

# ISEAS Cable

ISEAS Project • School of Education, Rm 701 • Indiana State University • Terre Haute, IN 47809

Supporting Special Education Administrators in Solution Seeking

<http://www.indstate.edu/iseas/Cable.html>

January 1997 - volume 18 number 1

## A Past Snapshot of Special Education in Indiana

At the September 27, 1996 ICASE Fall Conference in Muncie, Dr. Henry Schroeder, retired director of the Institute for the Study of Developmental Disabilities, gave Gary Collings a copy of his June 1971 dissertation for the ICASE history archives. The title of his document completed twenty-five years ago is The Projected Impact of Mandatory Legislation on Special Education Programs in Indiana. The following content is verbatim excerpts from Dr. Schroeder's 1971 dissertation which includes the terminology of 25 years ago.

Special education in the State of Indiana has been authorized under state statutes since 1927. This legislation, authorizing the implementation of special education programs within the public schools, has been permissive. Under permissive legislation, school officials have had the discretion in developing special education programs for handicapped children. Brinegar (1966) in a status report on special education in Indiana revealed that only thirty-six percent of the school aged handicapped children were receiving services in the

public schools. Additional information revealed that there was a progressive reduction in the state's share of the cost of special education programs. With these factors, the permissive aspect of educating handicapped children was uncertain. Brinegar (1967) stated that educational programming is effected by the amount of money spent, and a downward trend in state funding for special education may reflect an apathetic attitude toward handicapped children on the part of many governmental and educational

*continued on page 2*

### Inside . . .

<i>Administrators' Corner</i>	6	<i>Information from ICASE</i>	11	<i>OCR . . .</i>	17
<i>ISEAS Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</i>	7	<i>License Renewal via CRUs</i>	14	<i>Department of Education News</i>	18
<i>ISEAS University Forum</i>	9	<i>ISBA Legal Services Information</i>	14	<i>Federal Update . . .</i>	22
		<i>OSERS/OSEP . . .</i>	15	<i>Resources</i>	23
				<i>Tongue-in Cheek</i>	25

*Snapshot • continued from page 1*

leaders. This concern prompted the movement for a more positive legislation program for handicapped children.

The legislative movement was directed toward a new era for special education. The 1969 Indiana General Assembly enacted programs for handicapped children mandatory rather than permissive, with an effective date of July 1, 1973. Indiana is one of twenty-six states across the country which now have mandatory legislation.

Two specific directions were undertaken in this study. First, Phase I of the comprehensive special education plans were analyzed to seek projected impact trends within special education; and, second, local directors of special education were interviewed seeking attitudes toward the mandatory legislation and variables within the planning process. A total of 320 school districts were used in this study. All were listed in the 1969-70 Indiana School Directory published by the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The criteria of selection were based on the recommendations of the State Advisory Council for Special Education, that all school districts would submit a Phase I plan by December 1, 1970, before the next step in planning would be approved.

A letter explaining the purpose of the study and requesting an interview was sent to each of the thirty-five directors of special education. A follow-up telephone

contact was made to clarify the director's intention to participate in the study and to set a mutual date and time for an interview.

The author interviewed each of the directors of special education at his office utilizing the open-ended interview instrument. All interviews were tape-recorded, unless the respondent objected. A replay of the individual's responses permitted an accurate retrieval of the individual's responses. A request was made to include the names of each school district as a means of identification of those who have participated in this study. [Unfortunately, name of directors were not given.]

Following is the alphabetical listing of school districts employing certified directors of special education who were personally interviewed: Anderson School City, Bartholomew Consolidated Schools, Clark-Pleasant Community Schools Johnson County Special Education, Duneland School Corporation, East Allen County Schools, Elkhart Community Schools, Evansville-Vanderburg School Corporation, Fayette County School Corporation, Fort Wayne Community Schools, Goshen Community Schools, Greencastle Community Schools, Hammond Public Schools, Huntington County Community Schools, Indianapolis Public Schools, Kokomo-Center Township Consolidated Schools, Lafayette School Corporation, Logansport Community Schools, MSD Bluffton-Harrison, MSD Perry Township, MSD Pike

Township, MSD Washington, MSD Wayne Township, Marion Community Schools, Michigan City Area Schools, Monroe County Community School Corporation, Muncie Community Schools, New Albany-Floyd County School Corporation, North Lawrence Community Schools, Northeast School Corporation, Plymouth Community School Corporation, Rensselaer Central School Corporation, School City of Gary, School Town of Highland, South Bend Community School Corporation, Vigo County School Corporation.

Phase I comprehensive planning forms were mailed to all 320 school districts in Indiana. Returns of the planning forms were received from 315 school districts. These returns represented 98.44 percent of the school districts. Out of 315 responding school districts, 86 indicated a single unit plan. The most prevalent area was the speech handicapped with 85 school districts having a single unit plan. The least prevalent was the area of the multiple handicapped, with only 11 school districts involved.

