ROUGHLY EDITED COPY

ACDHH

TASK FORCE MEETING – SENATE BILL 1092

MARCH 9, 2022

Captioning Provided By:

Caption Pros

20701 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 107-245

Scottsdale, Arizona 85255

www.captionpros.net

***

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: We are having some streaming issues. Some might not be able to see me sign. So just make sure that we can -- all right. Turn off our videos. So, we're going to go ahead and shut off the PowerPoint at this time so that we can get started.

So with the PowerPoint on, it only allows one video to be on screen, so if the other Deaf participants will only be able to see the interpreter, they won't be able to see me signing. So I need the interpreter to turn off the video, but if a hearing person comes on, then I will have the interpreter turn their video back on. Got it. I'll turn it off.

Okay, that's an example of communication facilitation. Working through some issues, some technical issues involved as well. So, that's what Deaf people go through every day with technology that is designed for hearing people.

So, Zoom is really designed to focus on voice, auditory things, and Deaf people have to come up with creative ways to bypass that design, and turning off videos and working with -- I know we love to see our videos and see our interpreters on screen, but Zoom technology does not work out for us, so hopefully one day, that will work out.

So anyway, it's nice that we do have options, so here we are.

>> JEREMY McCOWN: Good morning, this is Jeremy. Okay, we have not started streaming yet. I've been waiting for everybody to get here and whatever the plan is. So it says that we're streaming, but I have not actually pressed the "live" button on YouTube. So I wanted to make sure everybody was set, and what we were going to do with the interpreters.

So if Tawny is going to be signing most of the time until somebody hearing comes, then I will need to spotlight that interpreter. So if that can be communicated like we normally do, say interpreter flip, and I'll go ahead and add a spotlight right now for Tawny.

And then, Tawny, just let me know whenever you want to go live.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Sure. I will do that, Jeremy. Thank you. Thank you for your -- the awesome support from the technical department. I appreciate that.

>> JEREMY McCOWN: No problem. You're welcome.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: All right. So I guess I'll wait until we are streaming to make sure that we are -- everything is public through ACDHH website, so we're going to wait until Jeremy confirms that we are actually live streaming.

>> JEREMY McCOWN: That's what I was saying. You just tell me whenever you're ready to go, and then I will do a countdown from five. So are you ready? Okay, here we go.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I am ready.

>> JEREMY McCOWN: Five, four, three, two, one. Go.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: All right. We're ready. Okay. Hello. Welcome, everyone, to our second task force meeting. And we're going to be focusing on language acquisition of Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and DeafBlind children in the state of Arizona.

So the task force meeting is being facilitated by ACDHH under the state of Arizona law. It is a wonderful group of people here with a variety of backgrounds, various agencies, also community members, and we have a great first task force meeting -- last month, rather, we had a great task force meeting last month and now we're on our second meeting, so we've got to go through a few ground rules and expectations, review, why we're doing our task force, et cetera, and then we'll dive into our subcommittee reports and share all that information and work together for the success of our task force meeting.

Just giving you guys a second to look at these ground rules. So this is just to ensure access, that everyone can have access and fully participate in the meeting. So, we want to review these rules. If you have a comment or a question, you can raise your hand. We will have opportunities for sure to collect the information from everyone to review everything. We'll have plenty of time for our discussion today.

The meeting is scheduled from 10:00 to noon Arizona time, but we might finish a little bit earlier. If we finish with our agenda. We'll see how it goes.

So I want to make sure, Jeremy, we are -- our live stream is recording and we're all set? We're on the record now?

>> JEREMY McCOWN: Yes.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay, excellent, thank you. As a reminder, we do have captions available. It's live captioning, it actually says live transcript, but you see the closed captioning logo. You can open that up and you'll be able to get a transcript or captioning. We also have ASL interpreters for those who need access to visual language, or we can have -- and they're also providing a translation into English.

So, when you raise your hand, we will ask you to turn on your camera at that point, and need to turn off the PowerPoint to make sure that everyone can communicate easily.

Okay, so just to review, this is regarding SB 1092. The goal is to establish a task force with diverse community members and partner with various agencies to see how we can do -- establish a language assessment process for Deaf children in Arizona. So, it's going to be due in June. That's our timeline, it's coming up.

This is the agenda for today. So just reviewing our timelines, and then we'll have an opportunity to check in with the subcommittees and get updates of all of the subcommittee information, see what we've got from all of our community and other subcommittee representatives, and our subcommittees are going to report in and talk about who their facilitators are, talk about what their roles are, talk

about what goals they have for their next meetings, and hopefully we can get a better picture of what every subcommittee is up to.

And we're going to -- after we do our subcommittee check-ins, then we are going to have an open forum for everyone to talk about the different things that subcommittees brought up, talk about sharing resources, or talk about how each other's subcommittee's information can support goals of the others. If you have any questions or concerns, we can use that time during the open forum to talk about those.

All right. So, we're going to -- I'm going to show you the timeline next. So, during the subcommittees, we have -- these are the subcommittees that we have, rather. I froze. Okay, it looks better. Sorry, my video froze.

So these are the three subcommittees that we have. Demographics & data, systematic connections, and assessments and review. So, we are going to encourage the subcommittees to meet once a month between the task force meetings, so the goal is for the subcommittees to collect information, develop that information that can benefit the whole group, the whole task force, and make recommendations.

So this is the timeline. January, ACDHH worked pretty hard figuring out who should be on the task force and inviting the people that we need to have here, and ACDHH staff started talking about making sure, you know, we got all of our invitations and everything was ready, so February we had the first task force meeting, and now here we are with the second meeting. So this is what we're doing on our timeline.

We have some of the drafts of information, so that we could start filling in information from subcommittee discussions. For the next task force. And each one, we'll dive a little bit deeper with what is found.

So we're trying to -- we're going to be developing this agenda with feedback from the subcommittees, and with the discussions during the form, finalize that, and make recommendations. Once we're finished, we will make recommendations to the state.

And we're going to switch interpreters to Beth.

I'll let you take a look at each of these that the subcommittees will be working on. And interests, things that people are motivated to research more. You'll see members of each task force listed here. And where they're from and their knowledge background.

You can see we have several people who are represented here in different agencies. A lot of people are involved in Deaf education in the state of Arizona. Wow, it's just really great to see all of us come together, share our considerations, our thoughts, our wisdom, and advice. Really help people providing family perspectives.

It's very important to recognize all the cultural agencies that are involved here as well, the diverse

population that we have here in the state of Arizona. It's very nice to see underrepresented communities represented here. And I think it's just important to keep in mind family backgrounds and people that we serve here in the state of Arizona.

So we wanted to just make sure that we divided these subcommittees into different groups to make sure everybody is represented equally here, and I know that there is a lot of heart here with the people that are involved in the subcommittees, and there will be a lot of brainstorming, and that will be very helpful to have the entire task force.

So we'll go ahead and do the subcommittee check-ins right now, since we've already been through the PowerPoints. And we can copy any questions into the chats. I can go ahead and take the PowerPoints down once the subcommittee starts, we'll do the assessments and review first, then data and demographics, and then we'll do the systematic connections.

So we'll go ahead with those subcommittee check-ins, and we'll see what's happened. If there are any questions that are copied in the chat, I'm hoping that someone will take notes and we can have those to work from later on.

