

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

State Advisory Panel

February 20, 2025

Called to Order	Chair Donelli commenced the meeting at 9:05 a.m. She formally welcomed the IDEA panel and asked Secretary Hart Lewis to take the role.
Roll Call	<p>Secretary Lewis did a roll call. Members present: Amanda Owens, Damon Terry, Hart Lewis, Jennifer Donelli, Jessica Powel, Laurel Nesbitt, Melissa Wassana, Robert Madrid, Larry Melendez, Carli Mortensen, Dr. Margaret Cage.</p> <p>Amy Trevino, Christa Kulidge, and Lisa Keck sent in an excuse and will be joining later today.</p>
Quorum Present	Chair Donelli let the record show that a quorum is present. Because the panel is conducting a virtual meeting, meaning Zoom, everyone will be muted to reduce the amount of background noise and conversations that may take place during the meeting. Members may unmute themselves for discussion and voting purposes. A roll call vote will ensure that any action the panel takes during the meeting. Those audience members who wish to provide public comment should indicate this by putting their names into the chat.
Approval of Agenda	<p>Chair Donelli requested a motion to approve the agenda. Damon Terry made the motion; a second was provided by Robert Madrid. A roll call vote ensued: Amanda Owens, Carli Mortensen, Damon Terry, Hart Lewis, Jennifer Donelli, Jessica Powel, Laurel Nesbitt, Melissa Wassana, Robert Madrid, Larry Melendez.</p> <p>Secretary Lewis has a correction for the agenda minutes to add his name to the agenda and minutes.</p> <p>Vice Chair Mortensen stated that Hart's roll call vote did not match what was shown, and Dana Malone was absent. There are discrepancies between people marked present and those who were not there. Henry Sandles' attendance is unclear; he attended the November meeting but left early. Corrections need to be made regarding these mismatches. The policy and procedures report incorrectly mentions the Legislative Advisory and Standards Committee instead of the Legislative Education Study Committee, LESC. Additionally, NMAC is cited incorrectly as MAC. The section about recommendations from Ms. Nesbitt is confusing; it should state that "they are suggesting that PED suggest amending the restraint statute."</p> <p>Member Owens apologizes and says she could be wrong, but when she looked over the comments that she made on page nine, Member Owens said that she was concerned that students in the same grade who need specialized reading instruction receive the same amount of services despite differing reading levels. It wasn't what she recalls saying; it was more along the thread of everyone getting the same amount of time, if that makes sense. This statement says that setting goals that expect a child to make a full year of progress in one year is unrealistic. And she is confident she didn't say that. She was talking about how that's the general goal. And she mentioned that if they're only expecting a year of progress, that's what they expect from most students. They hope they'll make a year of progress over a year of school. And she mentioned that, in some instances, they</p>

	<p>might merely maintain the skill gap instead of closing it.</p> <p>Office of Special Education staff member Kaity Ellis says she will double-check the audio against the minutes to ensure it's captured accurately.</p> <p>Member Nesbitt had one other question. But she knew that their committee had made recommendations in the interim. In December, they submitted recommendations. She believed that those should be part of their record as a panel. She didn't know whether those should be included with this agenda or if they should be included with their minutes. Or if her question was just how recommendations of these committees become part of the public record associated with the IDEA panel, and whether that needs to be attached to the minutes in any way?</p> <p>Chair Donelli was told they could include the information in the chair report, which she shared with everyone. She will present it at the relevant agenda item. Her report is about 10 pages long, including recommendations and comments on two legislative bills. She asked the Chief Counsel for suggestions on where to report it.</p> <p>Chief Lozano said the report is in the right place, and it will be in the minutes. The chair could ask OSE to add those recommendations to the minutes.</p> <p>Member Nesbitt recommended attaching panel recommendations from all committees to the set of minutes. This would honor the committee's work and maintain a historical record.</p> <p>Chair Donelli asked for any other corrections to the minutes and motioned to approve the minutes with suggested amendments.</p> <p>Vice Chair Mortensen moved to postpone the vote until after corrections can be made at the next meeting so Member Owens can review her comments in the audio.</p> <p>Chair Donelli requested a motion to approve the corrections to the minutes. Vice Chair Mortensen moved to table the vote; Member Nesbitt provided a second. A roll call vote by Secretary Hart Lewis ensued: Amanda Owens-yes approve, Carli Mortensen-yes, Damon Terry-yes, Hart Lewis-yes, Jennifer Donelli-yes, Jessica Powel-yes, Laurel Nesbitt-yes, Melissa Wasana-yes, Robert Madrid-yes, and Larry Melendez-yes.</p> <p>Chief Lozano wanted to discuss a procedure. The Office of Special Education could send meeting minutes beforehand for review. However, we should ensure that members only return changes to the administrator, not the entire board. This way, we can track changes, make amendments, and vote on them during the meeting.</p> <p>Chair Donelli thanked Mr. Lozano for his suggestion and agreed that using track changes would be beneficial moving forward.</p>
Approval of Minutes	November 8th, 2024
Public Comment	Gail Stewert thanked Chair Donelli and the committee for allowing her to participate and comment publicly. She said she is struggling with what to say because there's just so much going on that impacts the unmet needs of children

