In attendance: Kelly Roberts (Chair, HI), Dalun Zhang (Vice Chair, TX), Mark Innocenti (Secretary, UT), Joe Evans (NE), Alan Kurtz (ME), Glenn Fujiura (IL), Rachel Freeman (KY), Troy Cahill (NM), Meaghan McHugh (AUCD), Neil Scharp (ND), Michele Newman (CO), Rene Jamison (KS), Ann MasterGeorge (AZ), Margo Izzo (OH), Brian Reichow, (CN), Dan Bier (WI), Karen Ward (AK), Karen Heath (AK), Wayne Stuberg (NE)

**Agenda with Minutes**

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   
   All in attendance introduced themselves.

2. **Discussion of Research Symposium: “Autism Across the Lifespan: Evidence Based Practices” Monday, November 18th 8:30am-11:00am.**
   
   Eric Moody and Mark Innocenti were thanked for helping to arrange the symposium. We currently have 125 registered; a solid registration number.
   
   *Post conference note:* The symposium was well received; 160 people attended. Evaluation results from 45 attendees are attached to the minutes.

3. **Review 2012-2013 Accomplishments**
   
   This past year went well. The list of activities identified by CORE for the year were completed. Four webinars were held and attendance was approximately 80 per webinar. The evaluation results from the webinar by Glenn on “Conducting research with individuals with intellectual disabilities” are attached to these minutes.
   
   Kelly requested suggestions on how to improve quarterly calls. No suggestions were provided.

4. **Consider Possible “thread” in Research and Evaluation for 2014 Annual Meeting**
We were not able to arrange a thread for the current conference. Dalun in his role on the Conference Planning Committee discussed a research strand but it was considered too late in the process to make it happen.

Attention focused on the process of getting a research strand for the 2014 Annual Meeting. The discussion turned to the issue of workshops versus symposia. Workshops happen before the meeting begins; symposia occur during the conference. CORE has a strong record with workshops. Kelly has to work with the Conference Planning Committee to get a CORE sponsored workshop included. Suggestions were made for 2014 and included evaluation as a workshop topic, the webinar Glenn gave earlier this year, and the topic of moving from research to policy and practice impacts. Kelly will work to insure that CORE sponsors a workshop for next year.

Discussion returned to a symposium research strand. The issue of AUCD members being researchers in different topic areas making it difficult to pull together a strand with a research and evaluation focus. It was noted that many of the symposia presentations are already based on research. The possibility of having symposia submitters check a box on the application if their symposium presentation is researched based. Some wording will need to be developed to identify what is considered research. We could then work with the Conference Planning Committee to put research-based presentations in the same symposia slots. This possibility will be explored.

5. Discuss Objectives and Develop a Plan For 2013-2014

A discussion on increasing the representation of CORE in the AUCD network occurred and at the annual meeting occurred. The possibility of doing a survey to all CORE representatives was discussed but concerns with this process were expressed. This discussion will be continued in future quarterly calls.

Continuing to sponsor four CORE webinars was discussed and approved. Margo volunteered to do the first webinar based on some of her recent research and a new project she received. This was discussed and approved.

Topics for the remaining webinar were discussed. Many topics were discussed. The group settled on a focus on evaluation for the remaining three webinars. Possible topics included grantsmanship and evaluation, information on different types of evaluation, performance measures, and using evaluation to tell your story. The possibility of doing these as 30 minute webinars was raised so that more people might be able to attend.
Making these webinars useful for key center functions was also discussed. These short webinars could remain online and be used by UCEDD/LEND programs whenever needed for training. More discussion of this topic will occur at the next quarterly meeting.

Other issues discussed included: CORE linking with Andy Imparato to determine how we can help him move his agenda forward. Getting more information on CORE to network. Partnerships with other Councils.

**The following were identified as the CORE plan for 2014:**

1. Conduct three quarterly meeting by phone and one meeting at the AUCD annual meeting.
2. Sponsor four webinars.
   - The first webinar by Margo Izzo on *Scaling-Up EnvisionIT: An Evidence-Based Practice to Improve Academic and Transition Outcomes* was held on December 16, 2013. The evaluation of this webinar is attached.
   - The remaining three webinars to be determined
3. Improving CORE role at annual meeting
   - Development of a research strand.
   - Sponsor one or more workshops.

6. Visit by Andrew Imparato and Leslie Cohen

Andy discussed a summit conference on the state of the art in intellectual disabilities to be held in 2015. AUCD would host mini-conferences that would lead to the larger conference. CORE’s role in this process is not clear. The overall goal of this summit is still being determined but research will play a key role. We will ask Andy to provide more information at an upcoming CORE quarterly meeting.

