



August 23, 2005

Transcript of NCSET Conference Call Presentation

Review of the 2005 National Leadership Summit

presented by:

Freda Lee, Education Consultant
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Steve Gilles, Transition Consultant
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Dr. Johnson: Welcome, everyone, and thank you for your participation. I understand that we have quite a few participants on this call. The purpose of the call today is to talk a little bit further about the National Leadership Summit which was conducted June 14-15 in Washington, DC. We have a number of featured speakers. We're going to have Chris Bremer from our staff talk a little bit about—we've taken some time to analyze the state action plans that have come out of the Summit. We're going to talk to you a little bit about what we've seen between 2003 and 2005 in terms of some of the priorities or high interest areas that you began to dialog about and put into your plans in June. We also have two individuals who are leading the teams, Freda Lee from North Carolina who is an Education Consultant with the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, and Steve Gilles, Transition Consultant from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. They're going to talk a little bit about their experiences since the Summit, at the Summit, during the Summit, and following the Summit, so we'll get to them in a minute.

First of all, I think many of you who are on this call are likely to have been part of the National Leadership Summit this June. Just a brief summary in case you were not, 50 teams and over 500 individuals participated in the National Leadership Summit, representing 46 states as well as the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Pacific Rim Entities, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Many of these teams participated in the 2003 Leadership Summit as well. Teams averaged approximately eight members. What we saw also this time was an increased participation for families as well as youth with disabilities which is much appreciated and we thank you for bringing those individuals. We used

the national standards and quality indicators identified by NASET, the National Alliance for Secondary Education and Transition, as a focused framework for planning and delivering the event and conducting preplanning, and we're also encouraging use of that framework in follow-up activities with us.

What I'd like to do is to move very quickly into the substance of this call. I'd like to turn it over to Chris Bremer, who has been working with several others here to examine all of the state plans and all of the information coming out of the National Leadership Summit to provide you with a summary of what we found. We're also in the process of putting together, much like we did for the 2003 Leadership Summit, a summary of these priorities and state strategies and actions.

Dr. Bremer: Hi. Welcome, everyone. What we did was look at the priorities that were expressed in the various state plans and try to come up with some categories and themes and then compare them to what happened at the 2003 Summit. First of all, I should say that in 2005, we had 50 states represented and in 2003 there were 42, so we had greater participation in 2005. In 2003, our analysis of all of the state priorities yielded 10 categories of priorities that fell into three areas and those general areas were State-level Infrastructure, Programs and Services, and Youth and Family. I'll just briefly say what those topics were in 2003.

In 2003, we had the categories in state-level infrastructure or state systems infrastructure; data design, collection, and use; collaboration; and professional development. Those categories also came up in 2005, but there was an increase in the interest in collaboration, data, and professional development. We had 34 teams this time mentioning data design/collection whereas only 10 mentioned it last

time; and in the area of collaboration, 27 this time and only 16 last time; and with professional development, we had 30 mentioning it this time and only 12 last time. So that's a significant increase in interest about improving things at the state level.

In Programs and Services, last time we talked about access to the general curriculum, postsecondary access, graduation and dropout, and workforce and employment issues. And in those areas, we had more interest in workforce and employment this time (16 vs. 8 last time) and a little less in the other three. But we've had some new areas that we would classify as Programs and Services. A big one was postschool outcomes—14 teams mentioned an interest in postschool outcomes and that didn't even come up as a theme last time. Eleven teams mentioned best practices and four teams talked about high school reform. So these were new categories and I think that's of interest.

In the third set of categories, Youth and Family, this time there was a category of person-centered and transition-driven planning, and we had 13 teams ask—last time, 11 teams mentioned that. That's about the same proportion given the larger number of teams. And we had a few last time talking about family education and involvement and actually that really didn't come out as a theme at all this time which was of interest. But we had a new theme, youth development and youth leadership. Sixteen teams brought up youth development and youth leadership as a priority and that did not emerge as a theme at all in the previous Summit. So we're seeing these as very interesting findings and trends and we are thinking that part of the reason for these changes may be the NASET framework which is pointing people to think about some of these areas and I'm sure there are other factors as well that are pushing us in that direction. But those are the primary findings that we have.

I should also say that in our analysis this time, we are looking both at content areas such as postschool outcomes and strategies such as data collection, so we will also be able to talk about some of the ways these things combine. So, for example, there were a lot of groups that talked about data collection around postschool outcomes and we're coding both of those categories and we'll be able to tell an inter-

esting story in the end about both strategies and content areas in the state plans. And all that will be in the publication that comes out of this which will be formatted similarly to what we did after the previous Summit. (The 2003 Summit Summary can be found at <http://www.ncset.org/Summit03/findings.htm>).