The joint service administrative unit was reported to be the responsibility of 49 school districts. These 49 school districts were the administrative unit for all school districts included in the joint service agreement. The number of school districts involved in this type of administrative unit was much higher than the



*continued on page 3*

*Snapshot • continued from page 2*

number of single unit and transfer tuition units combined. The results indicated some school districts offered or planned joint services in all areas of handicapping conditions. The areas of speech handicapped and educable mentally retarded were found to have smaller numbers of school districts participating in joint service programs. The low incidence areas of hard of hearing, visually handicapped, multiple handicapped, and trainable mentally retarded had a large number of school districts reporting involvement in joint service programs. The largest number of participating school districts in joint service programs was reported in the area of the trainable mentally retarded.

The 35 directors of special education who are asked to participate in this study consented to an interview to obtain their attitudes toward mandatory legislation and comprehensive planning. Of the directors of special education interviewed, 29 (85.7 percent) were men and six (14.3 percent) were women. The age range of the subjects was 26 to 64 years. The mean age of the subjects was 40.9 years. One director held a doctorate in special education administration. All 35 directors were certified and licensed by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. All 35 directors of special education were asked to report their area of special preparation. Speech and hearing therapy, mental retardation, and the combination of the these two were the largest reported areas of preparation. The smallest re-

ported areas were those handicapping conditions considered to be low incidence. A median of nine years of teaching experience was reported. Seven years of administrative experience was the median.

The directors of special education were asked to express their views on mandatory legislation. Almost two-thirds of the directors expressed a favorable attitude toward mandatory legislation, which they felt, gave them the force needed to develop programs for handicapped children when dealing with superintendents and school boards. These directors felt mandatory legislation gave additional assistance in development of programs in low incidence areas and shed new light on the educational needs of handicapped children. They further expressed the need for mandatory legislation because the state had failed in its leadership role in developing education and training programs for handicapped children in school districts.

The nine directors expressing negative attitudes toward mandatory legislation regarded this legislation as a law that would force school districts to recognize handicapped children, and thus create a negative attitude among educators and the community. The directors held the attitude that education of children within the state was a part of the state constitution and, therefore, mandatory legislation was unnecessary. In addition, it was felt that mandatory legislation could assist those school districts which needed force to develop programs for the handicapped, but that more

progressive school districts would not need to be forced to develop such programs.

The directors were asked if there were any provisions they would delete from the mandatory legislation. Those directors who suggested deletions were concerned more with terminology than with anything else. The deletion recommended most often was the term "all" which appeared in the legislation regarding educational programs for all children. Ten directors felt the term needed to be defined and clarified and did not belong in the legislation. It was the consensus of this group that the term "all" is nebulous when applied to educational and training programs for the handicapped.

Deletion of the 1973 deadline for implementation was suggested by seven directors who considered such a deadline unrealistic. Implementation within a four year period cannot be realistic unless all variables for programing are consistent, that is, unless there already exists an availability of personnel, finance, and facilities.

Other provisions to be deleted were the area of learning disabilities (until defined), the role of the general commission on education for reimbursement, the area of the trainable mentally retarded (because this area is more the responsibility of mental health or welfare according to one director), the rule that allows transfer tuition to be paid to an out-of-state

*continued on page 4*



*Snapshot • continued from page 3*

educational center.

Twelve of the 35 directors interviewed felt they would not delete any provision now in the law. The general consensus was that, in so far as it goes, mandatory legislation is good. There would be no need to delete provisions, but to add provisions in order to improve the law for handicapped children. Thirty-three of the 35 directors suggested funding as the most important provision. [Some things never change.] The second most frequently suggested provision, cited by 27 directors, related to personnel.

When asked to what extent will mandatory legislation accomplish its purpose of providing educational services for handicapped children, the largest response, expressed by 23 directors, was the development of quantitative rather than qualitative programs. The major concern was that handicapped children would be labeled and placed because of the period of time required for implementation of the law. The law created a crisis situation, and the necessity to place children into programs seemed greater than developing sound educational programs.

Four directors felt poor attitudes of school districts toward handicapped children would not be changed because of the mandatory legislation. Three of the four directors compared mandatory legislation to the integration-segregation problems of education in the past. One of the directors

stated some school districts will always “drag their heels.”

The factors of funding and personnel were considered variables in the accomplishment of services. Three directors felt money and personnel would be the terminating factors to the accomplishment of services. The dependence of funding and other available monies was expressed by nine directors.

Information obtained from the Phase I comprehensive planning forms and from the personal interviews of directors of special education resulted in the following major findings:

1. Approximately 2,000 professional personnel are presently employed in special education. The need for additional professional personnel by 1973-74 has been estimated at 3,165, an increase of 158 percent over a three year period.

2. Approximately 309 teacher aides and clerical staff involved in special education programs are presently employed. The projected need for additional teacher aides and clerical personnel by 1973-74 has been estimated at 1,427, an increase of 462 percent over a three year period.

3. Financial expenditures for special education programs were 21.7 million dollars during the 1970-71 school year. The projected financial expenditures for 1973-74 were estimated to be approximately 61 million dollars, an increase of 181 percent over

the three year period.