>> CAROLINE OGLESBY: Hi. My name is Caroline Oglesby. Our note takers are -- well, we've identified Christy and Jennifer as note takers. So I wanted to give an overview in regards --

>> Tawny was just setting up everything here. Okay, go ahead.

>> CAROLINE OGLESBY: I'll start over.

Hi. I'm Caroline Oglesby. I'm with Arizona Early Intervention Program. I am in the assessment review subcommittee. I'm the facilitator, and we have identified Christy and Jennifer as our note takers for this subcommittee. We met for our first time yesterday, and in the interest of this committee, we're going to be focusing on assessment use for children who are Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and looking at all of the different assessments that are used for the 0 to 3 population with AzEIP, 3-5 the special needs preschool, and K-12. So that's our task in regards to looking at the assessment tools, looking at if they're standardized, how are they administered to children in this population.

And then also, if there are any suggestions or recommendations about the assessment tools that are used, what that would look like, and planning on if there is any additional training or support that's needed and guidance for the programs that are using any particular tools or other tools that we would suggest.

And we are scheduled to meet monthly. Our next meeting will be March 23rd from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m.

Any questions for the larger group? Thank you.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: So now the data and demographics subcommittee. Thank you, Caroline.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Hi, everybody. I'm Kendra Benedict. As of an hour ago, I'm the facilitator of the data and demographics subcommittee. And Fran Altmaier, as of an hour ago, has been voluntold to be the note taker. We met an hour ago. Fran, myself, Suzie Perry, from the Department of Ed, and Jesus Marquez, parent advocate, we met to briefly talk about what types of data we need to be gathering, where we can go to find that data.

We talked about the need to know more about what everybody in the subcommittee and task force does, so we know what our in-house resources are to find that data.

Tawny, that slide you just shared was very helpful, that will help us to that end in identifying who we can go to for additional information.

We talked about the need to really narrow in on our focus, because this topic could literally lend itself to a dissertation, and so we need to be really clear on what population it is that we are looking at.

I also brought up the fact that, you know, in this field, we tend to focus very narrowly on children who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing without additional disabilities and who are progressing not at a rate that we would hope because they've had language deprivation. And in doing that, we are leaving out a huge chunk of the population of Deaf and Hard of Hearing children with severe medical needs or other disabilities.

With that said, again, it's important to narrow in on what it is that we're doing here, but I think we would be doing the field a disservice if we did not at least recognize that group who may be communicating in other ways, using augmentative communication, assistive technology. We have to at least make recognition that that group is there and needs research as well.

I just don't want to proceed without even acknowledging that. But that might be out of the scope of this task force. I understand that.

And so we are just, for starters, starting a Google Doc to share all of our questions so we can categorize them, narrow down, and then start to reach out to have our questions answered. Between Fran having access to the Department of Health information, newborn hearing screening, myself, and Suzie with ADE, and Jesus as a parent advocate, knowing many different organizations around the state, we feel that with our network, we can gather a lot of this information.

But we recognize that a lot of the data that we may be collecting isn't the quality of data, say, that you would be publishing somewhere. There are gaps in the data that we will be collecting. We already know that. Even Suzie shared some information about data that they have from the department of ed and the number of preschool children exiting preschool, going to kindergarten, identified as Deaf or Hard of Hearing, and we all immediately identified that those numbers were way off. She only had -- I think 35 kids last year going to kindergarten, and I can say that from PDSD alone, we had 20.

But we recognize that's why we're all here. We're here to identify where these gaps in our data collection exist and how we can go about making that data better.

Fran, anything I missed? Does that sum it up?

>> FRAN ALTMAIER: Yeah, I think you've got it. Thank you.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Thanks, everyone. If you have any questions, please feel free.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Great. This is Tawny. Great. Thank you for sharing the information. It seems like you met just an hour ago. That's great. Good work.

I'm curious if anybody has any questions for the larger group. Okay, I guess not. So, we'll go on to the third subcommittee, the Systematic Connections.

>> MOLLIE HARDING: Hello. I'm going to be serving as the facilitator for the Systematic Connections subcommittee. We also met yesterday for the first time, and we spent our time discussing all of the agencies, all of the professionals, and the roles that those agencies and professionals serve when it comes to diagnosing hearing loss, and making referrals, and connecting families with the services that they need.

So really, we spent the time gathering information, sharing resources, and sort of educating each other about what the Part C process looks like, and we briefly began to talk about how families and students are connected with resources under Part B.

So, I have some questions just about the subcommittees in general. I'm wondering if we are just supposed to be gathering information, or if we're supposed to be working on any sort of deliverables. You know, as a facilitator, I want to make sure I'm doing my job, so I want to make sure we're working on all the necessary things.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: This is Tawny. I'm taking notes here. Great. Okay, hold on. The interpreter needs Tawny to be a little bit bigger.

Okay, so that's a really good question, Mollie. Yes, I would agree that we do need to have a picture of what the deliverables might be. And for your committee, I would like to see a roadmap. Like, where we see -- where we have newborn babies that are Deaf identified until later, and their journey through the system, like, until they're 21 years old, right? Because they're still in the educational system at that age.

So that's what my hopes are for your subcommittee. I'm hoping that gives you a little bit of an idea of what to play around with. Oh, okay. I've noticed Jesus's comments that the screens are small. So if you could change the video up in the right, gallery view will be so small, but if you can do -- under the view, just go into speaker and then maybe you can see the picture.

On each person's thumbnail, they have three dots and you can do "hide video participants" if that maybe helps. Or you could pin me. So you can do that by clicking on the three dots on each thumbnail of the person.

>> INTERPRETER: We're going to switch interpreters now.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay. Let's see. It's in the corner. Maybe that would help. Did that help? You can go to -- if you see the three -- you should see three videos, me, Mollie, and the interpreter, Windy. Do you see the three of us? And if you see the other ones, on any one that has a video going on, you can click the three dots in the corner and you should see a menu, and then there's one that says "hide non-video participants," and hopefully the tech team can talk with you in chat to help you with that. Because it is important to have it accessible, for sure.

Okay. So we're going to continue our video check-in and make sure people can see the interpreter -- everyone can see everyone. Okay, Mollie, did you have an idea -- so the roadmap, the players -- the state players and the process, including possibly alternative paths as well. So, for example, Deaf children referred to specific agencies and other systems.

>> MOLLIE HARDING: That gives me a better idea of what to be working on. Thank you so much.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Absolutely, you're welcome.

Okay. So, now the other two committees, if we can. We're going to go ahead and do a description. As Mollie brought up, before we go into the forum, that's a perfect segue. So for the assessment review committee, we hopefully, for the list of assessments, what the purpose of those are, focusing on language acquisition. Remember, Deaf and Hard of Hearing kids, it's a good idea to focus on assessment, language assessments for Deaf and Hard of Hearing children, narrowing it down only to that, because we're wanting to look at current ones that are used in the state. The pros and cons of those and what other assessments we would hope to see as a group, as a subcommittee, we would hope to see more people in the state using and then collecting data on that.