	<p>with disabilities in the State. She talks to families in tremendous pain, who need daily support, and wanted to think of ways to help them.</p> <p>Since the 1990s, she's been trying to implement IDEA as a lawyer in this state, starting with her daughter. She's learned over more than 25 years that focusing on advocacy at the IEP table and on forms doesn't significantly help meet the needs of children with disabilities. She urged the committee to remember that compliance with IDEA technicalities is just a tool to achieve education for children with different needs and who have been wrongly excluded from public education.</p> <p>Ms. Stewart stated that the tools are not working well. While it's good for parents to know IDEA when attending meetings, learning these tools isn't enough if the school district doesn't have the knowledge and infrastructure to meet their child's needs. The focus needs to shift to what's happening in classrooms.</p> <p>She also stated that, in the 1990s, when parents asked about dyslexia, they were often ignored. There is more understanding and resources, which is a positive change. The key for their children is to develop expert knowledge about different disabilities and strategies, which they can share with school districts. While the Office of Special Education is working on a universal IEP form, having forms won't help without fundamental knowledge. They need to validate the need for expertise in their school districts, which requires state support. Ms. Stewart thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak.</p>
Chair Report	<p>Chair Donelli greeted the panel and the public. She stated that it was hard to believe that we are halfway through the school year. She mentioned that she was proud of the panel's work and appreciated their dedication to improving student outcomes.</p> <p>Chair Donelli reviewed the Meeting Ground Rules with the Panel.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Silence means agreement • Adhere to the agenda • Don't repeat what has already been said • Wait to be called on by the chair before speaking • Attack issues and not each other • Be precise when speaking • Avoid acronyms and maintain professionalism <p>Chair Donelli stated that these ground rules will help the panel focus on important issues and have respectful, productive discussions. For the next meeting, she said the panel will introduce comment and question cards. For virtual meetings, the panel will keep using the raised hands feature. She thanked everyone for their participation.</p> <p>Chair Donelli reported that since the last meeting, the Executive Committee approved recommendations from the Policy and Procedure Committee for the Office of Special Education. They discussed and approved comments via email on proposed rulemaking 6.29.1 NMAC concerning graduation requirements. These changes will remove the modified pathway for incoming first-year students starting in the 2025-2026 school year. Additionally, comments were approved on House Bill 260, which addresses updates to restraint and seclusion policies. Special thanks were given to Vice Chair Carli Mortensen for representing the panel's comments. The upcoming joint meeting with the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) aims to strengthen collaboration, benefiting both organizations. The agenda included a parent panel focusing on transitions from Part C to Part B. The chair</p>