- a. Salary expenditures for special education personnel during the 1970-71 were reported to be 19.7 million dollars. Salary expenditure projections for 1973-74 were estimated to be 54.6 million dollars, and increase of 176 percent over the three year period.

- b. The 1970-71 special transportation expenditures were reported to be approximately 2 million dollars. Projected expenditures for special transportation during 1973-74 were estimated to be nearly 6.4 million dollars, an increase of 228 percent over the three years.

4. Eighty-six school districts submitted single unit administrative plans, 16 of which submitted plans including transfer tuition handicapped children from other school districts. Forty-nine districts, representing the administrative unit, submitted plans for joint service programs.

5. Surveys conducted by the individual school districts indicated that there are 151, 619 handicapped children in the public schools. Percentages of incidence estimates of handicapping conditions indicated approximately 138,363 handicapped children would be in the public schools.

6. Twenty-two directors of special education expressed a favorable attitude toward mandatory legislation because of its usefulness in the development of special education programs.



*continued on page 4*

*Snapshot • continued from page 4*

7. Twenty-six directors of special education reported more responsibilities and changes of authority because of mandatory legislation.

8. Only three directors reported experiencing significant loss of responsibilities and authority, such as the loss of directorships, due to mandatory legislation.

9. Personnel, finance, and facilities were seen as major concerns. Thirty-three directors of special education suggested that the provision of funding would improve the mandatory legislation. Thirteen directors designated the lack of facilities as the most specific factor affecting comprehensive planning for special education programs. Twenty-one directors indicated a major need of additional professional personnel on the local level to implement the mandatory legislation.

10. Twenty-six directors reported the comprehensive plans would not be implemented without additional state funds.

11. Ten directors suggested provisions relating to the term "all," which appears in the mandatory legislation regarding educational programs for all children.

12. Twenty-eight directors indicated the use of resource teachers in their special education programs to overcome the shortages of professional personnel.

13. Twenty-six directors

indicated itinerant teacher arrangements would be used in the areas of the emotionally disturbed, and visually and speech handicapped to overcome professional personnel shortage.

14. Twenty-three directors felt their school districts would exceed 50 percent of the financial expenditures in the implementation of the local comprehensive plans.

15. Twelve directors expressed confidence in meeting the personnel timetables as described in their comprehensive plans.

16. Seventeen directors felt state funding would be a major factor in meeting the personnel timetables.

17. Twenty-five directors regarded state funding as the major factor in the accomplishment of the financial timetables described in their comprehensive plans. Ten directors indicated financial expenditure timetables would be met without state funding.

18. Positive community reactions were reported by 28 directors. Community reactions indicated the need for service for handicapped children was overdue in the school districts. Only five directors found no major reactions toward their comprehensive plan.

19. All 35 directors reported using community and state agencies, educational personnel, and community lay groups in the development of their comprehensive plans. All the directors also

reported using community and state agencies, community resources, as well as public school personnel in determining the number of handicapped children designated in their plans.

20. Twenty-nine directors indicated including children who were enrolled in private and parochial schools in their survey of handicapped children. Twenty-two directors included the enrollment figures of private and parochial schools in the total population for a more accurate incidence figure tabulation.

21. Ten directors felt 65 to 75 percent of the handicapped children across the state would be receiving special education services by 1973-74.

22. Twenty-three directors reported concern that mandatory legislation would be instrumental in the development of quantitative rather than qualitative special education programs.

23. Twenty-three directors reported some type of evaluative provisions were being made to evaluate their comprehensive plans.

24. New and expanded special education programs were being planned before mandatory legislation by 34 directors.

[And then along came P.L. 94-142..... Thanks, Henry, for a job well done.] □



## ADMINISTRATORS' CORNER

**Brett Bollinger** (New Albany-Floyd), Jim Durst (Blind School), Leslie Durst (Resource Center), **Charles Edwards** (South Central), Sonja Frantz (Blumberg Center), Mike Furnish (Special Olympics), Sharon Henderson (Jay-Randolph), **Darcy Hopko** (Alexandria), Fran Johnson (Huntington County), Roger Kryder (Northeast), Bill Littlejohn (Blumberg Center), **Jacki Lynn** (MSD Pike), Angie McKinney (Blumberg Center), **Cindy Pittman** (Avon), **Annette Razor** (Blue River Valley), Sally Schenkel (Huntington) were participants in the first session on November 20-21 of the 1996-97 ISEAS Academy: Leadership and Education for Administrators in Special Education. The theme for Academy II is Life in the Balance. The final session will be held on January 20-21, 1997 in the Kitselman Center at Ball State University.

**Sheila Decaroli**, director of special education at Anderson Community Schools, attended the annual National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Conference in New Orleans the week of November 18th through a conference sponsorship provided by the ISEAS Steering Committee.

**Bill Dreibelbis**, director of special education for Carmel Clay Schools, was recognized with the Education Award at Noble of Indiana's annual celebration for his work in promoting services for graduating high school students.