Dr. Johnson: Thank you, Chris. We have a couple of other things regarding evaluation. We did have an informal evaluation of the Summit and I wanted to thank so many of you for participating in that. We had well over 200 replies to that evaluation. We will take to heart this opportunity to perhaps in the future to conduct other similar leadership Summits where your comments really reflected on, again, the need for more team time planning, appreciation of the content experts, but really more and more time for your teams to spend planning and we'll take that to heart.

Alright, now I'm going to move to start with our two state team representatives. Freda Lee from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, would you lead us off and talk a little bit about your team's experience and what you've been up to.

Ms. Lee: Sure. I'll be glad to do that, and thank you for inviting me to speak. We attended the first Summit in 2003 and we felt we gained a great deal from it and it was a benefit to us. So, as soon as we heard about the second one, we started planning and we really took the needs assessment process seriously. We looked at our needs and evaluated those needs and then established some priorities for us as a state team. I'd like to describe our team so that you'll know who was in on the discussion.

Our team consisted of a school principal who also happens to be responsible in her school system for transition services that occur at all the schools in the system. She is also an adjunct professor at one of our state universities. We also brought the State Consultant for Transition Services for the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation who, prior to coming to the state department, had been a member of our 2003 Summit team that went to Washington. I think one of the reasons that she decided to join the state VR staff was due to some of the things that she learned while she was in Washington. We also brought a local VR school counselor who has a large caseload, thinking her input would

be valuable to us. In addition, we brought two members from the Department of Public Instruction. I was one of those members and my job at the Department of Public Instruction is transition and secondary education, but I also have statewide responsibility for students with cognitive disabilities. One of the things that we believe is important, is that the state performance plan tie into what we're doing in transition, so one of our three consultants for auditing and monitoring came as member of our team. She also participated in 2003. We felt that at least from education and VR, we had good representation. We did not, however, and I think this was a weakness of our team, have a member from mental health on our team and that's something we know we will correct if we do this again. When we came in 2003, we had a representative with career technical education and we had plans for a person from that area to be with us, but other work commitments interfered. So that was who our team consisted of and now I want to go through our priority issues with you.

Our first priority was to improve our inter-agency collaboration. Our second priority was to organize a statewide postschool data collection and analysis system. Improving the quality and comprehensiveness of the transition components developed by IEP teams was our third priority.

I'll walk you through what we did at the Summit. The first thing I want to say is that we took comprehensive notes at the Summit. I think that was helpful to us as a team to have one person who was really good at taking notes and recording our thoughts because it's helped us keep focused on what we're about. Even though we have our state plan, our notes include information as to who said what and things like that so we'll make sure that we know exactly where we're going.

On the first day we also talked about school reform and just how do all the things that are happening in school reform fit in with our transition priorities and goals. Then our team identified content experts that we would like to have share their expertise with us and we were really fortunate. We identified six experts and were able to schedule five of those folks to join our team and assist us in this process. This was a really valuable experience at

the Summit. In 2003, I don't think we had quite as many content experts that worked with us, but it was something that we really valued.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the national standards and how we fit them into our planning. When we did our needs assessment, we had not focused as much as we should have on the youth involvement piece. The more we read over the national standards and quality indicators, that need really stuck in the minds of the team members that perhaps this was something we could work on as a team and by working on that particular thing, we could increase community and interagency collaboration. And I want to share with you some of the things that we've got going.

The first thing we did was invite Joann Cashman from NASDSE to come and speak to our group about Pennsylvania's Community of Practice (CoP) on transition. As a follow up, when we came back from the Summit, we brought together another team and with help from NASDSE and the IDEA Partnerships, we went to Pennsylvania where we attended their CoP conference and observed what they were doing around transition. We received lots of information on youth involvement and it helped us tie together the information that we had gathered at the Summit on youth involvement. We made many contacts and saw a lot of evidence of how everything was fitting together in Pennsylvania. Because of our planning at the Summit, we were able to identify a person from a college to go with us so that we could focus more on what's happening to students who are attending postsecondary education. This time we also made sure that we had a parent on our team and it was great to have a parent with us from the Exceptional Children's Assistance Center (ECAC). ECAC is now planning to conduct training based on some of the information that we gathered from the Summit about parent involvement.