So maybe, for example, assessment that has been being used so far, maybe it's out-of-date or aged, and we might want to see a new assessment take its place, but we would need to see training happen, or resources, or funding, if those need to be purchased. We can identify the assessments that are currently being used, the pros and cons, and what assessments we would like to see being used more or be introduced, and the process of collecting literacy -- language acquisition data.

So if that is -- if that links up with what the committees can do... hopefully.

Caroline, did you have any questions about that?

>> CAROLINE OGLESBY: No, I don't.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay, great. Thank you.

So for data and objectives, I think we want to identify what data we currently have -- sorry, data and demographics, identify what data we currently have. We want to look at maybe raw numbers. We want to see what information, what other information we do have out there, what assessment scores we have, for example, for -- do we have scores for individual Deaf and Hard of Hearing kids,

do we know family demographics? Do we know locations, school programs that are being used? Do we know -- right. Recording is going to be a challenge. Sometimes it's -- there will be good information, but it's not enough to help. And sometimes it's not. Sometimes it's too much data. Sometimes it's not enough. But too much data is not a bad thing. But we'll see -- we would like to see a summary of the data that we currently have and maybe identify what data is still needed and what gaps we have, like was mentioned, there are gaps.

Mentioning that in your deliverable next time we meet on the task force, we can review the process in that deliverable.

Okay. Kendra, do you have anything to mention regarding that?

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Nope, all good.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay, great.

Now we'll go on to the open forum. Any questions or thoughts or things we want to share in the open forum? Hang on, I just realized I need to fix my video. Give me a few seconds to change the video. I have to leave Zoom and come back. I have a black screen. I'm not able to see myself on my screen. So I only see myself on the iPad on a separate device. So give me a few minutes, 20, 30 seconds. I'll be right back.

Okay. Looks better now. I'm going to get the PowerPoint started.

So, any question or topic we feel we want to know will help support the work of the task force or the goals of the subcommittees, we can talk about. This is kind of just a draft that I came up with, but if there's new information -- some of the subcommittees talked about some new information, like gaps in data. The 35 kids identified, which you've already mentioned, that's a discrepancy with what you already have, what you already know. So that's a great point to discuss here.

So I want to clarify something. It says 35 -- it says -- it shows 35 Deaf students, but one Deaf school has 20 registered. So that obviously is a discrepancy. 35 out of -- 30 out of 35 kids don't go to one Deaf school, that's not possible. So obviously, you know, in the state of Arizona, obviously that's a discrepancy, so we're going to need to dial in on that, and that's one data point to figure out.

Sorry, that's not what I said. The interpreter misunderstood me.

30 kids going to one school, there can't be 30 out of 35 kids going to one school. That's not possible. Obviously, there are more than that who are preschool aged. Thank you. That is a better translation. Thank you.

So, looking this over, we can talk in the open forum. We can close the PowerPoint, and whoever wants to raise their hand and start a discussion about what we've seen so far, what we've talked about so far. If we want the hear from other committees, maybe other committees can give some feedback on what your committee talked about.

I do see a question in chat.

So the question says, maybe it's an unrelated question, but is the work that we're doing here as the task force related at all to the LeadK or the pass am of that type of legislation here in the state of Arizona? And the answer is any legislative bill could be discussed related to Deaf or Hard of Hearing language acquisition, but we have a specific -- there's the EdK, but we're not using that terminology.

Arizona did not use that exact model. They kind of went in a different direction, so we established a task force, and that's what we're here to work together on, as the language acquisition and assessment. So, it could be a similar concept, but we did not specifically copy that 100%, no.

So currently, we need more data. That's what we're talking about right at this moment. We want to know how our families are doing, what they're doing. So, thank you for that question. Any more questions? Go ahead, Fran.

>> FRAN ALTMAIER: Yeah. So, my thoughts related to some of the data might be the need to develop some data sharing agreements so that when we're talking about a number of kids like that 35 that was mentioned, are they the same 35 that we already knew about, or that we're tracking, or were they a different 35 than started in our system.

So I know for our newborn screening, I have data sharing agreements with early intervention, so I can track specific children, and where they're at through the early intervention process. But we may need to think about some data sharing agreements between the early intervention and the Part B programs, so that you can follow those same children through their evolution of newborn screening, early intervention, early childhood programs, school age, so that we have a set cohort of children to be able to evaluate those children and their progress over time.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah, that's a great question. So hopefully we'll be able to answer that question.

Do we have anyone who can answer that question, respond to that question?

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: This is Kendra. I think that that is in progress. Suzie Perry would probably -- or maybe even Caroline could speak to that, but I think that's something that's been in progress for a while now for AzEIP and ADE, for their data systems to communicate.

Caroline, do you know anything about that? I don't think Suzie is here. She had to go to another meeting.

>> CAROLINE OGLESBY: Yes, that's something that we have currently in progress right now. Sharing data for the children transitioning from AzEIP to ADE.

But I think it might be helpful if it's any specific data that the group wants to track.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay, yeah. Thank you for your input on that. I'm glad there's a process already in the works. Hopefully the subcommittee can capitalize on that and use that in their delivery as we continue the process.

A lot of other states have the same struggles because, you know, sometimes there are two

different system, two different built-in, two different -- literally and figuratively, they're just in two different buildings. So that communication sometimes doesn't cross.

So if they're following this kid over here, they might not -- it might be the same kid and it might not. So adding that -- adding maybe ID numbers to kids, there's a lot of talk about that. But we haven't really seen that fly so far.

>> CAROLINE OGLESBY: Yes, from AzEIP perspective, and ADE, our collaboration, that's exactly what we're looking at. Having -- when a child is referred to AzEIP, they would have this specific ID number that would be used for ADE. Keeping in mind with FERPA and HIPAA compliance. But that way, we would be tracking kids based on their ID number.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay. I look forward to seeing what can happen with that process. Maybe it would be a good idea for us to review -- okay, that's better. The interpreter was blurry. Okay, so I think it's a good idea maybe as a group to review the numbers that AzEIP on their website and compare that to National Center For the Deaf, you know, that they have there. Sorry, National Center on Hearing Assessments. National Center of the Deaf have different data.

Yeah, the National Hearing Center. The state's data -- there are different websites that have results there that we can also take advantage of looking up the data there as well.

>> CAROLINE OGLESBY: And I want to add that with AzEIP, one of our service providing agencies is Arizona State Schools For the Deaf and the Blind. So those of you who are not familiar with AzEIP's services, [indiscernible] foundation for blind children, they collaborate with AzEIP to provide the vision and hearing services.

So they may have some data as well for the 0 to 3.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay. That's good to know.

I'm trying to think about one issue that came up at the national level. It might apply is the loss of follow-up. You know, from after the newborn screening, a baby is screened in the hospital, but it seems like it's possible that they're then referred to an audiologist, and then the audiologist does a follow-up evaluation.

It's interesting that the medical numbers of babies that are in the hospital, they seem differently -- I don't know, the documentation of those numbers seems like -- let's say, for example, 50. So they refer 50 to audiologists, but only maybe 30 actually get a follow-up hearing test. So the loss of follow-up would be 20, and that's -- wow, that's, like, close to 40% of the babies that aren't getting the follow-up. Hearing test.