Bob Robertson, former consultant with the DOE Division of Special Education and current coordinator with Elkhart County Special Education Cooperative, sends the following message as he recovers at home from cardiac surgery:

"I can't tell you how much I appreciated the many cards, flowers, and prayers I received during my recovery. It helped a lot. Thank you for remembering me.

I'm feeling stronger every day, and I expect a full recovery. My low fat, low sodium diet is taking off more weight than I would like, but I'm sure that will rectify itself when my appetite improves.

A crisis like this makes one think about what is important in life. One of the things I reaffirmed in my life is how important my work is to me. I hope you feel the same. As special educators, we make a profound difference in the life of children with disabilities. We are truly fortunate to have the opportunity to serve them."

Bob's home address is: 23270 County Road 28, Elkhart 46517.



## HAPPY BIRTHDAY!

January 4  
**Jackie Gruesbeck**  
 Smith-Green-West Allen  
 Special Education Cooperative

January 7  
**Mary A. Murray**  
 Southwestern-Jefferson County  
 Schools

January 11  
**Bill McKinney**  
 Northeast Indiana Special  
 Education Cooperative

January 13  
**Bob Marra**  
 Division of Special Education

January 13  
**Fred McNulty**  
 Porter County Education  
 Interlocal

January 28  
**Robin Parker**  
 Division of Special Education



# ISEAS

## Steering Committee

### Meeting Minutes

**November 13, 1996**

*[These minutes are considered unofficial until approval at the next meeting on December 18, 1996.]*

**Members Present:** Phyllis Craig, North Central Representative; Mary Jo Dare, Central Representative; Sheila Decaroli, East Representative; Muriel Downey, Northeast Representative; Brett Bollinger, Southeast Representative; Saundra Lange, Southwest Representative; Joan Machuca, Northwest Representative; and, Jeff Young, ICASE Representative

**Members Absent:** Bob Marra, Director, Division of Special Education

**Staff Present:** Gary Collings, ISEAS Executive Director and Susie Thacker, ISEAS Executive Assistant

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Gary Collings as ISEAS Executive Director.

**Approvals: MOTION: Minutes from the October 23, 1996 meeting were presented. With a motion by Decaroli/second by Machuca, the minutes were approved as written.**

**Mini-Grants:** Expenditures to date of \$500 mini-grants:

Central Roundtable	\$ 0.00
East Roundtable	0.00
North Central Roundtable	361.82
Northeast Roundtable	0.00
Northwest Roundtable	0.00
Southeast Roundtable	0.00
Southwest Roundtable	0.00

**Mini-Grant Applications/Reports: Southwest -** Jim Jacobs joined the roundtable to discuss EH certification through Indiana State University. The next three meetings the roundtable will rotate members leading discussions on current practices that are successful in their areas.

**Northwest -** Mike Livovich will give a presentation on 504 at the Northwest Roundtable meeting on November 13.

**East -** East Roundtable is in the process of securing speakers for roundtable meetings.

**Central -** The roundtable is dividing into sub-committees in an effort to be more effective.

**Southeast -** The next roundtable meeting will be Friday, November 15.

**North Central -** Focus for the November 25 North Central Roundtable meeting will be reviewing residential and alternative residential placements.

**Northeast -** Northeast Roundtable will use their \$500 mini-grant to cover costs of meeting rooms for roundtable meetings and to support the cost of speakers for the roundtable retreat.

**Roundtable Calendars:** Northeast Roundtable submitted their calendar of roundtable meetings for the year.

**Lighthouse Applications:** No new Lighthouse applications have been received to date.

**Administrative Study Keyclub (ASK):** No applications have been received.

**1996-97 Events/Reports: OT/PT Topical Session:** Dare and Collings reported the Eighth Annual ED-MED Conference held Thursday, October 24, 1996 at the Indianapolis Convention Center was attended by over 500 and seemed very well received. ISEAS sponsored one of the nine presentations at which Vicki Hershman, State Coordinator for Partnerships for Assistive Technology with Indiana Schools (PATINS), presented. Jackie Nink Pflug delivered the keynote address on "Learning to Live with a Traumatic Brain Injury".

There was discussion as to whether ISEAS should support a separate workshop for OT/PTs in an educational setting. Bollinger said he would support ISEAS sponsoring a workshop to bring together OT/PTs, teachers, school administrators, etc. for a team-approach. He also suggested the scope might be broadened to include transportation directors and training bus drivers. The Committee asked whether there was any current effort to revise

*continued on page 8*



OT/PT Guidelines. **CONSENSUS: Representatives should go back to their roundtables to determine if there is an interest in a workshop on school-based therapies. Collings will talk with Paul Ash, DOE Division, regarding the current status of OT/PT Guidelines.**

#### *Secretaries/Support Staff*

**Seminar:** Approximately 115 special education secretaries and support staff participated in the annual ISEAS Secretaries/Support Staff Seminar on Tuesday, November 12, 1996 at the Holiday Inn North, Indianapolis. Concurrent sessions for the morning were: (1) Conflict Resolution with Jeff Young and Mary Jo Dare; (2) Parent/Public Relations with Mike Livovich; (3) Cracker Barrel Panel Discussions on Selected Topics with Jeff Young, Mary Jo Dare, and Sheila Decaroli; and (4) Staying Well at Work - Coping, Surviving, and Thriving with Sue Ann Specht, Health Promotion Services at St. Vincent Hospitals. Craig Zablocki presented at the afternoon session on Lighten Up and Laugh for the Health of It.