	<p>said she looks forward to a productive outcome and invited questions or comments regarding the report.</p>
Director's Report	<p>Dr. Margaret S. Cage, Ed.D. Deputy Secretary, Office of Special Education</p>
	<p>Dr. Cage welcomed the committee and expressed pleasure in sharing her Director's report about ongoing activities in the Office of Special Education, which she plans to provide to the Madam Chair with hyperlinks. She shared her connection to the work as a mother of a child who is legally blind and a diverse mix of children with varying academic abilities. The Office of Special Education aims to revitalize New Mexico's special education system with a comprehensive approach, emphasizing rebuilding trust and accountability, fostering an inclusive culture, and providing technical assistance.</p> <p>Collaboration across agencies is a new focus, and there are efforts to offer professional development at all education levels. Dr. Cage emphasized the importance of attendance in these trainings and explained that they cater to parents, school board members, and other community members involved in education. The report will detail initiatives, progress, and future plans.</p> <p>She briefly discussed Senate Bill 38, which aims to strengthen oversight and improve services for students with disabilities by establishing the Office of Special Education as a statutory entity under the New Mexico Public Education Department. The bill enhances monitoring and accountability and transfers preschool special education oversight to improve early intervention services. Dr. Cage highlighted the need for clearly defined procedures for accountability that align with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).</p> <p>She also added, the new state plan aligns education resources and improves compliance while ensuring students with disabilities receive the necessary support. Improved cross-agency collaboration includes regular meetings among various departments to serve students better. The bill also emphasizes that professional development is available to all educators and recognizes the needs of gifted students.</p> <p>Dr. Cage addressed concerns regarding the Special Education Ombuds placement, explaining that it will remain under the Developmental Disabilities Council. She showcased the bill's role in reforming special education and highlighted key responsibilities of the Public Education Department. The state plan outlines goals including cultural responsiveness, pathways for teaching, and ensuring equitable opportunities for students. Different activities are designed to align with these priorities.</p> <p>Upcoming monitoring for compliance will occur from February 24 to April 11. There will be a tiered monitoring model, with on-site, desk, and self-monitoring assessments planned.</p> <p>She mentioned a financial investment from House Bill 2 for recruiting teachers in special education, leading to hiring 370 teachers for vacant classrooms after a rigorous qualification process. Dr. Cage indicated that professional development initiatives will continue to be shared, including Special Education Director training and Parent University virtual sessions focusing on parents' understanding of special education rights and processes.</p>

	<p>Another law conference is planned for school leaders to ensure they are informed about their roles. Dr. Cage shared trends from the state performance plan showing improvements in several indicators of student outcomes, including reading and math proficiency, while acknowledging areas of decline needing attention.</p> <p>She stated that the Office of Special Education is committed to enhancing outcomes for students with disabilities and aims to work closely with local education agencies and stakeholders to create a more equitable system. Acknowledging that significant changes typically take a few years, she expressed optimism for ongoing improvements and looks forward to the committee's continued support. She responded to a question about conference attendance for parents, clarifying that specialized law conferences cater to educators, while Parent University offers sessions that address law topics for parents. Information about the Parent University registration is shared and will be forwarded for further dissemination.</p>
Question #1: Monitoring five-year cohort	<p>Member Nesbitt greeted Dr. Cage and thanked her for her report. She began with one question about the five-year cohort monitoring discussed earlier. She acknowledged she may have asked this before and was unsure if her question should go to Dr. Cage or Mr. Lozano. She wanted to know how the panel and the public can help with the monitoring effort. She mentioned that she attended a conference where public and advocacy group comments were invited. She asked if there were ways for the panel to prepare to contribute to the monitoring and provide input.</p> <p>Dr. Cage said she appreciated the question and mentioned that the panel might not participate in the monitoring process. She noted that last year, they did not conduct interviews with educators, students, or parents, which is part of the on-site monitoring process. She then asked Chief Lozano to address another aspect.</p> <p>Chief Lozano said the state lead will contact panel members to discuss the process. After findings on statewide compliance and special education in New Mexico, Dr. Cage's involvement will likely occur at the end. The IDEA panel will engage with Ms. Nesbitt on the findings and the response. The state lead will connect with panel members and directly contact school districts, parent groups, and parents.</p>
Question #2 Update on HB 260 Restraint and Seclusion	<p>Vice Chair Mortensen asked for an update on HB 260, the Restraint and Seclusion.</p> <p>Dr. Cage had no updates on HB 260, which the Developmental Disabilities Council mainly handles. She was involved in the workforce but was not an expert witness for HB 260.</p> <p>Chief Lozano mentioned that there would be a review of an amendment. They could vote on the bill after the amendment review. Member Nesbitt agreed with Mr. Lozano. Member Kulidge also had her hand up about this. It is known from information this morning that an amendment has been submitted and will be heard by the committee tomorrow. Vice Chair Mortensen believed they would discuss that in some detail today in their Policy and Procedures Committee, but there is an amendment that essentially, for the most part, addresses the definition of seclusion.</p>