So I think it would be really interesting to look into those numbers and, you know, because that is a challenge that babies in the hospital, they get their hearing tests, it might be a little bit different. There might be different factors involved. You know, fluid in the ears maybe, or maybe from c-sections, maybe they have fluid in the ears compared to maybe a natural birth.

And so that's where I think some of our loss of follow-up numbers might be changing. And, yeah, thank you for the comments in the chat. Yes, so I'm reading that. I'm happy to share that, Fran and Mollie. This is exciting. You're already exchanging information.

And someone else let me know that Jesus had a question. Jesus, did you want to show your video and ask your question?

>> JESUS MARQUEZ: Okay. For language acquisition, I think the numbers seem to be -- they should be bigger than they actually are, and should we collect data also from out-of-state, maybe like at Gallaudet University, or do you think there are other places that we could collect data, or do we only -- can we only collect data from here in the state of Arizona?

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: If your subcommittee feels like, you know, other state research -- you know, research from other states could benefit, then you could ask, you know, other states, like where did they get their information, the reason that you decided to collect the data. And then you can use that as a comparison as well. For example, Mollie just mentioned the numbers of the children, you know, getting follow-up -- you know, follow-up hearing tests after they leave the hospital.

That shows right now how we need the knowledge. And there's other factors that are involved. And other states I know struggle with the same thing. So it's a great discussion for the systematic connections and the other subcommittees to share and connect, share their information.

Okay, is there any more discussion? Are there any more questions?

Okay, so we have the assessments and the data and demographics and the systematic connections. Do any -- is there any other information that all three of the subcommittees maybe should know? For example, other states I know struggle with the concept of, you know, home birth. There's been discussion about missing information with families that don't birth in the hospital, or in a birthing center, that we should include home births.

The people on the reservations sometimes don't go to the hospital, you know, that are in data sharing. It's important to keep that in mind, and also people who move here from other states, other countries. How is the data kept on them when they're born outside of Arizona. So those are things to consider. That just kind of came up, you know? And so if you have anything else that comes up that we should keep in mind...

Okay. Well, with the silence that I'm noticing, it seems like you're all very excited to keep working on your subcommittees, and that's great. I think there's a lot of information that we need to find and collect still. So, we'll go ahead and show the PowerPoint again, and then there will be information included on the PowerPoints for the subcommittees for upcoming meetings.

And there's a comment in the chat, if you would like to read the chat. Fran shared something to Mollie there. Not everybody might have access to the chat, so Mollie is saying, "the number of babies born from 2020 that were a loss to follow-up was much higher than normal due to the pandemic. We

are seeing that 2021 as well, but hoping it will swing back to more normal.

The good news is that we've identified a similar number of children with hearing loss as we expect each year."

So that's great news. Okay, I will go ahead and share the PowerPoint again and I'll ask the interpreter to shut off her video, so that will be easier to see.

Okay. So, as a friendly reminder, the next task force meeting is April 13th. We're hoping your subcommittees will meet again between now and then and collect more information. I hope that we have more people joining who didn't have the opportunity to join, so that we can have a full house next time.

And during the discussions, I'm hoping we can get a picture of the deliverables that you're considering and put the information together. We'll have a more in-depth report. You know, we'll give ten minutes for each subcommittee to share their findings, some of the challenges that you're finding in your approaches and where things are leading you to find your deliverables.

So with that, we'll -- then after that, the next task force meeting will be May 11th. But April 13th, be ready to share those kind of things. And I'm sure that ACDHH staff will work out with the interpreters and share that information so that we have interpreters at the ready.

So, thank you all for joining us today and your commitment to data gathering and information gathering. It's just the beginning, and I know there will be a lot more thoughts and considerations as the next few months approach.

And I wanted to let you know also, this is the last opportunity for your subcommittees -- maybe if, you know, you know people that have information that can provide your subcommittee more information, you could -- the close of business day for that would be Friday. So keep that in mind if you have anybody else that maybe wants to join, if you're considering a person who has a lot of knowledge in the area that your subcommittee is.

So there's a committee form that they can fill out, if that can be sent to ACDHH and we'll work it out.

So are there any last questions, or is there any last information request from anyone?

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Tawny, this is Kendra Benedict. Can I ask a question?

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Sure. Sure, Kendra. Go ahead.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Thanks.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I'm going to take the PowerPoint down first. Okay, great, go ahead, Kendra.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: In talking to some other folks about the task force and about the subcommittees, I'm feeling like there's a lack of understanding, and I'll speak for myself. What the end goal is here, I myself am confused. I think the subcommittees and what we're working on is

great, but I'm lacking a full understanding of what are we trying to accomplish at the end of the day on that timeline, when the last bullet point was June, and I can't recall exactly what it said. Something about presenting what we have. Like, what -- this sounds really stupid, but what are we doing? I don't know how else to ask it. I don't know what we're all doing here.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Sure. Hold on. Hold on.

Okay. So, that's great. I'm glad that you shared that question. You know, I'm sure that oftentimes, when a question is asked, a few other people have the same considerations.

So, we are focusing on deliverables to create a report for committees, and that report will help us come together as a task force in May and really be able to provide recommendations to the State of Arizona for statewide, including different stakeholders and players that are involved, to make sure that we have good collection of data for Deaf and Hard of Hearing children and their language acquisition process.

So, we'll have a list of recommendations that we would like to see set up and process, or we need to do more assessments, introduction assessments, or whatever. So really, any recommendations that we can see based on the subcommittees, like where we can identify gaps and services so that we can recommend how to, you know, correctly collect data or how assessments are done.

We are really wanting to be able to make recommendations, and based on what Arizona needs are, and we can bring that to the governor and to the government of the State of Arizona and hopefully set up a system for future legislation.

So I'm hoping that will help clarify a little bit.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Yeah. A little bit. Thank you. Are we starting off with any assumptions? Do we as a group have assumptions that there is data, there isn't data, what data is there? What do we think we're going to find? Like, ACDHH went to the legislature last year to have this bill passed, why? What are the assumptions and what are we trying to determine if those assumptions are wrong or right? Yeah.

>> INTERPRETER: We're going to switch to the interpreter, Windy.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah, that's a great question. I will let ACDHH staff respond to that. I was not involved in the bill passage, so I'm here to -- after the bill passed, to help facilitate the task force, so I will let ACDHH respond to that.

But based on our current discussion, I can already see that there's some data gaps. There's some variation in what assessments are being used, and some not clarity about that. And so the goal isn't -- it isn't that everyone is using that one assessment and that's the one we want. But it's just there's a variety of those.

And the reports to the state of Arizona regarding language acquisition of Deaf children, we have two or three different assessments, so it's hard to compare that data as well, because kids are taking

different assessments -- being used with different assessments, so the baseline levels are not where our Deaf children are and what milestones they're reaching. For language acquisition in general, for children in general, where are our Deaf kids in comparison, and we need to know which assessments are being used to help find that information.

So the reason -- that's the general reason for this task force, but specifically you might have to -- this might need to be fielded by ACDHH staff.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: Tawny, I'll add to that. If our primary goal is to determine how children who are Deaf and Hard of Hearing are progressing, especially in the birth to 5 range, I would encourage people to go to the University of Colorado's website, specifically their website, and I can put the link in the chat.