We have also worked on some other items related to our action plan since we came back. One of the priorities in our action plan was to organize a statewide postschool data collection system. We had already been talking about some of those things and bouncing things around so when we came back, two members of the team met with the University of North Carolina-Charlotte and shared with them the

information that we had gotten at the Summit from Bob Shepherd on how New York had conducted their postschool outcome data collection. We took all the information from Bob about what works, what didn't work, and some of the best ways to collect data. We're now in the process of developing a proposal and designing our questions for our survey so that our state will be able to institute a statewide postschool data collection system. And that's very important because it's part of our state performance plan and it's also important to meet the requirements of the law by collecting data. We have collected data in the past, but only in selected school systems with large time spans between collections. We collected in 1988, 1993, and 1997 but we had not systematically done it each year. So we're designing a data collection system that will collect data every year. We'll do it at time of exit, six months out, and we're looking now at two or three years out.

We also wanted to address how we could improve the quality and the comprehensiveness of our transition planning and the development of the transition component of the IEP in a manner that truly reflects student involvement and participation. As part of that discussion, one of our content experts, Ed O'Leary, came in and talked with us about IDEA and we have invited Ed back to our state. He will be coming back in November to do some training at our Exceptional Children's Conference on IDEA 2004 and to talk about the legal requirements for transition. He will also be addressing how we can have more involvement from youth in the transition planning process.

In terms of looking at how all these things fit together, one of the things that's happened since bringing our team to Washington and really talking about interagency collaboration is that we are talking about the need to form a CoP around transition. There may be people who want to be part of our CoP, but they don't necessarily want to be the person that's involved in every single meeting. They just want to be supportive. I think in the past, we've sometimes become a little bit disappointed if everybody doesn't come to every single meeting and every single agency isn't involved in every little detail. What we're doing now is more of an invitational way of developing interagency collaboration.

We are telling everyone about what we're about, what we're doing, and how it's paying off for us.

A good example is that last week, we had an interagency meeting between Vocational Rehabilitation and the Department of Public Instruction. The consultant for transition at the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation said, "Listen, I was just at a new transition interagency collaborative meeting, and Freda, I realized your name wasn't on the list to attend and I'm going to make sure that you're involved with this." It's not necessarily school to work transition, but it's transition in many, many different forms. So it's happening that way, but it's also happening in other ways. By being part of other groups, we have learned of a grant-funded project in our state for Medicaid infrastructure and one of the things that this group is working on is how to help students access Medicaid services. They were also working on how to implement a waiver system across the state. It took them less time than they thought to get some legislation through so they had some monies left over. Because members of our team happened to be at that meeting, they said, "Well, gosh, we could use that money to address some of the issues that we developed in our plan in Washington." So we're really excited, everybody's talking in a very positive manner about what we put on our plate in Washington and that we're also doing something about it.

We have a meeting on September 1 to plan our first-ever youth leadership/youth development conference next spring. And for us, that's a really big step. In the past, typically the Department of Public Instruction has not stepped up to the plate and been the agency to do youth leadership development, particularly for students with disabilities. This initiative is very important to us and we're excited about that. I think we're going to be able to use a lot of the information that we received at the Summit. We'll also be able to use the standards to look at how Standard 3.1 states students "acquire the skills, behaviors, and attitudes that enable them to learn and grow in self-knowledge and social interaction and physical and emotional health." We've been so worried about students making it through high school and getting the diploma. Sometimes I think we haven't concentrated quite enough on emotional development and some of the social skills. So this

will be a big part of the training that we will have at our first conference for youth in the spring. The conference won't be something that just the Department of Public Instruction is doing, it will be something that other agencies have stepped up to the plate and also said, "Yes, we feel this is important."

So, the Summit as a whole for us has just been wonderful. It's lit a fire underneath us. I think we were always working toward quality transition planning, but this has really given us some new goals and things to look at. And now, I will turn this over to my colleague and give him a chance to tell you about what they've done.

Mr. Gilles: Okay. I will just highlight a few things here. I am Steve Gilles, State Transition Consultant from Wisconsin. We, too, value very much how the Summit helped us bring time and focus to some of our statewide efforts. We also attended the 2003 Summit where we were working on and continued to improve interagency collaboration. And as part of that effort, we took a look at resource mapping, the Essential Tools guide (Editor's Note: available on the Web at <http://www.ncset.org/publications/essentialtools/mapping/default.asp>) and we involved the National Center through David Johnson. Kelli Crane and Marianne Mooney worked with a group of state-level stakeholders to start the resource mapping efforts in December 2004 for the purpose of interagency collaboration and identifying resources and setting priorities.