<p>Question #3: Fulfilling our role and supporting students, schools, and our department.</p>	<p>Member Nesbitt thanked Dr. Cage. She explained this as a difficult question and understands that Dr. Cage may not have all the answers. With many upcoming changes from the Department of Education and the anxiety many feel, she wondered if Dr. Cage had any talking points to share. She also asked, as a panel, how can they focus on their role in supporting students, schools, and their department during this challenging time, especially concerning executive orders and administrative shifts?</p> <p>Dr. Cage thanked Member Nesbitt for the question and shared that it is a daily concern for her. However, the governor's office has instructed them to proceed one day at a time, with official updates from them. She said things are business as usual, and New Mexico is prepared to support students and families. They are working to codify special education practices in statute since they are among the few states without such measures. She emphasized that the funding is adequate to meet their needs, and they will remain vigilant.</p>
<p>Question #4 How many positions are still vacant?</p>	<p>Chair Donelli was curious about filling the 370 positions and asked how many are still vacant.</p> <p>Dr. Cage thanked Chair Donelli for the question. Unfortunately, they couldn't answer this because it was part of an application process. Only 53 LEAs applied for stipends for vacancies, which are consuming the 370 filled positions. They plan to survey local education agencies and charter schools for data and collect teacher vacancy reports in NOVA for statewide awareness.</p> <p>Vice Chair Mortensen stated that having a report of vacancies would help gather information on how LEAs maintain efforts. Vice Chair Mortensen stated that tracking vacancies is essential to see if they are meeting their responsibilities, as many children are denied FAPE due to these vacancies. Vice Chair Mortensen appreciated the inclusion of this reporting for better tracking.</p>
<p>Break</p>	<p>10:15-10:30</p>
<p>Committee Meetings</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy and Procedure Committee Focus: Ensure adherence to IDEA regulations and other relevant laws. Tasks: Review and update policies, ensure compliance with legal requirements, and provide guidance on legal issues. 2. Family and Community Engagement Committee Focus: Strengthen collaboration with families and community organizations. Tasks: Develop resources and support systems for families, facilitate community partnerships, and encourage family involvement in the educational process. 3. Transition Planning Committee Focus: Support students in transitioning between educational stages and into post-school opportunities. Tasks: Develop transition plans for moving from early intervention to school settings, and from school to post-secondary education or employment. <p>Chair Donelli mentioned that the following item is for committee meetings. Committees will meet to plan and must schedule a meeting before May 1st and 2nd. They should review action plans and consider new steps. Committees include Policy and Procedure, Parent and Community Engagement, and Transition Planning. A breakout room is available for discussions. Public members can join</p>

	<p>for input. The meetings are expected to last about an hour and a half, with a lunch break around noon.</p> <p>Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis informed the public and committee that staff will assist if there are issues. She continues to help add members to the committee of their choice.</p> <p>Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis asked Mr. Wadley to broadcast to the committee rooms, as they had 30 minutes until their lunch break.</p> <p>Mr. Wadley broadcast that members would need to meet back with Chair Donelli after lunch.</p>
Lunch Break	12:00-1:00
Roll Call	<p>A roll call vote to ensure members are present after lunch: Amanda Owens, Carli Mortensen, Christa Kulidge, Damon Terry, Hart Lewis, Jennifer Donelli, Laurel Nesbitt, Lisa Keck, Robert Madrid, Larry Melendez.</p> <p>Chair Donelli announced they had a quorum to proceed with the meeting.</p>
Committee Meetings-continued	<p>Chair Donelli stated that some committees requested additional work meeting time and asked if an hour and a half was enough.</p> <p>Member Kulidge said the transition committee is ready to report so they can continue their work while waiting.</p> <p>Member Keck thought an hour and a half may be too long for the family and community to report.</p> <p>Secretary Hart agreed that the Family Committee needed less time to finish its report.</p> <p>Member Nesbitt said that there was much to address for policy and procedures through legislative action. An hour may be the minimum needed to complete tasks.</p> <p>Chair Donelli says she was good to reconvene at 2:15. She also said that members must reopen the breakout rooms to continue their committee meetings.</p> <p>Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis asked Mr. Wadley to broadcast to the committee meetings that they had 10 minutes left. When finished, they would need to send their reports to the Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis.</p> <p>Chair Donelli acknowledged the valuable discussions that took place. She apologized for missing the committee meetings. She heard positive feedback about family and policy. Chair Donelli asked Member Kulidge if she wanted to start the committee reports.</p> <p>Member Keck greeted everyone. She said some things discussed further are ideas they have already shared. One focus is honoring and respecting the different perspectives of families in New Mexico. They also discussed how the Office of Special Education can celebrate diversity from these perspectives.</p>

They mentioned the concept of a Parent University, which is a great idea, but they may feel excluded due to its name. She said, many family members may not feel comfortable attending because of their educational backgrounds. They discussed the importance of communication and language in the effectiveness of the Office of Special Education in reaching families. Many parents of children with disabilities face similar challenges, and they should not assume they have the necessary language skills to understand IEP documents and other materials.