They have a grant, a CDC grant right now. Some of you may already be aware of this. But ASTB is involved in that, and they are tracking all of our birth to 5 kids' progress. Anyone who's at the school for the Deaf that does not extend out to the politic schools at this time. But that is one effort that's under way to do that. I hate duplicating efforts. It seems like we should probably look at that or bring them into the conversation at some point, if that's the primary goal of this group, because that data is being collected. Just thought I would put that out there.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Excellent. So, I was aware of that, the federal grant of the University of Colorado, but they are looking at the whole child assessment. They're not only looking at language acquisition. Obviously, that data would be beneficial, yes. And I see them using that data for what the program -- the center, and plus for purposes of our committee as well.

But we're looking at birth to 5. How do we know the language acquisition. In general, we know -- you know, standardized testing does not always identify for Deaf and Hard of Hearing children, we don't always know how they're doing. Are they doing well with reading, or are they doing well with general language skills, are they acquiring general language skills, whether it's signed or spoken language or written language.

Do we have to specify. Do we want the State of Arizona -- that's one of the questions we have for this task force.

Do you want me to repeat?

The interpreter was not clear. I wanted to clarify.

Okay, so do we know how Deaf and Hard of Hearing children are doing in terms of spoken language, written language, sign language. Do we want to know specifics on those points, or just do we want general information. That's the question. That's the question for the task force to determine, we as a group to determine.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: That right there is helpful. I don't know if that had been stated very clearly. Yeah, so thank you.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Sure, yes, of course. It will take time to -- you know, sometimes we're developing this together, so we're going to go where the task force decides we want to go. So each state and the families that you work with and the children that you work with might be involved. So it's all for the state of Arizona -- well, whatever we feel is best for the state of Arizona.

So do we have another question -- another question here. It says, similar to standardized testing, are we looking to recommend a standard test for Deaf and Hard of Hearing kids in Arizona? That's an interesting question, because in general, testing I think wouldn't be recommended until later, like third grade or beyond. Usually testing applies to those age groups.

So assessments, though, could be more -- they could be recommended -- how data is collected in various systems. Spoken language, written language, and sign language. It depends on what we're using currently, and what the task force feels would be the best idea to start to work on, and start going forward and continue doing.

So some assessments really emphasize spoken language, but can be modified for sign language, and there are -- those assessments are not normed or designed or intended for sign language, and spoken language and sign language are very different, so in terms of vocabulary, in terms of grammar development, they are different.

And so that means we could find -- you find challenging, as with teaching a 2-year-old, I find those challenges to be important. And sometimes when you try to deliver those assessments and you bring those kids and you have maybe a kid who came from another country who is 10 years old, and those assessments don't really apply to that language level and that age at the same time, so those are some of the struggles that we can encounter.

So standardized testing, I'm not sure about that. Again, that's up to what the committee feels is the best recommendation for the task force as a whole.

But if we're focusing on one assessment or if we're talking about depending on age or depending on language use, there's a variety of options. But it's important -- the important thing is what we see happening currently in the state of Arizona, what's being done at schools and at home, and what we feel is -- will give us the clearest picture of what kids are doing related to language acquisition currently.

And Jesus asked, who sponsored the new bill? Do you mean the new bill -- SB 1092, the task force is based on? Is that the new bill that you mean? I actually am not aware of the answer. I don't know the specifics. I will let ACDHH staff chime in and respond to that, with that information. I don't know. They might have to look that up and add it to chat.

I will let them reach out to you directly with that information.

So are there any more questions that we need to discuss. All right. I'm waiting for Nikki to respond to Jesus's question. But other than that, are there any other points, raise your hand and let

us know.

I have a question. At this time, do we know -- does anyone on the task force know how many Deaf or Hard of Hearing -- or DeafBlind children there are in the state of Arizona currently from age birth to 21? Maybe 5 to 21, if that helps? Do we know the numbers? Estimates even. Okay. Kendra says there would be multiple databases. Caroline?

>> CAROLINE OGLESBY: Yes. I was going to add, I can get the number of AzEIP children who are also with ASDB, and Kendra and I, you know, can get that number. But the question is how many children. We would only know the children who were actually enrolled in AzEIP, because what we find, there are many children as this whole group is about, who are missed and they may not get services until later.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah. What is the main reason for that?

>> CAROLINE OGLESBY: I think a lot of it is public awareness, Child Find, underserved area population, and some families who -- their children may have been identified Deaf or Hard of Hearing or vision loss. They may not want to enroll in early intervention and do things privately.

>> KENDRA BENEDICT: And Caroline, I'll add to that, if I may. And we spoke briefly about this at the first task force meeting. But, you know, we have a very diverse population in Arizona. We have a very rural population in Arizona. And it's a question of accessibility in some cases. You have Navajo Nation that for the last two years during COVID has been for the most part shut down and they don't have the access that the metropolitan areas have to Internet.

And then you also have families just dealing with basic everyday living needs, Maslow's Hierarchy, and the thought of looking into services, it doesn't come before putting food on the table and earning a paycheck and keeping the lights on.

So it's a complex issue. There's no simple answer, I don't think.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Thank you for sharing that. That exact kind of thing should be involved in recommendations, you know? Like, you know, if people aren't having food, you know, are they able to get food services, and that kind of thing. Like, we need to look at all of that, not just early intervention. I guess we need to look at all of our partners and advocate agencies and different representatives, you know, that could help us make sure we're supporting our families in those areas.

Also, there are other factors also, I'm sure. Trust. Public awareness. Yes. Thank you for that discussion. You know, I recently learned for that national data, that educational statistics for 2017 showed 350,000 Deaf and Hard of Hearing children in the U.S. They didn't break down specifically by state, but generally in the U.S.

And it was interesting that 77,000 in IEPs that were from age 5 to 21. Yeah. Or before age 5, different numbers. But there were 77,000 on IEPs. Maybe some that are not in the educational system or, you know, maybe some are tribal. So there were a variety of specifics and information

there, but it didn't have exact information of the data that was collected. But it was interesting, that was 2017. That was data from 2017. 77,000 on IEPs. 13.6% of that number on IEPs in Deaf schools.

86 were in mainstream public schools. And often, they are the only Deaf children in that school. And so, that's something I just recently learned from national data. In 2019, again, there's a report published, it says 400,000 Deaf children in the U.S., and only 8.1% go to Deaf schools. That was a reduction in two years. That meant 91% go to public schools, and most of them are the only Deaf children in their schools.

And so, wow, that's tough for us to count each of those, you know, if you think about all those different states, you know, do they have Deaf schools, are they on IEPs, and so that's quite a discussion.

I remember one university, they had a team member go to a public school and they knew of two Deaf students that were in there, and they went in the principal's office and they waited for the students to come in and they said hello, and they were talking to them. And then another student came in and they were communicating, but they were like, are you Deaf? Like, wait, why are you here at the school?

And the two of them were having discussion talking with each other. It was like, you know, anyways, they were just sitting waiting, and they really didn't even really know each other. They were just thrilled to find out there was another Deaf student in the school. You know, I think the majority of Deaf students or Deaf kids may experience that, you know?

And to follow that, to provide services and support to all of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing children, no matter what kind of school they go to, you know, it would be interesting to know their language use, and, you know, their culture. I don't know. It would be good for us to know to be able to support those children.