Collings suggested roundtables might consider Sue Ann Specht as a possible resource for roundtable presentations.

**ACTION: Young noted he will bring to the next meeting copies of minutes he took during the Cracker Barrel session.** Decaroli suggested that in the future interaction might better be encouraged by dividing the Cracker Barrel discussion into smaller groups. She also suggested participants be asked in advance to be prepared with topics they wish

to discuss. Downey asked if a session for directors on how to work well with their secretaries could be presented at a future date.

**LEASE Academy II:** A participants' list for the second annual LEASE Academy was reviewed. Collings reported 17 applications have been received to date. In order to increase the numbers and accommodate any late registrations, the deadline has been extended up to the time of the first session, November 20-21, 1996. The second session will be January 20-21, 1997. The theme of the Academy is "Life in the Balance" and is hosted by ISEAS and presented by the Center for Organizational Resources (COR) of Ball State University.

**LEASE Academy III:** A follow-up letter from Collings to Dr. Leonard Burrello, Smith Research Center, Indiana University, regarding preliminary plans for a third LEASE Academy was discussed. In the letter, Collings expressed the Steering Committee's suggestion that the third Academy at Bloomington be reduced to two total days to be held either the week of January 26 or February 4, 1998 with a focus on Strategic Alliances. The topics have been narrowed to Communications including the media and Marketing.

A draft of a survey to be sent to directors regarding the theme, timing, and costs of the Academy was reviewed. Suggestions for revisions are:

1. Add "Other Suggested Dates?"
2. Add "Would you prefer to

stay with a four-day format?"

3. Add "If you would like a more on-going format, would you be interested in including week-ends?"

4. Expand survey to include items of interest for a larger professional development focus

5. Add question regarding including open participation

Collings will bring a revised survey to the December meeting for approval.

**Trainers' Bureau:** In the late summer and fall of each year the ISEAS office gets requests for local district experts who might be available to conduct inservice training sessions on various topics. It has been suggested a list be compiled of local trainers who could be made available with their director's permission. Collings presented a draft of a survey to be sent to directors asking them to list any members of their staff who they would nominate to conduct training sessions in another district. Suggestions for areas to be included in the list are alternative education/alternatives to expulsion, discipline/behavior management, inclusion, program review, transition, legal/due process, alternative residential/wraparound, integrated therapy models, clerical/data/office practices, and categorical - such as autism. Directors will be asked to note any additional topics/names according to the expertise of their staff. The completed forms can be returned to either roundtable representatives or the ISEAS



continued on page 9

*ISEAS • continued from page 8*

office. The survey will be revised and brought to the December meeting.

**Conference Sponsorships/ Reports:** *NASDSE:* The 59th Annual NASDSE Meeting will be held November 17-20, 1996 at the Royal Sonesta Hotel in New Orleans. The theme of the meeting is "Accountability in a World Class Education System for Individuals with Disabilities". Sheila Decaroli, Anderson, will represent ISEAS at the meeting. Muriel Downey is the alternate.

*CEC:* Salt Lake City will be the site for the International CEC Conference April 9-13, 1997.

*LRP:* The annual LRP Conference will be held May 4-7, 1997 in San Diego.

**University Forum: Organizational Meeting:** The Forum has decided it will not have a faculty rally this year in conjunction with IFCEC.

Cathy Shea, chairperson, has been in contact with the president of the Indiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (IACTE) about special education topics for teacher training. Shea has an invitation for Forum members or representatives to attend the December 6 meeting of the IACTE at Keystone at the Crossing. In lieu of the next Forum meeting, all members will be invited to attend the IACTE meeting and stay through the discussion at lunch.

Copies of the full minutes from the November 1 meeting are

available upon request from the ISEAS office.

**Other Business: PATINS Recycled Computers Project:** A list of software and related items that have been donated to the PATINS Project by PC Review Magazine was distributed. These are available on a first come, first serve basis. Those interested in receiving any of these items for disabled, at-risk or disadvantaged students/classrooms may contact Vicki Hershman, PATINS State Project Coordinator, at 317/243-1311.