She also shared that in special education, they might use language that is inaccessible to all families. They need to ensure that their communication respects neurodiversity and the diverse backgrounds of families, including those with grandparents raising children in New Mexico. Relying solely on emails and social media may not connect with all families, especially those in rural areas who do not use these forms of communication.

Another critical point mentioned was the need for a commitment to a student-centered approach from the Office of Special Education. They should find ways to include students in their IEP process early on, rather than waiting until a mandatory age, allowing them to engage in the IEP process from elementary school and even run their meetings by high school.

It was further stated that to achieve this, they must push for friendly documents for neurodiverse learners, as current IEP documents are often too complicated. They discussed ways to implement student-led IEP meetings without overwhelming classroom teachers and how professional development can help staff engage with students meaningfully. Increasing student engagement would also involve parents and grandparents more effectively.

They touched on the idea of parent ambassadors in schools who could support those uncomfortable navigating the IEP process, especially those facing language barriers. This way, parents can build community through their experiences in special education. Lastly, they set the date for their next meeting in May and asked if there were questions from anyone else..

Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis asked Member Keck when their next committee meeting outside the IDEA panel would be. Member Keck told Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis that it would be March 10th, 2025, at 9:00.

Chair Donelli asked if Member Kulidge was present to discuss what they had discussed during the transition.

Member Kulidge mentioned that the recommendation regarding the transition from pre-K to post-secondary education is almost finalized. The focus has shifted to improving secondary and post-secondary transitions. The proposal is for the OSE, possibly with the College and Career Readiness Bureau, to organize an annual transition conference. This conference would bring in various outside agencies to share resources and information. Member Madrid discovered useful information from Member Melendez that he was unaware of, highlighting the ongoing need for such knowledge sharing.

Member Kulidge emphasized the importance of this conference, recalling its past effectiveness and the positive feedback from attendees. They aim to rejuvenate this event with support from the Office of Special Education, and other members

have also expressed their commitment to help with planning. Funding could come from various agencies, and incorporating a special education track into existing conferences could promote collaboration. Kulidge asked Member Melendez or Member Madrid if she had missed anything in the discussion.

Member Kulidge thought focusing on one specific opportunity would be better than trying to be too global. They believed training to transition people well can significantly impact kids' lives.

Member Nesbitt asked Member Kulidge about her comment, praising it as a great plan and idea. She expressed that they seem like great opportunities for collaboration. She mentioned that her agency is interested in participating in transition efforts and would like to be approached if the plan gains support.

Member Nesbitt mentioned that she had started making a list of organizations involved in their work, including the Commission for the Blind and the Commission for the Deaf.. A discussion also happened about a child navigating post-secondary education, highlighting the need to teach students how to transition from an IEP to receiving ADA services and advocate for themselves. Member Nesbitt expressed excitement about the opportunity, suggesting that with support from various stakeholders, more agencies may want to participate. It was noted that a follow-up meeting had not been scheduled, but was open to reporting at the final meeting and gathering feedback from community members involved in the planning.

Dr. Cage said creating a working group focused on transitions was a great idea and a key part of the state plan from early childhood through later stages. She stated that we need staff from OSE to help make progress for the fall. Dr. Cage named people who were eager to partner, including Dean, Lisa McNiven, Laurel Nesbitt, and the DDC (Developmental Disabilities Council).

Member Kulidge expressed enthusiasm for her passion area and offered support. She mentions retiring in June but clarifies that she won't disappear. She prefers to focus her remaining energy on what matters most rather than a strict work schedule.

Chair Donelli asked if there were any other comments or questions. Chair Donelli stated she knew how much Member Kulidge supported the idea and offered help in planning. She mentioned hearing about a successful transition conference and offered to help recreate it. She thanked everyone and then handed it to the policy and procedure committee.

Member Nesbitt shared what was discussed in the policy and procedures committee meeting. It was mentioned that the legislative session was hectic, and everyone was trying to manage many bills. Dr. Cage and Miguel Lozano joined the discussion to provide information on SB 38, the Office of Special Education Bill, and other bills that needed more clarity. The committee did not have a written document with recommendations because there was not enough time to finalize the discussion.

The recommendation for Senate Bill 38 was to make a public comment supporting the bill. It was mentioned that it was important because it established the Office of Special Education and strengthened special education in the state, especially when there are threats to special education and federal laws. The committee plans to draft proposed comments, which they will present to the

executive committee for future public comment opportunities.