I thought that was interesting to see a big change, though, in the numbers from 2017 to 2019 in that published report. So, hopefully we'll see another report published and put out soon. And that is from the Center of National Educational Statistics of the U.S. Department of Education. That's where that report was from.

Okay. I see that the SB 1092 answer is in the chat that Nikki put in there. Yeah, the copy of the bill is put in there. Great. That's great after the task force to have access to that bill. Thank you for sending out that information. Maybe you can't see it now, but I'll send it out.

Are there any more questions, comments before we wrap things up?

Okay. I guess not. So, have a great rest of your week. And good luck on your subcommittee work, and before the next task force meeting on April 13th. So we'll see you then. And if you have any other questions or you need anything else, please don't hesitate to ask and let me know, okay?

Thank you so much. Bye-bye.

And we can stop the live streaming.

>> JEREMY McCOWN: Clear.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay. Now it's just ACDHH and us. You can feel free to share your videos.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Thank you for leading the meeting, and what do you guys think? Do you think it was a productive discussion? I thought it was a productive discussion today.

>> BECA BAILEY: Just a short comment. Sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt. I was thinking about something. My group, half of my group showed up, but that's okay, it was this morning. They had data included in their own systems, right? But it was like, oh, well, there's PDSD stuff and Department of Education stuff.

You know, there's so much included in all the different systems and it's so broad, and each system collects data differently, and so I said, yeah, you're right. Sometimes we'll have to show gaps, and that will be good to show that those gaps for the next meeting. So that's what we're going to do to start gathering what we have now, and we'll let other task force members know -- you know, those that work for different agencies and things like that.

They'll just collect data and present it, and in the next meeting, we could try to maybe help direct -- narrow it down to specific deliverables or what we're exactly looking for to make the biggest impact we can.

So that was my observation anyway so far. Let me see. I'm going to check my notes to see if I missed anything.

I really think that was most of our discussion.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah, I agree. The agencies -- you know, people working for the agencies and different task force, because the community don't know that there's data even available or who to even ask or how to collect it. So I think, oh, my gosh, we have so much data sometimes, and I think okay, what do we do? But that's okay. I think that's a good problem to have, right? Too much data, so we can pick and choose.

I think it would be a good idea if we type down deliverable recommendations for each subcommittee to see, you know, like where we have a lot of information, because it's not easy with all the different kinds of data. I mean, there's so much, all the way up to adulthood.

I think we do need to limit it, because, I mean -- unless your subcommittee says, well, I think this data is absolutely very, very important, or whatever. So, you know, like someone said, should we include other states. I don't know. I think we should look at language use in home, and, you know, different things related to Deaf children in Arizona and keep it limited maybe. And then try -- so sometimes birth to age 3 isn't even involved, you know? And it's easier to --

Well, it's easier to follow sometimes, and maybe you have five kids in kindergarten, and you think, well, where is that kid? You know, it's harder to follow them, because if you don't have them from early on, or if they're using hearing aids and not getting any services provided to them.

I do really think we need to do more work in there, like, providing advocacy. And I think tomorrow afternoon, I'll be typing up for each committee the -- kind of a guide on the data and the goals.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: So we'll have some things that our subcommittee doesn't like on the list, right?

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: It's why it's always important for interpreter and us to work with the interpreters as a team. So anyway, that's fine.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: For the deliverables for each subcommittee, and kind of the goals for each subcommittee, I think is a good idea to develop those.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: You know, I think gathering some information and looking at the lists that they have and then saying we're trying to decide and determine what's the most important to focus on.

>> BECA BAILEY: That would be a really big help, if you could send that on to us. And then we can send that on to the bigger group so they can have a better understanding of what exactly they should be focusing on and where to go from there.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Sonia, what did you think?

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: I agree. Just with the discussions in the groups, there's a lot of confusion around what the ultimate end goal is on what we want to accomplish. But I also think some of those individuals who are really concerned voiced that today, that there are assumptions. And so those are some things that, it tends to be the chatter around our community, that we are assuming that there is something wrong.

And I think that's really one of the things that, you know, as a state, we really need to just keep that in mind, is we do have a lot of gaps. We have a lot of different agencies. Unfortunately, we don't have that shared perspective. We don't have agencies that would want to work together. And so this is where I think these goals are really going to help out to keep them on track and not veer into their own silos, which is where they are now.

You mentioned something really important earlier, Tawny, is that a lot of agencies in other states work together. They're actually sometimes in the same building, et cetera. And in our state, we've had several efforts, a round of efforts trying to bring these groups together and there's still a lot of division. And so it definitely affects our children.

And so, you know, I'm glad that we were able to kind of keep it a neutral theme, but I'm glad that we're able to put out those goals as well to keep everyone, you know, just kind of on the same page and on what we ultimately would like to accomplish in these next now three, four months that we have

together.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I think you hit the nail on the head, right? We'll see where the resistance is and what attitudes there are that they think, you know, maybe a resistance to doing more work. It's not necessarily more work, it's just a collaboration. So the framing is important. We see that resistance might be there. That's okay. That's normal. At this point, it will be there, and we'll just kind of wrestle with it and kind of figure out the whys and what we're doing this and what's the purpose of these things and what's the benefit, we'll wrestle with that now and hopefully we'll get to the point where there's a bit more willingness to take some steps and, you know, share data and one or two steps is good. That's progress.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Yeah. I think that's also a wonderful way to build bridges, to -- those service groups and agencies within the state at Arizona, from yesterday's meeting, there was systems connection. The systems connection. So we talked about that heavily, where the kids are going, what's they're journey from identification of hearing loss until, you know, what's next. You know, who did they meet and who do they talk to.

They're going to see an audiologist, they're going to see doctors, they're going to see coordinators, family support groups, all of the different places and connections they'll make. Are they making those connections, or are they getting lost? Is there data there? Does everyone have access to that data? Does everyone -- you know, maybe we'll realize that someone in our network does have access to some of that data.

So I think that's right, with the task force, what we want to do is pull in everyone who has -- who we can toe set the foundation for making those connections and supporting our Deaf, Hard of Hearing, and DeafBlind kids.

So that is maybe -- I was thinking what's the intention behind the legislation. Yeah.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Yeah, and I'll say that once legislation was passed, I was having monthly meetings to ensure that, you know, there was communication, and the question was always, what is ACDHH's goal behind this bill. So, you know, they've got this mentality that there's a hidden agenda to something, you know, and the individual who asked the question today is the individual who has been asking what is our intention behind this bill.

So really having that partnership is really important. Again, there's a lot of these things hopefully we'll be able to, you know, be discussed and worked out during these subcommittees. So, you know, we'll see how that goes.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah. I agree. I was taken a little bit aback from that question. I was like, is this like the EdK? Like, I'm not sure where that question is coming from. Is there a positive feeling or a negative, or maybe it's neutral. Maybe it's just purely information-seeking. I don't know. But I was like, it's not exactly that, it was a different thing. But I wasn't exactly sure where that

person was coming from. That was an awkward moment from me.

I was thinking, I hope I answered it in a way that ACDHH was good with.