After we started the resource mapping process, we wanted to come to the next Summit to help us further identify a clear focus and create a more specific plan of action. So we targeted a resource map around the most hard-to-serve students with disabilities. We needed to improve communications and services for those students, and we also wanted to identify additional resources to help the process. The group from 2003 consisted of six members including the transition consultant from the state Department of Public Instruction as team leader, the director of our statewide transition initiative (based on Ed O'Leary's outcomes project, 6th year), the director of our statewide postschool follow-up study, the co-director of our Family Assistance Center representing parents, the statewide Division of Vocational Rehabilitation transition person,

and lastly, the state consultant from the technical college system. After that first Summit, we added two representatives from the Department of Health and Family Services—it's a very large agency so we added some more representatives. We also added a person from the Department of Workforce Development and the Division of Juvenile Corrections.

As people come to the table wanting to improve interagency collaboration, discussions led to who else should be involved. It took a great deal of discussion to narrow our focus to become more specific about resource mapping and who needed to be served. It creates new discussion to involve additional people and opens doors to possible partnerships and mutual understanding. Since we've returned from the 2005 Summit, we've added three additional people, one from higher education, a director of the statewide parent project, and a specialist from Health and Family Services who deals with mental health issues. Our priorities for the work at the Summit included obtaining multi-agency consensus on the definition of hard-to-serve students with disabilities and developing our resource map which ended up starting with one group of hard-to-serve students. In addition we wanted to improve communication, collaboration, and identification of additional statewide and national funding.

We also had Tom Heffron from the Technical College State Board attend with the Communities of Practice group that met at the Pennsylvania Transition Conference. He reported back to the group and we are planning to continue to connect in this area. We used the Essential Tool for resource mapping beyond our state workgroup Summit team. We provided training to our 12 Cooperative Services Agency transition coordinators who work with our state project (<http://www.wsti.org/>). Our statewide transition project is in its 6th year of operation. We involved Kelli Crane and Marianne Mooney (from TransCen, Inc.) in training on the Essential Tools guides on team building (Editor's Note: Available on the Web at <http://www.ncset.org/publications/essentialtools/teams/default.asp>) and resource mapping. We also will be using the National Standards and Quality Indicators Transition Toolkit as a way to identify regional county and local district priorities. At first we were a little reluctant to use the

Transition Toolkit for assessment of state activities because it seemed to work more appropriately for local districts and county transition teams. When we came to the second Summit we knew exactly what we wanted to focus on and were hoping to get support from the Summit process to set priorities. Because we knew as a state group what we wanted to do and how we wanted to do it, we were a little skeptical on how this guide was going to help us target those areas of need. Since the meeting and as a result of using the toolkit with our coordinators we now do have a use for the guide to create common understanding and local area assessment which will provide us some state trends. We now believe it is a very useful tool, especially for local resource planning and setting priorities.

Just to focus on the National Standards Toolkit for System Improvement for a minute, it took us time to figure how we could best use this tool. At first we used the five areas listed in the guide to structure our resource mapping efforts for our Summit work group. We started with schooling and will be working on the other areas—career preparation, youth development, family involvement, connecting activities. In addition to that, we've used the tool to train transition coordinators who work with two main groups including county councils and transition action teams within the schools throughout our twelve service delivery areas in the state. They're going to use the National Standards as a way to prioritize and assess on a regional basis and then provide the state department of public instruction with some possible statewide trends regarding issues they identify using the toolkit and the priorities they set.

Another use of the toolkit is to frame our state conference. We have a statewide transition conference. We had over 550 teachers attend that conference as part of the outcomes project. Dr. Ed O'Leary was there last year. We are going to use the strands involved in the National Standards for the strands of our conference and we hope to roll out to those who participate how to use the toolkit for local district planning. We will share that guide and show people how they can use it for prioritizing transition activities.

Lastly, we're using and planning to use the guide through our focused monitoring process as a

technical assistance tool. One of the hardest things to do in the focused monitoring process is, once you find the key areas of concern, to provide the needed technical assistance and support to make improvements. So we are definitely going from a group that didn't see the value of this guide at first glance, to a group that already has found great usefulness and many ways to promote the toolkit and make it available. We would be the #1 endorser and promoter of this guide. I think it will serve us very well to continue to explore the many uses.