**Next CORE phone meeting: January 15, 2014 @ 3:00 PM EST**
Evaluation of CORE Workshop at AUCD Annual Meeting

**Autism Across the Lifespan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of participants</th>
<th>160</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of survey respondents</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have learned new information from this session
   - Strongly agree: 27 (60%)
   - Agree: 18 (40%)
   - Disagree: 1 (2%)

2. How likely are you to incorporate information from this session into your own work?
   - Very likely: 30 (67%)
   - Likely: 11 (24%)
   - Somewhat likely: 4 (9%)
   - Not very likely: 1 (2%)

3. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the session content
   - Highly satisfied: 28 (62%)
   - Satisfied: 16 (36%)

4. Please provided any comment on the session, materials, speakers or discussions:
   - Somer Bishop's presentation was excellent.
   - I really enjoyed the perspective provided on adults with ASD. I appreciated the breakdown comparison between DSM-IV +DSM-5.
   - Well done- broad range of information.
   - New to research & EBP. Frustrated that Adults excluded (primarily due to funding source), hope to take info & processes explained to develop & pursue research in adult sector.
   - Very well done. Would be nice to have follow-up sessions for more discussion.
   - Fabulous presentations-good ideas for continued research.
   - Great presenters. Nice to cover the life span.
   - Great discussion of adult intervention & change to DSM. Early childhood could have focused less on research study and more on specific interventions & how to implement.
   - The matrix of EBPs, was VERY helpful! Excited to use this and share this with my colleagues. -Emily Johnson, Global Autism Project
   - Great info from all presenters.
   - Excellent sessions, thank you!
   - Thanks!
I really enjoyed Dr. Reichow and Dr. Bishop's presentations. I felt they were the most informative and relevant to my interests.

Cox presentation—excellent thank you for advance handouts! Handouts for other 2 presenters would have been very helpful.

I would like the symposium to be more hands on, more interactive, more experiential based learning. Nice collaborative presentation.

Very informative.

Excellent coordination & topics. Good responses to audience questions/comments, very interactive presentations.

Presenters very knowledgeable and interesting to see how the life span has gaps that need imperative research.

Excellent series of talks both the review of childhood interventions and review of adult studies will be very helpful to me in the future.

I especially enjoyed Somer Bishop's presentation on Adults & opportunities in research. I liked the DSM-5 discussion—the best I heard on the subject. Good handouts on evidence and research.

I learned new information from DSM-5—evidence based on adult provided by Bishop. Did not learn new info from evidence based on children provided by Cox. But hopefully the website she mentioned at the end of her talk will be helpful. Wish she had spent more time on presented info and less on methodological details—very frustrating. The presentation delivered by Reichow and Bishop were excellent. The first presentation (DSM-5) was excellent. The second was informative. Somer Bishop's talk was excellent—she transmitted info with out nagging down in the methodological details. Her videos were very engaging. She did an outstanding job of presenting research and learning to practical clinical alternates. She also did a sensational and appreciated job of dealing with audience members who were not a target.
Overcoming Challenges to Conducting Research with Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities

CORE Webinar

September 23, 2013

Number of Individuals who clicked registration: 173

Number of registrants: 120

Number of participants: 56

Number completed survey: 32 (57%)

Number of Students/Trainees: 36/56 (64%)

Number of participants who are family members of a person with an intellectual disability: 24/56 (43%)

Please provide your overall level of satisfaction with today’s webinar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11) 34%</td>
<td>(17) 53%</td>
<td>(4) 13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to the following statement, “I learned new information from today’s webinar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12) 38%</td>
<td>(17) 53%</td>
<td>(2) 6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Good quality, however at least ONE of the panelist should have been able to directly respond to the question about Action Research. Perhaps include a qualitative researchers on the next panel on this issue.
- Unfortunately, I joined late. I look forward to listening to the recording.
- I have a learned a lot of new information. It's great! Thank you!
- Excellent presenters!
- The addition of Edlynne was insightful in getting feedback about what a research participant understands and feels and will help in making my ongoing research approach more user friendly.
- The lady from Oregon was very interesting, but she went so fast I had a hard time taking any notes.
  Thanks.
- I was wondering if a copy of the powerpoint would be provided for attendees as I wanted to go over again for the benefit of my knowledge. Thank you so much.
- I really enjoyed hearing from the student (Edlynne). Her perspective enabled me to gain further insight into the individual with disability and what their needs are when conducting research. The entire Webinar was extremely helpful. Thanks to all of the speakers.
- Might be useful to have Q and A after each presentation and then at the end, so that questions would feel more current.
  I am interested in issues related to research with children with ID, in particular.
Scaling-Up EnvisionIT:  
An Evidence-Based Practice to Improve Academic and Transition Outcomes  
December 16, 2013

Webinar Survey Results  
Total Registered: 106    Total Participated: 76  
Total Completed Webinar Survey: 31 (41% of participants)

Please rate your overall satisfaction with today's webinar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>10 (32%)</td>
<td>17 (55%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond to the following statement: “I learned new Information from today's webinar”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>12 (39%)</td>
<td>15 (48%)</td>
<td>4 (13%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide any comments on the webinar or ideas for future webinar topics

- Really appreciate how widely you would like to have this curriculum used. Research is important but so is getting quality curriculum out into school districts. Thanks.

Questions:

Q: Texas has not adopted CCS, is this program still applicable?
Q: will the curriculum be available to schools who do not participate in the pilot AFTER the life of the grant?
Q: do you have to specify which schools are experimental and which are wait-list controls in the proposal, or could you make this decision after funding is confirmed?
Q: How about individual district?
Q: How are IRB requirements handled?
Q: how did you overcome the technology challenges in schools
Q: What were the grades that you were going to focus on?
Q: Once the pilot is over and if a state team was selected, how many districts within the state can access the EnvisionIT curriculum? Is there a charge for it? Assuming that the state is picking up the PD for implementation.
Q: Is the powerpoint available for participants electronically?