>> BECA BAILEY: Yes, your answer was very neutral.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: So, we don't -- that might be part of the language was taken from that, or maybe part of it was -- maybe resources or something was adopted from it. But it's some -- it's not exactly -- you're right. It's a similar concept, but it's not exactly, you're right.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah, it was kind of political to, like, use that name as well. It gets very political. Is it ASL or English. It's kind of like, we'll just kind of steer away from that and focus on the direction that's best for all of our Deaf kids. Doesn't matter what language they're using, because really, collecting data is helpful. When the EdK bill was passed, there was some modifications --

>> INTERPRETER: I missed -- when the LeadK was passed -- I lost after that.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: So when LeadK was passed, both California and Kansas, they started -- they set up task forces, they started looking at the data that they're using and collecting data, rather, and the result in the first year was they they've found that 70% of Deaf children were not meeting their language development milestones. That's what they found. So that is significant. 70% is a big number.

So from birth to 5 -- but I imagine with older kids, there's a difference. But regardless of whatever language they're using, they need to be meeting their milestone for cognitive development and social and educational access. For future life success as citizens. Of their state.

So making sure they're getting proper services and supports with family involvement. That's critical. And so that data was very eye-opening. The data that was collected throughout that process was very eye-opening. So I'm hoping to see that here as well.

There's all this -- with everything being siloed, it can be kind of unclear. You know, we think we're okay and we we they think they're okay. The machine just continues going. But if we take a time-out and we see, hey, is the machine working well, then that's where we check in.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Right. So we have to see, do the numbers match. Yeah. What is the -- what are their tracking metrics. What are they looking at, what are their demographics, how do they compare. And where are they. Where are they getting that information from. Yeah.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: I know ACDHH staff, you are already -- you already have started working on this and looking for this, investigating these systems for a while. So that's valuable for the process. You can say hey, we're missing -- we have a gap over here, and we can bring up these gaps. So that's really nice to have you guys there.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Yeah. And, you know, I wanted to also -- what I'll do is I'm going to share some documents with us internally, and just things that I've created to help Betty and Shari understand what's happening in our state and where the gaps are, so we've identified where those

gaps are, and many of the players and the community members who are on these task forces are part of that.

And so to hear that there are gaps for them is like a sore subject, right? And so it's kind of like opening up that wound that they don't want to hear about. And so I would like to share that with you, so that you guys have an understanding of how those things work within our state. I'm also noticing that some people aren't attending. You know, as I'm taking notes and things like that, so some task force members haven't been in attendance at the subcommittee meetings or the last two meetings. So, you know, these are things that I'm thinking of as well as part of the reason why we continue to have gaps. And so, I want to share these documents with you guys, and you guys can decide whether or not that's something we want to share at the next subcommittee meetings.

So I created a roadmap to show Shari and Betty where the gaps are, you know, in our state. And so if I can share that with you guys, and then you guys, we can decide whether this is something that we want to take to the next subcommittee and say, okay. I believe it's Systemic Connection talked about the roadmap. So maybe this can be presented to them and say, this is kind of where we were. Is this where we're at? Or, you know, do we need to change this?

Or is there something -- I know there has been a change, because our state used to not see unilateral kids. Now they do, because it was a big fight from us and a big push for that. But in the past, our state did not see -- they did not serve unilateral kids. So that's a big change that has actually been pushed from AzEIP and from the commission. Not from the Deaf school. The Deaf school did not want to support this.

And so, you know, as we -- this is, again, we start to reveal these things. It's going to start to -- you know, we're going to get that resistance.

So I'm going to share those with you all via email, and then just, if you have questions or anything, I just want you both to have a better understanding of what our state looks like, and what has been happening. And then we can decide what we want to do with that information. And actually, I wanted to post this on our website, but I also was kind of hesitant because of where we're at. In this process.

But it is something that I wanted to put up on our website so that we have an understanding of where we're at. But I will definitely share that with you all and we can decide whether we want to share this with subcommittees, and also assessments. So I've done a lot of research on collecting what currently is happening in our state and other states and what assessments are being used. So we do have information that has been gathered.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Okay, great. So for the task force, the subcommittees already have a lot of internal information. They have -- you know, some of it they'll share and some of it they won't, but as far as the community, as far as it relates to the overall discussion, they might share certain points and hopefully they'll be sharing information between each other. And there will be a

basis for comparison, comparing notes.

So we're bringing that information -- trying to get by. And so where we -- what I'm hoping to really see, what we're really looking at as we look together, I don't want people to feel like it's me, it's personal, I'm not doing a good job. We're not challenging individuals. We're challenging the system.

So we have to kind of take it away from the personal level and really focus on -- that's what I'm hoping to get to, challenging the system as a whole.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: I think it would be great if we share that roadmap that we have, we share that with the subcommittees, and so then they can add to it or they can modify or they can say this is a direct -- this is something. That might give them something to -- it could be a resource that they can use, that they can find useful.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Either we could share it for the future or hold -- that's a good point, we may want to talk about that a little more.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Yeah, it's important to show that ACDHH is committed to the community discussion, and engagement with the community. That's part of the process. Yeah. And it's a good idea, I think, to review the deliverables that we've had so far, if things make sense. So, the data reports is one. The percentage of Deaf and Hard of Hearing students, et cetera. And I was thinking about a few others that I've seen. I'll give you some samples of those others.

And then also, we'll see -- it's a good place to start. Those other samples, we may not go with them, but it's a good place to start. And then also, what assessments are used, the pros and cons of each assessment type. And the pros might be, it's easy to perform, or it's inexpensive, or whatever. Whatever each pro and con for each assessment would be. And then I would encourage us to find parameters for, like -- we're not looking for the least -- we're looking for what's the most often used as well.

And make some recommendations. There might be some other assessments that we're really eager to see be implemented instead. So those are the three things I think that will help us, with the information that it could kind of bring it back to making recommendations at the -- for the task force.

So we're basing it on what we see. We might just need to fix one or two things and we might have 20 things that need fixing. So we have to gather the information first.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: You know, people are learning and as we go along. So the State of Arizona, the ASDB -- let's see, hold on. Did they use standardized assessment systems at ASDB? Or is it -- or do they use something specifically for Deaf and Hard of Hearing students? Or do they use the mainstream assessment? I'm just a little bit confused, if you could clarify that.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: So ASDB uses a number of different assessments. Now, with the new leadership, I think they have transitioned to different assessments, because a lot of their assessments

before were focused on spoken language only. So like, you know, BCSL, that was not used at all. But I learned yesterday in the assessment review is they recently hired someone and that is not currently being used in the birth to 5 programs. That was not being used when I was at ASDB.

So we use the McArthur. We use the DAYC. And so those are the two that we really used for those kiddos. We also use the TASL. Again, these are all for monitoring a spoken language and things like that. McArthur can be used for a sign, but what I understand, it's not standardized for that.

>> INTERPRETER: I'm sorry, Sonia, what did you say?

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Sorry, I live by the base out here and a jet just flew over.

So, we used a number of different assessments, but really a lot of them were focused on the spoken language and the milestones that they were leading, we didn't really have anyone who was specialized to assess their level of ASL.

And so I don't know what's currently being used. What I learned yesterday, they are different from what I had known in the past. But Kendra's comment today was, they're still in this process of using what Colorado uses, so I'm assuming it's the McArthur. But, you know, my group is ready to jump in and find this information.

