looking at the change to reporting specific demographic categories and where OSEP is saying *must*, our belief is that to report high-quality data, we believe states must consider race and ethnicity when analyzing the extent to which the demographics of families responding are representative of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the part C program. So that was the rationale for us changing the indicator instructions to include race and ethnicity in the list of demographic categories that the states must consider when determining representativeness of the survey responses received. As I mentioned a few minutes ago, race and ethnicity must be included in state analysis with the 2024 submission for part C, which is different for part B. Part C is one year delayed. In addition to that required demographic category, states also have to have at least one of the following demographic categories and there is a list on your screen:

* socioeconomic status,
* parents or guardians whose which is other than English and who have limited English proficiency,
* maternal education,
* geographic location, and/or
* another category approved through the stakeholder input process.

So within that list I really wanted to highlight the option for states to include a category that is not mentioned here in our list of “at least one of the following.” That could come about and states could decide on through the stakeholder input process, which we have already teed up in the instructions what we are looking for in terms of how states are meaningfully engaging stakeholders. Want to flag that for you for C4. And we can go to the next slide.

We are going to move on to part B and talk about B8 and B14 a tad more. Indicator 8. B8. Parent involvement. Once again I have the current language that was taken out of the instructions tied to this analysis of representativeness. As was the case with C4 it has this “should” language. States should consider these things, and then with the revision, now we are saying what states *must* include. As we have noted earlier, race/ethnicity has to be included starting with the 2023 submission. And then in terms of the additional demographic category, it also has a list like it did in part C. The list is slightly different because we are dealing with kids of a different age, of course. Thinking about at least one of these following demographic categories:

* age of student,
* disability category,
* gender,
* geographic location, and/or
* another category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Once again, the opportunity exists for there to be a demographic category that is chosen based on, you know, and sort of informed through the stakeholder input process. Next slide.

I have been going pretty quickly. That means we have lots of time to chat. B14. Some of the information on the slide in terms of what is currently in the package and what was revised might not sort of occupy your day-to-day space. Just wanted to hone in on the last bullet on this slide, which is, once again, race/ethnicity starting in 2023. And the list of other demographic categories you have to choose “one of” are the same for 8 and 14. Disability category, gender. What is not in B14 but is in B8 as an option is “age of student.” That doesn’t exist here, but everything else is the same.

As is the case for all of them, right, C4, B8, B14, this piece about high-quality data and OSEP believing that high-quality data means data that accurately represents these populations. Whether it be, in this case, the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left the school, or B8, students with disabilities receiving special education services, or C4, those enrolled in a part C program, we believe you have to include race/ethnicity for us to be moving toward high-quality data. That is, like it.

I listed a few resources here. From the bottom of the list up:

* [<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/monitor/state-contact-list.html>](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/monitor/state-contact-list.html) |There is a link to all of the OSEP state leads who work in my division so if you wanted to know who worked with a particular state that you are oriented to, the link will take you right there.
* [<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/spp-apr/>](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/spp-apr/) | The second link is the link to our IDEA website that houses all of our state determination letters and all of the APR documents. Right now they are listed from 2014 to current. 2020 being current because we haven't gone through the process yet for 2021.
* [<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/Universal-TA-for-FFY-2020-2025-SPP-APR.pdf>](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/Universal-TA-for-FFY-2020-2025-SPP-APR.pdf) | And then the top link is for our universal TA document that we issued probably maybe last month, a few weeks ago regarding the new package. There are a number of questions states have raised that we respond to in that. I wanted to share with you we anticipate that is going to be a living document and will keep updating it as time goes on. I will flag for you and say the stakeholder engagement piece has created quite a bit of energy out in the field. We know that we are going to have to do a lot of work to provide guidance to states and also working with our TA centers and hopefully working with you to make sure we are sharing that information. And supporting states in that space.

I think the next slide is like hey, did you guys have any questions? What would you like to share, etc. Or we can engage in conversation. If all of you are quiet and if you like Christine answered every question I could possibly have, which I would not believe, I probably have a question for you guys.

**The Question and Answer Section***[Begins at 30:18 minutes]*

**Myriam** | Hi Christine. Somebody would like to know if the links are live?

**Christine** | Yes. Yes. I think you can access them in the PDF. I haven't tried but yes.

**Myriam** | In any case, the recording and the PowerPoint and everything is going to be posted on the website.

**Christine** | Any other questions or comments?

**Carmen** | You can also download the PDF of this presentation and check whether the links work in that too, so.

***Editor’s Note:*** [The remainder of this webinar transcript has not been edited from the original real-time transcription. We have, however, **bolded** questions from the attendees.]