I just wanted to touch on an issue in terms of how we have moved forward. We started with the hard-to-serve students with disabilities. We had to define that population and we brainstormed and listed several groups that fit into this hard-to-serve group. Then we targeted the specific kid to start with. The group we selected was the students with disabilities who exit correctional facilities and then re-enter school. Since the Summit we have had a couple of conference calls. We had one face-to-face meeting and we have another one scheduled at the end of September. But the key is the relationships that were built in the process and after each Summit. One of the fortunate things is the secondary relationships and work that gets completed just by riding on the same airplane together. I returned back to Madison with our person that represented corrections, and we've already communicated many ideas together. As a result, I've talked to the youth correctional education directors for the first time. We've had our team member from the Technical College System with me presenting at the corrections statewide conference on postsecondary education and transition resources. I've also visited one of the youth correctional facilities and I presented our Summit workgroup to our 12 CESA transition coordinators and the issues around corrections that we're looking at so we can use our systems involved to re-enroll those students better. We're also looking at our post-school follow-up study as a way to consider additional questions to get a better handle on the follow-up of those students that actually leave corrections.

So you can see that I think that it took us the first Summit to build the relationships between and among agencies, and now I believe we have the tools to move through improved interagency collaboration

and narrowing the focus, setting priorities to accomplish our tasks and our goals. So just in closing, I know one of the issues we were asked to reflect on was what federal or national action should be implemented to help address our priority issues? I think we really need some clarification and definition regarding functionality, transition assessments, the summary of performance for IDEA, and it sure would be nice to have a side-by-side similar to what the NCSET offered us regarding the statute regarding the regulations. I think that would be very helpful.

In addition to that, we need to have more research and support as it relates to the conclusion that implementing the transition requirements will lead to improved school results. We are in constant need of research-based practice and using data to make decisions. Especially as it helps us focus on monitoring efforts and completing our state performance plans, tying to the priorities and indicators to data and research. We need to clarify the language in the indicator 13 which is confusing, relating to what is in the proposed rules and statute. I am sure people are wondering what is meant by “coordinated measurable annual IEP goals and transition services”. And, as always, we need the time, resources, and supports for interagency collaboration. Unfortunately, we have no specific funding to bring these people. We just continue to operate because workgroup members consider it important so they involve themselves, but time is always an issue. More resources are needed in general to continue to build statewide capacity and improve statewide transition services.

I just would like to conclude by saying I think the Summit was incredibly valuable to help bring focus, not only on the National Standards and Quality Indicators, but also to create the discussions and the dynamics that you sometimes have to go out of state to experience among agencies that are too busy to meet at home. So I’ll end with that and turn it back to David. Thanks.

Dr. Johnson: Great. Thank you, Steve, and Freda as well. I appreciate your willingness to come on here and talk a little bit about what’s been going on. It sounds like both of you are busy if not overwhelmed with all of what’s going on. It sounds very ambitious and I can appreciate that. We have some time now to turn to some audience questions and

if as you come on, I’d like you to identify yourself with your name and perhaps the role you have and your state. In other words, if you are a transition coordinator for the state agency, please let us know. Let’s open it up to some questions here. Any questions for these guys? I can start off with a question. Either or both of you, Steve or Freda, what remain as some of the most significant challenges as you move ahead in your own states?

Ms. Lee: I think for us it is the whole accountability system. We have a very, very rigorous accountability system in our state and it’s going to become even more rigorous. Our state board voted this spring to increase our graduation requirements again. In addition to having to pass all their coursework, now our students will have to pass five exit exams. And so that is going to be very difficult for some of our students, particularly students who have difficulty taking tests. They may know the information, but they do have difficulty taking tests. And we have done what I feel is a very good job with alternate assessments in our state, but we’re having to redesign our entire alternate assessment system and that’s along with lots of other things. So for students who are preparing to transition out of high school, just being able to work through all the accountability issues. And I wish the federal government could give us more guidance, very specific guidance related to transition and what the impact of meeting some of the NCLB requirements might be on students with disabilities, particularly if a student fails the exit exam the state has implemented. What is going to happen? I’d to see more research around those types of things.

Mr. Gilles: After four years of data that we’ve collected through our transition project—information which can be found at our Web site—agency involvement in the IEP process continues to be a major area of concern for us in terms of getting teachers to be more aware of services and contacts so they can involve more agencies in the process. That includes getting agencies at the state level to involve themselves with each other to remove the barriers that prevent collaboration from happening. So we continue to work on trying to build the capacity of the state around our transition planning efforts with our counties and efforts to bring those agencies into play

with the schools so we can get better involvement from all in the process of better serving students with disabilities with effective transition planning.