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: Great. Assessments, when you mention those in the meeting, I remember the McArthur. Yeah, I have experience with that. Developmental vocabulary, blah blah blah. That assessment specifically for Deaf children. That was a tough time. Because you had to have spoken English. And you ask through the family input through the vocabulary and the age group, and there were other whole separate things they would do with the ASL and the child itself monitoring that, and the vocabulary was based on their first 100 words as hearing children learn them, and they spoke them.

So I don't remember exactly -- and for Deaf kids, they don't use those words, right? So it's hard to sign commonly used spoken words sometimes. Sometimes it's easier to sign certain words. Like, for younger kids when they're 2 years old. Little kids in English at 2 years old, they don't emphasize that kind of thing. It's easy to sign that. Because it's a popular sign. But it's different, also depending on what they're exposed to and the kind of language.

So there's just -- you know, talks about parents' education level, socioeconomic status, all these different things. Do they communicate well, is the family at home? There are so many factors involved. Assessments really need to be separate from language really. Other states pass the LeadK, and for public education and language, it was like -- it wasn't a successful way to keep updated, I don't know, for language development and stuff.

So really, it's just kind of tough. And so I caution people about that often. The assessments and what they're measuring. Seems like there's some good awareness.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: You're right, though. We could keep going with the discussion, right? And

there are so many factors involved, a variety of factors, environment, at some level. There's so many things involved for growth and development and development, you know?

>> TAWNY HOLMES HLIBOK: So I guess we only have a few minutes left with the interpreters. So I guess we saw some questions, like especially what's the purpose or the intention for these committees and all this. So, those are good. People are curious and that's good to know. It's good also to have a brain dump sometimes and allow people to ask their questions and talk about things.

But I do think it's good for us -- for me to give an idea of what deliverables we might be looking for. And I will send you guys out an email with a folder to share things. So I just want to say, I apologize for the conflicts last week, explaining about the 12 to 2:30 Eastern time. That was the university time. There is a big event that conflicted with the university events -- or the university events conflicted with those times.

And I had accepted to go present in two weeks before, and all of a sudden, it was like oh, okay. It was a large general community of like, are you available at this time. And I said, well, I have a commitment. And they were like, oh, but you have to do this. I didn't expect that. I was just kind of set from now on, do you think you could avoid Wednesdays. And they said, from now on, you don't need to be involved in those Wednesday things.

So I'm apologizing for that time conflict. It was the university. Hopefully now have some agreements. For language development for the community. I think it's important. I feel excited to work with you guys. I felt bad. I hope that you guys can continue to understand that we're continuing to make communication improvements and share information and things like that.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: I would like to add to that something.

>> BECA BAILEY: Thank you. I appreciate your comment and sharing the content and the reason behind that. So hopefully that comment from here on out will go smoothly for us, and I know that you've been there. But you just mentioned some of the resistance, and people will become more engaged, and there will be some clarifying points that happen along the way.

I feel like we're doing okay, but one thing that I would like to add is to maybe resolve how we as a task force use folders, because I think for today, we put that on hold. My subcommittee already started doing a shared Google Doc, for our group anyway. So I said, well, let's wait for Tawny to let us know what she's going to do.

The second is the note taker. It seems like the notes are going to be outside that folder. But, are there going to be minutes shared in the folder, I'm not really sure about, like, what's going on there, how we're sharing stuff. I'm not really sure what we're limited to.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Regarding the questions, like who is providing access to like the folders. Can ACDHH allow all those specific access to all the folders, or is it just the facilitators, or maybe that's something we need to figure out with Jeremy maybe.

Do you have any recommendations?

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: This is Jeremy.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Go ahead.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: So I just need to know --

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Oh, you're still here, Jeremy.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: You forgot I was here, huh?

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: I did actually.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: No problem. So, right now, we have that folder structure that we created, that folder there. So what could happen is we can share that out with everybody that needs to have access to that, and that way everybody could keep all the files there, they're in one spot, and we don't have somebody with their own Google account having to share out, and then they leave, something happens to them, and we don't have ownership of that file.

So what I would recommend is we just -- we have one folder under the PPCEU drive on the shared drive, and it's -- you know --

>> BECA BAILEY: You said under the PPCEU. Okay, thank you.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: Yes, we call it language acquisition, or whatever we want. And then we can share that out at that level. Or we can go even further and only managers can have that level. And then we can make lower sub folder that the participants can have access to. Does that make sense?

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: And we already have those sub folders created. Betty had created them. So those are already in the shared drive.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: Okay. Well then I would just need to know -- I would need to have a list, or somebody would have to go in there and actually put people in there and what level of access they want. That way there's not all the sharing back and forth. You would just give them access to that folder and they would see it in their MyDrive, or their drive shared with me when they open up Google.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Yeah. And for my group, what we did yesterday is I had created the agenda, I had sent that out to everyone in a PDF form, and then once we determined who was going to be our facilitator or note-taker, then that person, I shared that with that individual, because everybody else really didn't need access. They were just sharing the information, the note-taker was putting all the information on her notes.

And if you go under the sub folder for my subcommittee, the notes are in there. That, you know, she was able to generate.

So you can see the notes there and she has that shared document as well. So it depends how you guys want to utilize that.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: This is Jeremy. So, what I'm -- okay. Where did you -- where are you -- we need have, let's say, one folder dedicated to this entire thing, okay? And that needs to be on the PPCEU drive. So is that folder already in existence? If so, where do I find that? I'm looking right now in the PPCEU drive, and where would I find that?

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Can you go under public policy, and then [indiscernible].

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: Perfect.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: And you'll see the different sub folders, under subcommittee meetings, there are the three sub folders.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: Okay. So, I see that. And so what I am saying is -- let me expand this. Of course, it doesn't want to expand out. I see sub folder, subcommittee, assessments review, subcommittee on data and demographics, subcommittee on systemic actions. So if I were -- subcommittee on assessments review, there's a link right there that you can actually -- when you right-click it, you can share, or you can just say [indiscernible], and everybody that's on that committee, you would share that out with them.

And then they would have access back to that folder, anything that's in that folder, they would see. And that wouldn't put them in the top of the tree, which is the SB 1092 folder. That would be more of a who wants to have total access to everything within those folders. So that might just be your managers, you know what I mean, the people who need access to all that information. Because not everybody is going to need to see everybody else's stuff.

So that's the best way to do it, is organize it out like you have, and then just share from there. And then just make sure that everybody stores their stuff in there. And when they do, then they don't have to create a document within there and then say oh, I need to share it out. And now they're just sharing something that has already been shared.

Because everybody can see that. That's best practice.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Yes, and that's exactly what we were able to do yesterday with the assessments review subcommittee. Just simple as that, so that way they can, you know, access that information, just out of that folder.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: Perfect. Sounds like you're on the right track.

>> SONIA SAMANIEGO: Thank you.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: Does that answer your question?

>> BECA BAILEY: Yep.

>> NIKKI SOUKUP: Yep, great, thank you very much.

>> JEREMY McCOWN McCOWN: Okay, I'll go back to my fly on the wall spot.

>> BECA BAILEY: Okay, great. It looks like it's past 12:00. I know the interpreters have to leave. So, thank you, thank you. Thank you so much. All right. Thank you all. Thank you.