They should be working. If someone tries it and you look now and they are not working, I can fix that.

They do. Rene since they work.

Okay, awesome.

For those who may have had no awareness of this, was it like drinking from a fire hose? I speak really quickly. I should have warned you all about that. I get so excited about stuff. Is it like a tracking from a fire hose and you need to sit and process or not. Actually Christine, you made a mistake in that slide, just kidding. I hope there are no errors. Maybe you have thoughts or initial impressions just based on what I have shared or not or you have been thinking about it since October when we released it and have loads of ideas. I knew this group is not shy. If not, remember I have a question saved for you guys.

**There is a question here. Is the U.S. Department of Education signed with agencies of which state report post school outcomes? For example, VR.**

I am the executive rector of CIDA, we serve Korean American families who have children with a disability in New York and Long Island. Does the thrust of education tell each state with agencies of which state, we have also the agency living for people with a disability, do they define which agency outcome is included in the post school outcomes?

Do you mean like in the survey?

Exactly.

No, we are not that prescriptive in terms of you have to include those specific agencies. What the indicator does though is that how we measure it is looking at the number of kids in competitive employment, higher education, enrolled in higher education, competitive employment or some other kind of implement. Those are the three subcategories when states are collecting the information that they are doing the calculations on. There is no part of it that sends you have to be working with, I think what you are speaking about in terms of other public agencies that states might be working with around transition planning for students, etc., that is not going to be captured in indicator 14.

Great.

States that pull that data, so for the, I am trying to think of the top of my head the last indicator analysis I saw, it might be about half the states do it on a census, the other half might sample. I think there are a few states that have statewide longitudinal data systems and have access to Lake Department of labor information and can pull from that to answer some of these questions versus calling up every single student who left a year ago to see what they are doing. That, the particular indicator does not ask or does not dictate who they are working with.

Thank you. I always wondered where all the data comes from one of the state says we have an affluent rate of such and such and first of all with the liability of the data, sometimes we don't really see it happening at a ground-level. There are a lot of discrepancies between what the state describes as an employment rate for people with a disability so it is kind of wondered where the state is coming from.

I don't know if you have ever gone back to read what New York has a minute to us but it is posted. You could pull up indicator 14 to see what they have said about kids who had IEPs at the time the school. You can see what they are reporting in terms of kids with disabilities and later are doing post high school. You can always take a look. I encourage you to look at what states report because it is posted in publicly available.

Thank you very much.

No problem.

**We have another question. It is what is the nature of the concerns you are hearing from the state education agencies about the stakeholder input requirements? What type of solutions are you offering them?**

So far, things I have heard anecdotally has been angst around those four sample ballot and what we are asking. Are we expecting that it was a, that it was apparent on each of the different associations we listed out in the first sample bullet, is it that, you know, we talk is the second stop bullet that talks about building the capacity of diverse groups of parents to be able to engage in the development and condition of activities, like what would we be expecting to build the capacity of these birds. It seems monumental to them. I think that not surprisingly, right, there are new requirements, states are wondering what OSEP is going to accept or what we may push back on. I don't know. However, I think there is probably more angst than is necessary. That is not to say states are in various places, I believe. There are some states that might have pockets of doing some of these things really, really well and then others not so much. There is a lot of anxiety. I think also depending on your relationship a state may have with their PTI, for example. We all hope everyone has wonderful relationships but then I sort of what does that mean when you are engaging in the space or may not have what they consider to be the best relationship with other organizations. I think, that is where I think you guys bring a certain value to the work and us being able and I say us like big others, big we, us being able to articulate that value beyond people's egos or personal feelings or concerns or anxiety or whatnot and this is really about kids and what is going to happen that is best for kids and how we can all bring our resources to bear and our good thinking to bear about doing that is what we want to move toward. I think those are the biggest things. I got an email today, and we will be putting out something, I have something on the calendar, next week we are meeting internally to talk about some of the questions we've gotten more in the weeds. Suppose we have meeting targets on this. Things are extremely weedy and not sticking to the intent of the language. We want states to have a more meaningful and intentional process beyond just giving, like here are our targets guys. You are having these thoughtful and deep discussions about targets, revising the but not only that, also thinking about how you are developing activities, how you are evaluating what you are doing, how you are implementing certain things. Those are probably the biggest ones. We recognize we are going to have to do some more work to help states breeze a little bit in this space and let them know all of the incredible supports that exists and how they can leverage those to do well in this area. That doesn't mean that everyone is perfect straight out of the gate.