Dr. Johnson: Thank you, Steve. Any comments to what was just said here? Any experiences you want to share from your own team's perspective in terms of some of the follow-up activities and perhaps even some of the challenges you're facing?

Ms. Campbell: David, this is Mary Campbell at [the Office of Vocational and Adult Education]. I'm wondering if I could ask a question of NCSET and maybe Chris Bremer regarding the paper that's going to come out about the Summit. I was just thinking that in these three areas that lots of states mention, the collaboration, the data design, and professional development, if it's possible to somehow include (I don't know, bullet or something) some of the ideas that the states have already used in accomplishing some of these goals. In other words, something that people could look at to say, "Oh, here are some ideas of what people are doing or have done in these areas." Would that be part of the outcomes?

Dr. Bremer: In analyzing the data from the Summit itself, we are looking at the state plans as they were completed at the Summit. We'll look at the detail in them and see what kinds of things they're saying. But this particular report will be focusing on what the state priorities are, how they're described, and what the implications are for technical assistance. Are you talking more about what they're planning or what they're doing now since the Summit?

Ms. Campbell: Maybe just like promising practices or just some ideas that have already come out as the result of putting these plans together that perhaps other people reading these ideas might think, "Here's a different idea that we hadn't thought about or..."

Dr. Johnson: We use this information extensively in relation to thinking about some of the follow-up activities we conduct directly with states, and also in terms of some of the specific strategies a center like this moves from. I think in an area like collaboration, I think about an area like data enhancement and data use, we really will begin to think about that in relation to additional Web site topics, different ways to highlight other resources around the country that are involved in some of

these activities and supports. Best practice is certainly highlighted through various publications and briefs we've put out. Some of this even evolves into larger questions of how we think about our current Communities of Practice, our Capacity Building Institutes in terms of focus, in terms of changes we might want to make to better address specific teams. We also know which states have identified certain of these issues as priorities, so we know how to emphasize the work a little bit more specifically in terms of those regions of the country or specific states. So it informs us in many ways in terms of follow-up and ways to think about this.

So the report itself will probably yield data and then include people or direct people to various resources, such as our Web site, basically, as we begin to think about making sure what we're doing there and with other activities that specifically address those priorities. So the work of these teams really informs our direction along with the NASET framework as the backbone to our sense of organization. I appreciated Freda and Steve's comments about the NASET framework and its importance to you at the individual state level here because it's important to us, too. So, Mary, I may have answered your question.

Ms. Campbell: No, that's great. Thank you.

Ms. Sieler: This is Dede Sieler from the state of Washington. I work on a SAMHSA cooperative agreement for the Partnerships for Youth Transition. I'm wondering if there is a contact person or persons from the state who attended this meeting that I might be in touch with?

Dr. Johnson: Would you be kind enough to send us an e-mail regarding that specific request and we can get you the information about that? You can go right on our Web site and just e-mail the NCSET Web site.

Ms. Sieler: Okay, thank you.

Dr. Johnson: Okay. Other comments, questions, reactions, thoughts? Again, I just wanted to extend my thanks to all of you who participated or were on the call and a special thanks to Freda and Steve for sharing their experience here. I'm sure you're accessible by Web communication or phone and they're all on our Web site in terms of state resource folks under the heading, "Transition

Coordinators.” Thanks also to Chris Bremer for a lot of work, with others also, to go through the 50 state plans and analyze and figure out what’s going on there. It will be very important to share that with you within the next couple weeks, so look for it on our Web site.

Information coming from the Summit will be posted on our Web site at <http://www.ncset.org/Summit05/index.htm>—please take a look at that periodically. And thanks also to our federal partners—Mary, you’re on the call and others may be also. There were 23 federal agencies that really, really helped shape and support the Summit and financially support this as well and we appreciate your participation in that.

Our next teleconference will be on September 29 at 2:00 p.m. Central Time. The topic will be “Yes, Youth with Disabilities Can Travel Abroad” and it will be presented by Michelle Scheib and Melissa Mitchell from Mobility International U.S.A. So folks, thank you for participating. And thanks again, Steve and Freda. Bye.

This teleconference was coordinated by the National Center on Secondary Education and Transition.

This transcript is copyright free. Please duplicate and share with others.

Contact us at:

National Center on Secondary Education and Transition
Institute on Community Integration (UCEDD)
6 Pattee Hall
150 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis MN 55455
(612) 624-2097 (phone)
(612) 624-9344 (fax)
ncset@umn.edu (E-mail)
<http://www.ncset.org> (Web)