Another critical bill discussed was House Bill 260, the restraint and seclusion bill. This bill aims to amend current laws regarding restraint and seclusion in schools. The committee stated that the discussion was too extensive to summarize quickly, but they talked about recent amendments related to the definition of seclusion. They decided not to rush comments for the upcoming hearing as there was insufficient time for thorough input. However, they want to keep the possibility of commenting in the future when more time is available.

The group emphasized prohibiting specific interventions, such as seclusion without supervision and mechanical restraints. They discussed the importance of training teachers to help them manage behavior without using restraint and seclusion. The committee acknowledges that other advocates will voice similar concerns regarding the bill during future discussions.

The committee agreed to let the discussion on House Bill 260 develop further before making any recommendations for public comment. They had previously offered comments in support of it during the first committee hearing. A member also raised concerns about Senate Bills 1, 2, and 3, as well as House Bill 31, which deals with school shooting threats. They highlighted the need to consider communication problems and behaviors related to disabilities in these bills, especially since they could lead to severe consequences for students with disabilities.

The committee also briefly covered SB 242, the Improving Science of Reading Bill, and SB 235, which addresses dyscalculia in math. They plan to consider these bills further in their upcoming discussions and decide if public comments are necessary.

Additionally, resolutions about forming a state board of education require more in-depth discussion. The committee may create recommendations regarding this topic as well. In summary, the main action point is to prepare a supporting comment for SB 38. A meeting date was not set, but the timing will depend on when these bills are scheduled for hearings. The discussion on various bills affecting students with disabilities was noted as an engaging and essential topic for the committee.

Member Madrid expressed happiness about discussing fourth-degree felonies. He mentioned that, due to legal requirements, he must separate individuals aged 18 and younger into a secluded area. This makes assisting these young people in correctional settings difficult despite providing educational services.

Member Nesbitt acknowledges Member Madrid's excellent point. She said she understands that if a young person, aged 18 or younger, is incarcerated in one of their facilities for a fourth-degree felony, it could have serious adverse effects on the young person's future.

Member Madrid expresses concern about isolating individuals under 18, emphasizing the psychological impact of seclusion. While acknowledging the provision of special educational needs, they find it challenging to enforce seclusion by law to separate minors from adults in the general population.

Member Nesbitt thanked Member Madrid for the input.

	<p>Chair Donelli thanked the policy and procedure committee for their hard work. Since the last meeting, they have met many times to advocate for students and influence change. Chair Donelli acknowledged their diligence and reassured Member Nesbitt that her meeting will be scheduled soon, expecting several more before the next meeting.</p>
Reminder for next meeting	<p>Chair Donelli reminded everyone to keep their folders updated as reports wrap up. She said that after the meeting, you should submit your updated action plans and notes to your committee folders. She also included that if anyone needed help, they could email her or Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis. Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis could also assist with planning Zoom meetings. Chair Donelli asked Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis if she had anything else to add.</p> <p>Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis said to confirm that there will be a meeting with the ICC tomorrow at 9:00, with Secretary Groginsky from the Early Childhood and Education Department attending. Be ready to participate. She reminded everyone, there will be an in-person meeting in May, likely in Las Cruces. Everyone needed to submit reimbursement requests to her within 48 hours. She asked Chair Donelli and Dr. Cage if they had anything else to add.</p> <p>Dr. Cage had nothing to add. She mentioned being pleased to have made time for the meeting despite being busy. She then thanked everyone for their time at the meeting..</p> <p>Mr. Wadley informed public participants that the link for tomorrow was on the posted agenda on the website for entry.</p> <p>Office of Special Education Staff Member Kaity Ellis mentioned that the link was also posted on the public notice.</p> <p>Chair Donelli said she was excited about the joint meeting tomorrow. She explained that this was a formal meeting for the panel and ICC. The meeting will have two co-chairs, and will alternate leading based on the agenda. She said they would also address their agenda approval, and they would have minutes.</p> <p>Chair Donelli expressed the importance of having a good conversation and relationships as they support students transitioning from Part C to B. She emphasized the need for a strong working relationship with the ICC. Chair Donelli thanked everyone for their participation, noting the meaningful discussions, and stated that the meeting would recess at 2:52, resuming the next day at 9:00 with Secretary Groginsky. She appreciates everyone's effort in attending the long sessions.</p>
Date and Location of Next Meeting	May 2025, Las Cruces, NM
Recess for the Day	2:52 pm