So I just wanted to add that this conversation doesn't seem that different from the kind of conversation that happened when the SSIP was first introduced. So when the state systemic improvement plans was first introduced, states that do not feel they had the capacity to do that kind of planning and therefore really sort of struggled with it and we heard a lot of pushback on that too. I think one way you all can think about it and certainly talk about it is the way in which you can sell that if they are not comfortable with the capacity of building families capacity apparent capacity to engage in this kind of work, that is what you all have been doing for quite a while is building that kind of leadership with parents. We have tools that have been proven like serving on groups and leading by convening that you are well versed in and therefore can be a support to your state as they do this to ratchet down some of the anxiety that they felt that now. Like anything else, in time, they will get better at it too.

Yes. Yes, yes, yes.

We have one comment combined with a question.

Yes.

**Paula Sands, "it is super exciting to hear about getting input from. Centers and parent staff, etc. Can you share with us more about how this will work? Is there a target of a number of parents each state should be hoping to have? Is there any state that is already doing this in a more informal way?**

Those are excellent questions. We have not said there is a magic number at all. So no, no magic number. I think, though, that our hope we to be that we are looking at divers parents. If you report to us that we have two parents that serve on this one group and we only engage this one group and they are two white male parents, then one could question sort of how you are reaching out to diverse groups of parents, right, beyond just the two that you have tapped to be engaged in the work of Foley. We haven't set a magic number but we would hope that states are looking to engage broadly. Whether it be parents who have, parents of kids with disabilities who have disabilities themselves across Greece, ethnicity, graphics, level of education, whatever it may be that you are looking beyond just your, the parents that you tap all the time, the same. For the same thing that you are looking beyond that. I think there was another question you asked about folks that are doing it well. This is what I am hoping our centers and even some of you are going to be able to share with us in terms of those pockets of excellence, those examiner states that between pieces of this really, really well. I think that we probably have a sense if we draw around the SSIP. Carmen, thank you for reading that. When the SSIP first hit, folks went oh my gosh, how are we going to do this? Then states really did a good job and worked with their centers and thinking about all of that leading by convening work, which was happening a lot early on in the stages. States have done good work around that. I am hoping to get some ideas from folks out there about who is doing a great job at it. I think I have been in particular states I can recall, although we haven't traveled in on time and I am old so my brain is a little sketchy, but I have seen. I remember once I was a Delaware state lead for a number of years. Being in Delaware for a SSIP meeting they had with a stakeholder group. In this particular meeting, it was a fairly broad stakeholder group . I think maybe about 30 people or so. They were looking at data and had like data was all over the place. There were big sheets of poster paper and they were up but they did such a good job in the beginning preparing the parents who were involved in that because they had a few parents and their stakeholder groups but preparing the whole group in general regardless of their skill set and comfort level with data but preparing them to engage in these deep discussions about the data they were seen in Delaware. They had things like, they had a name for it, which is gives me now. Being able, it was almost like data prompt. Based on the graph you are seeing, just kind of, these are some of the things you are seeing that we are going to talk about. They did a good job of building some capacity for folks to be able to have a conversation that was intelligent. It didn't mean that you were some, that you have your PhD in statistics but that you were able to look at data can gain some information from it, ask thoughtful questions, etc. I remember being in that meeting thinking they are really doing a good job of building a level set for everyone and bringing everyone up to speed. I am sure there are lots of examples of good work around the SSIP. Thanks Carmen for flagging that we should look back to as well to think about how some of the states might be building that out for the new requirements that are coming online next year.

**There is another question here. It comes from Mary Jacob. When should states be reaching out to us?**

I have heard, you have seen me rub my eye, take off my glasses. It is me at the end of the day. I know that states are starting, some states are starting this work now. So I have heard from a few states like we want to put together our stakeholder groups starting in early March. To start having these discussions and so now they are teeing up lots of questions for us to see what direction we might be going in, etc. I think there are some states that are trying to get through SPP/APR submission on February 1st and aren't in the same place in terms of thinking about okay, next month we can start pulling people together and start having those conversations. I think it varies. I think it will probably start happening within the next few months. When you think of, now I say that and like we are still battling Covid-19, right, so I do have some level of sensitivity to the fact that states are dealing with very big issues because of the pandemic. I would say probably in the next few months. You are going to want to have all of those different touch points when you are thinking about targets for all of the indicators. You are going to have to set new targets for every single indicator and some indicators have changed quite a bit. So then that is a whole other discussion. There are some indicators that have way more sub indicators now. There are some indicators that are cutting states a lot of angst and will be at the moment that vendors are going to be other in-depth conversations. That should be happening, I would say, in the next few months. I would expect.