**Gallup Educational Perceiver Interviews:** Joan Machuca briefed the Committee on the Gallup Organization's Teacher Perceiver Interview. Six from her district are certified in the Teacher Perceiver process. This interview assists in the effective selection, placement and development of outstanding teachers. Seminars are conducted at locations nationwide and can be arranged locally. Personnel directors and school administrators are invited to attend the first two days of the six-day training process where they will be introduced to the interview through a hands-on learning experience. Certification on this research-based interview is completed in two or three sessions. Teacher Perceiver themes are Mission, Empathy, Innovation, Focus, Listening, Rapport Drive, Activation, Objectivity, Input Drive, Investment and Individualized Perception. **NOTE: Members asked that Collings explore the feasibility of having Gallup present their two-day introductory session as a stand alone**

**phase of Academy III after July 1997.**

**IDEAS Videotape Series:** The videotape series "Indiana Designs for Educating All Students, (IDEAS), is now completed and is being packaged for distribution. The thirteen-tape series is facilitated by Marilyn Friend, IUPUI.

**"Who are the Children Being Born Today":** Anyone interested in using this video may contact the ISEAS office.

**"Look Who's Laughing":** The video is currently in the ISEAS office.

**Next Meeting:**

- December 18, 1996 (Wednesday)
- Holiday Inn North
- 8:00 AM - Coffee and Rolls
- 8:30 AM - ISEAS Steering Committee Meeting (to be followed by Division Report and ICASE Executive Committee Meeting) □

---

## ISEAS University Forum

**November 1, 1996**

**Members Present:** Cathy Shea (IUS), Jane Swiss (St. Francis), Victoria Keetay (ISU), Lynn Holdheide (DOE), Ann Smith (ICASE), Jim Murray (ICASE), Gary Collings (ISEAS).



*continued on page 10*

**Others Present:** Terri Drozd, administrative intern at Hamilton-Boone-Madison Special Services Cooperative

1. **Minutes** - The September 27, 1996 minutes were accepted as mailed.

2. **Assistive Technology Task Force** - Shea reported that Mary Beth Janes could not attend today due to a schedule conflict. Janes sent her report by fax which was distributed to members. This report will be discussed at the February 1997 meeting. Janes continues her work on the Listserv for all faculty members.

3. **Rally Replacement Activities** - Shea commented that the Forum will likely meet on a campus in 1997. **ACTION: Shea will contact IU-B about hosting in February.**

4. **Distance Learning Committee** - no report

5. **Professional Development** - Shea reported on the October 23, 1997 ICASE Executive Committee meeting which she, Cathy Pratt, and Lyle Lloyd attended. She distributed a list of 27 comments which the directors suggested for teacher training.

Shea has been in contact with the president of the Indiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (IACTE) about special education topics for teacher training. Swiss recently attended an ATE/IACTE conference at Turkey Run State Park. As the IPSB standards/competencies were discussed at the conference, she

questioned the lack of content regarding basics all teachers should know to teach all children including those with special needs.

Shea has an invitation for Forum members or representatives to attend the December 6 meeting of the IACTE at Indiana Wesleyan University Building at Keystone at the Crossing. This is the scheduled date for the next University Forum meeting. **CONSENSUS: In lieu of the next Forum meeting, all members will be invited to attend the IACTE meeting and stay through the discussion at lunch. Details will be mailed to all Forum members.**

6. **IPSB Exceptional Needs Standards/Hearing** - Ann Smith reported that she had not yet received the Exceptional Needs paper from the Indiana Professional Standards Board. Shea noted the IPSB timeline handout indicated the dissemination begins on November 15 with a projected IPSB adoption in January 1998. Smith anticipates receiving a copy of the paper and will see that it gets forwarded to the Forum members. Smith distributed a handout about the restructuring of the exceptional student education certification in Florida.

As a means of exploring what and how we would seek input, Shea asked members to respond to the question of "What can these preservice teachers tell us and what vehicle will help that happen?". The responses are noted as an addendum at the end of these minutes.

Members questioned whether

the proposed competencies for a generalist would have sufficient emphasis, for example, in behavior management. Swiss suggested Forum members may need to review local programs in the field and how districts have successfully moved away from categorical approaches. Our questions may be around what makes for good teaching as well as how and why. Terri Drozd noted that her school is building a partnership with an area university. Ann Smith encouraged the continued interaction with the ICASE Executive Committee. Members discussed the possibility of seeking more teacher training input from inservice teachers.

Members were asked to collect their thoughts around the above proposal and then each presented their comments. **ACTION: Shea proposed that she contact Daena Richmond to request that Forum representatives be on the ICASE Executive Committee agenda for their January 1997 meeting. Shea, Swiss, Keetay will draft the focus questions which they would like to discuss with ICASE.** The flip chart notes are listed in the addendum below.

7. **ITI Transition Paper** - Shea reported that Rogan could not attend due to teaching responsibilities. Holdheide noted that the transition paper is an assessment document to review training options. Rogan will distribute the paper to local directors and Forum members.

continued on page 11



ISEAS • continued from page 10

8. **Division Report** - no report

9. **University Reports** - Shea reviewed the handouts: the Sex Offender Registry is available on the Internet at <http://www.ai.org/cji/> and the National Clearinghouse of Professions in Special Education at <http://www.cec.sped.org/ncpse.htm> on the Internet; the 10 year limited license report indicating 91% of the limited licenses were in special education; and the announcement of the 1997 CEC/CCBD professional development opportunities.