Nora has had her hand up for quite some time. Her arm must be ready to fall off her body.

I am trying to unmute. We have some people waiting.

Okay.

This is coming. I just sort of wanted to say too that being informed that this kind of knowledge, you can go sheep these conversations with states, depending on what your relationship is they can't say how can you be of most use to them.

Absolutely. Absolutely.

Okay. I wonder if Diana can speak

Can you hear me?

Hi Diana, how are you?

I love your voice. You and I are the only two people I know who say it all.

I come from Barbados. I don't know how I picked that up on the East Coast but I do say it.

**I just wanted to mention two things following up on some things that you mentioned. One is that the national Center for. Information and resources and the regional. TA centers do the indicator aid analysis for the SPP/APR.**

It is.

In the past we have, you know in our report, we have identified some communal, really effective practices, particularly representing partnerships between parent centers that have succeeded in enhancing, you know, survey responses as well as improved outcomes. So anyway, just wanted to remind people that we do that analysis. When the new ones come in, obviously not this year but next year we will be doing that analysis and we will have the opportunity to identify some really great examples, specifically, now especially since it has to be so specific. Before it could be so general. You can find specific information in one state or territory and not in another. That was the first comment I wanted to make. The other comment I wanted to make is that it is so wonderful to have parent centers, parents center staff mentioned. I just want to reiterate and just like you said you are preaching to the choir, I know I am preaching to the choir too but it is so different to have a representative from a parent center and not just a parent because as parent centers, we are talking to thousands of parents and the whole range of parents. All the different types of challenges that parents face and so when the parent center is involved, then there are many, many, many voices of parents that are brought to the table and it is much more likely that the systems and improving plans that are developed are going to address problems that kids with the worst outcomes of face. Just this past guidance, the family to family health information centers is great to know it is great to have parent centers specifically in here. Thank you so much, we appreciate it.

Absolutely.

Nora, you are unmute it now. Can you talk, Nora? There is not a question but a comment for Christine. A couple of years ago, for early intervention in New York State not in collaboration of any parent center but with the program that is funded by New York State early intervention partners training project. Exactly what was described in the Delaware case. So she wanted to let you know that.

This is wonderful. My colleague, who has been my colleague for many years and is a family engagement lead, Jennifer Miley is on listening and and she is also the New York State leader so I know him and has worked with me for many years, and I know her heart is warm and singing right now and she is listening in on the call that you find the work happening there. I know that New York part C typically does quite a lot of work. I've been on some calls with them. They definitely keep you on your toes, ask such questions. Thank you for sharing that you have been in this space and doing that kind of work as well. You are certainly a good example of that.

Do we want to see if Nora can unmute herself and speak now? Nora, maybe you can type something into the chat.

I don't see any other questions in the question area.

Okay. I think.

Let me see.

Something is coming.

**Is it 2022 that will be reported a benchmark for future years? That is a question from Sarah Thomsen.**

That is a good question. You mean like all of the sort of what we are requiring into staccato engagement language in the introduction if we are going to use that data at like sort of baseline for moving forward. I hope I understood your question correctly. That is a very interesting question. I think historically in my experience with the SPP/APR, and I have been working on the data team that takes the lead on that work for quite some time, a think that what will happen is that this. We will look across submissions to see what states are doing and what they are not doing. I think states will be held to the letter of what is in the instructions. There are certain things which they must about. I think sometimes people would like us to get quality things but ultimately we have to stick to the words on the page and what the language says. I think if we are going to set a limit in some form or fashion, we would do it early on. We typically, unless for some reason there is some administration priority or policy shift or something that changes, we typically don't sort of, okay, a state reports this way consistent with the measurement even though it might not be like a gold star or gold standard for something and then all of a sudden switch it up and be like we want more without also changing language in a measurement table. Those things have to happen for us to be upping the ante. We will pay close attention to what we get and then deciding on a response to that. States get a little nervous like are they going to go to SPP/APR jail if they don't have all the sinks and whatnot. I don't know who has gone to SPP/APR jail yet but they will have to speak to what is in the language and where we say must, it is must. We will do what we can to support that and what makes sense. I think even Willy SSIP , but states were doing to engage their stakeholders in year one is probably very different from what it looks like my you know, phase three year three necessarily. We hope we are all in this continuous improvement process and you are always looking to deepen what you are doing, enhance what you are doing. I don't know that I gave you a clear answer but I think we will pay close attention to what we get the first time and very intentional and see what we can say about those submissions. The other thing too, right, is how is Covid-19 going to impact any of states ability to do this and do this well in a virtual space, connecting with folks? That is another complication to things. But I don't know what we will see. Hopefully we will be able to engage well enough with our TA centers and with you guys that we can keep this communication going and make sure we get the best information we can out to states so they can do great things.

I think the parent centers here are thrilled. Engaging the parents in this way.

There was a webinar with state advisory panels. Come in, you are probably on that one. They were also excited with some of them had no idea. I mentioned that to states like how is it that like? Maybe states stuck haven't started to have those discussions yet. It is not a defensive thing yet, then OSEP has to do a better job of getting the message out. That is on us to make sure everyone is aware of what the new requirements are so all the folks that could have a hand in this to do great things are there.

It is to early to know what the administrators priorities are going to be. Today was at the hearing for the nominee for the Secretary of Education. A lot of the signs in terms of executive orders that are coming out of President Biden's office are suggesting they are really going to focus a lot on equity issues. And so working on this and being prepared to do this kind of engagement is a good way of sort of preparing themselves to the states for if there is going to be other requirements later on related more to equity, related more to tackling significant disproportionality, which has been around forever. So that is something else dipping up to state, it could be preparatory work for that too.

Absolutely.

Don't forget to answer to the little survey that will pop up when the webinar is over.

The survey is for, it's a survey on the webinar, right Myriam? Christine, did you want to send them off with a question and they can either answer in the chat or get back to you or me and the project officer with?

I think that question is, definitely send it to Carmen or put an answer in the chat. Just sort of what are the ways you see the results as being able to support states in this effort? If you were able to have a conversation with the state, I think I mentioned earlier and Carmen said something similar, you are valued, your value that you bring to this conversations, this would be your calling card, your selling point, this is the value you add to this work. I would love to hear those thoughts. Even if you need a little time to think about it and come up with something you want to share, there is always a mechanism to share through Carmen. I am very interested in that.

Talking about Covid-19, I was thinking but this also but then I was reminded of it, there are some challenges associated with it but on the other hand, some parent centers have found that they have seen increased parent participation. You don't have to, childcare might be easier to do. I think the challenge is for states how to have conversation when they are so used to doing it in person and moving to this virtual platform and saying to people, you know, this is how you mute your microphone and what if your bandwidth isn't good enough, the struggles we have had in the department too. FYI, everyone, we just got a message today saying how our virtual network was having problems. This is how to fix it so we know how to "this is.

Carmen, I was sweating. All I was thinking was nothing is going to work, it is good that all worked out. I think one more thing that comes to mind is you mentioned operating in a virtual space, is the challenge with making, you know, building a relationship with folks that might not have typically been at the table. It is one thing if you are relying on the same cast of friends and characters that have typically been involved in the conversations but as we are asking you to reach out beyond that, like how do you bring folks into this virtual space and start to build a relationship, have a certain level of trust. Like oh my gosh, I can't believe you said that. But ever. That is also something else to think about. I think we are probably getting better at operating virtually but now it is like building those relationships beyond what you typically are doing that is the next piece.

The parent centers shouldn't overlook the fact they have gotten certain skills in doing that and those skills have been honed during the 10+ months of Covid-19 and that can be helpful to the states.

Definitely.

**We have a couple of comments. One from Diana. She says, "as a national and region. Centers, we can support. Centers to be effective in reaching out to and engaging with our state, territory, both part B and C. As a parent center, we are already very engaged with our state in the SPP/APR process. And Rene, she says this is another amazing opportunity to share the collective voice of more family voices that may not have been heard before. Many comments like that.**

Okay, good. Can you share them with me after?

Yes.. Centers can could parents on how to be heard. As a virtual platforms. The data we collect, especially now looking at a limitation signs can go a long way in providing information for the SPP team and the state and innovation in the way we learn how to respond to what we find using IIS can be helpful in addressing the issues that may be found in developing the SPP. Lots of ideas for empowering parent and student leaders in our states to be real partners in improved decision taking.

Love the student peace. Love that.

I think we are going to thank Christine for her time here and close it out and then again, keep sharing your ideas and we will pass it on. We will see if there's an opportunity maybe as things go on to have another opportunity to speak with Christine and some of her other colleagues around this issue too. Stay tuned for that. I know we are going to go to the evaluation after that but I'm going to put a plug in for Friday. You all are going to get sick of me. You will get to see me again because we are going to have the performance measure webinar. Please be on it. With that, I want to thank Christine and think also the wonderful support for the webinar, Myriam , Maria and Lisa. Thank you everybody, have a great day. Want to pull up the survey, Myriam?

It is going to pop up automatically when we closed the webinar.

Thank you everybody. Thanks again Christine.