10. **Next Meeting:** December 6 attendance at IACTE (details to be mailed)

No January 1997 meeting

February 1997 meeting to be held on campus of one of our member universities

**ADDENDUM (Item #6):**  
“What can preservice teachers tell us and what vehicle will help that happen?”

a. Holdheide - talk to teach-

ers to see how to determine needs and develop strategies; how to capitalize on strengths, environment, and whole person?

b. Collings - where does this fit into our other activities and with IPSB standards? What is our primary focus and commitments?

c. Smith - character of the person; how much inservice (self or district)? How much time as sole agent or as a collaborator with family? Did they have general education training first?

d. Drozd - collaboration is vital; life-long learners is the place we want to go; need to do it; take all data and see how IHE can implement.

e. Keetay - seek the teachers' perspective of why they are good. Identify effective generalists; partnership between IHE and K-12 to collect data; basic job description of skills. What aspects of training were positive/negative? What inservice has been good or needed?

Variables of administrative

support, personal characteristics, etc. Were the teachers in general education first?

f. Murray - how to get the bang for the buck? What's our purpose? How can we be effective in bringing about change? What is the IHE committed to change? Can they ignore IPSB? Need to bring practitioners to university level as can no longer afford to be separate.

g. Swiss - teacher trainers were trained differently than they now need to train others. IHEs may be out of step. Have directors select sites to survey teachers; forum and districts could have a task force to look at training, etc.; bring information back to see if there is a pattern; directors would need to agree on a “standard” description of a site to study; then forum could develop a vision of teacher training; present vision to directors for discussion.

h. Shea - take a list of competencies; prioritize those needed at undergraduate with implications for lecture, field experience, general side, etc.; development; learned on job. □



**ICASE  
Executive Committee  
Meeting Minutes**

November 13, 1996

**Information from ICASE**

ISEAS Office - Indianapolis

[These minutes are considered a draft until approved at the next scheduled meeting.]

**Members Present:** Daena

Richmond (President), Russ Dawson (President-elect), Jan Rees (Treasurer), Gary Collings (Secretary), Jeff Young (Past-

continued on page 12



President), Joan Machuca (NW), Muriel Downey (NE), Mary Jo Dare (C), Saundra Lange (SW), Brett Bollinger (SE), Sheila Decaroli (E), Phyllis Craig (NC)

**Members Absent:** None

**Others Present:** Patti Kem, Judy Flowers, Sharon Henderson, Marilyn Faris

I. Approvals

A. **MOTION: After a motion by Kem/Dare, the October 23, 1996 Executive Committee minutes were approved as submitted.**

B. Rees presented a comprehensive balance sheet and docket of outstanding bills. **MOTION: After a motion by Bollinger/Young, the November 23, 1996 treasurer's report, showing a balance of \$38,006.06, and the docket of outstanding bills totaling \$2,546.36 were approved as submitted.**

Rees discussed her on-going negotiation with IRS regarding the not-for-profit status under either the educational organization or business leagues. Rees presented a paper with five recommendations regarding the ICASE treasurer's position and responsibilities. In response members recommended that:

1. the nomination committee consider maintaining both the current treasurer and accountant for the next officer cycle;

2. Rees develop a system for maintenance of records and reports;

3. ISEAS project maintain a financial records archives for a period of seven years;

4. the Roundtable Development Committee develop guidelines on how roundtables may expend funds in keeping with the ICASE not-for-profit status;

5. the roundtable professional development funds be maintained by the treasurer with expenditures approved by the Executive Committee and noted on the payment docket in the minutes; and

6. that Rees develop an agreement for the accountant (Ruth Kenney) to be provided \$2,000 annually with an outline of responsibilities. **MOTION WITHDRAWN:** (Young/Decaroli) to provide accountant \$2,000 annually. Young asked that the minutes also reflect the Executive Committee's appreciation for the efforts of Jan Rees in setting up the system and dealing with both the IRS and Indiana Secretary of State.

II. Strategic Plan: 1996-97

A. Goal I: Encourage communication, support, and promotion of administrators of special education.

1. Report: Colleague Accomplishments - Kem reported that Bob Robertson is now home. Susan Sullivan has returned to work for short periods and will continue her treatments.

2. Report: CASE Board of Directors - Richmond pointed out highlights from the

October 18-19 CASE Board of Directors meeting in St. Louis including: issues from the field, common themes likely in the reauthorization which will start over with the 105th Congress, and replies to what CASE is both doing and needs to do for its membership. Richmond noted that it takes the second year to understand these national board meetings and suggested we needed more continuity in our representation.

**MOTION APPROVED: Dare/Flower moved that ICASE also pay the expenses for the past president to attend CASE board meetings (April/October) the third year along with the president-elect. It was understood that only the ICASE president would have authority to vote.**

3. Discussion: Utilization of Revenue - Richmond said she would chair a committee to compile ideas collected from the roundtables to make recommendations at the December Executive Committee meeting. Young, Dare and Collings volunteered to serve on this committee which will meet in Anderson on the afternoon of November 22.

B. Goal II: Promote the improvement of the education profession.

1. Report: IRTA Scholarship Applications - Richmond reviewed the application



continued on page 13

*ICASE • continued from page 12*

and scholarship guidelines offered by the Indiana Retired Teachers Association Foundation for students who plan to become teachers. Applications are due February 15, 1997.

2. Report: University Forum - Ann Smith provided an update to Richmond regarding the Forum members' interest in directors' input on teacher preparation competencies. The Forum will meet on December 6 in conjunction with a meeting of the Indiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (IACTE). Since neither Ann Smith nor Jim Murray can attend, Richmond asked for alternates. Muriel Downey will attend and bring a representative from IPFW.

3. Report: February 1997 Conference - Russ Dawson reported that he met with the IFCEC President (Olivia Parker) and toured the Radisson in final preparation for the ICASE Spring Conference during the IFCEC Convention. There will be an ICASE/IFCEC mixer on Thursday evening to be followed by the Fun Night with a Mardi Gras theme.

4. Information: ICASE Response to Interpreter Service Standards - Richmond called attention to Sharon Henderson's October 31 letter to Becky Noller (FSSA Division of Disability, Aging, and Rehabilitation Services) in regard to the issue of a licensure system of sign language interpreters. As chairperson of the ICASE Public Policy Committee, Henderson noted that such licensure would cause undo burden on the educational budget

as well as create a personnel situation making it difficult to fill these positions.

5. Report: IAPSS Information & Research Commission - Daena Richmond reported that Robb Warriner (IPS) attended this IAPSS briefing on ISTEP scores.

C. Goal III: Support the acquisition of adequate funding at local, state, and federal levels to meet the needs of children and youth with disabilities

1. IAPSS Legislative Platform and Resolutions - Sharon Henderson stated that the legislative committee had reviewed both the IAPSS platform as well as the COVOH position paper. ICASE needs to also develop a position paper to allow Roger Williams to know which legislative proposals to support in the education arena. COVOH has asked Richmond for a letter of support for their assistive technology "lemon law" proposal for which they have yet to find a sponsor. The General Assembly may not convene until the second week of January 1997 through April for this long session.

2. Report: ICASE Legislative Platform - Henderson commented that ICASE will not have a separate platform but perhaps a set of principles to guide in supporting various education related bills. Members discussed whether we should develop a position on alternative schools which will likely be proposed. It was agreed that alternative education programming is different from alternative schools.

Henderson asked if it would

be appropriate for ICASE to lobby for ESY funds above summer school and ISTEP remediation levels. Members thought not at this time. There was consensus, however, that the state assessment/remediation program should be re-normed to include students with disabilities. It was also discussed that additional funds for related services and transition might best be approached by supporting increases in vocational education and the general fund.

D. Goal IV: Encourage the development of an infrastructure to support persons with disabilities in their local communities

1. Report: ISTA/ICASE Fall Conference - Richmond reviewed the evaluation summary from the October 24-25, 1996 ISTA Issues Conference which was jointly sponsored by ICASE and other organizations. She requested permission to plan a future joint conference with ISTA and possibly Phi Delta Kappa. **MOTION APPROVED: Dare/Lange to proceed with the planning and bring back a proposal with funding request.**

2. Nomination: Two Individuals to Serve on Committee to Write Memorandums for Serving Students in Alternative Locations - Richmond asked for two volunteers to join Linda Duncan at South LaPorte in the development of a memo of understanding with the Department of Corrections regarding Camp Summit (a juvenile boot

*continued on page 14*



ICASE • continued from page 13

camp). Dare volunteered and will contact Bill McKinney to join them as his area may be receiving a similar camp from a Colorado-based organization.

E. Goal V: Promote Collaboration with Department of Education and the Division of Special Education.

1. Report: State Advisory Council - Mary Jo Dare reported that the November 8 meeting which was completely devoted to Mill Creek Corporation's request to transfer

from Old National Trails to West Central Joint Services. The concerns were the potential gap left at Old National Trail and increasing the size of an already large cooperative. The December meeting is when the vote to approve or disapprove the Mill Creek request will be taken. Jan Rees also noted that the Discipline Committee, which she has chaired, will file their report at this same advisory council meeting.

F. Other Business - Richmond reviewed the Division's Special Education Report on

Alternative Services which Bob Marra is presenting today at the State Budget Hearing.

G. Next Meeting: The next meeting will be held on December 18, 1996 at Holiday Inn North with the time scheduled as follows: 8:00 a.m. Coffee & Rolls

8:30 a.m. ISEAS Steering Committee Meeting

10:15 a.m. Division Report

11:00 a.m. ICASE Executive Committee Meeting □

## License Renewal via CRUs

[Editor's Note: The following is a November 14, 1996 reply to Gary Collings from Nancy Taylor, director of Teacher Testing and Continuing Education at the Indiana Professional Standards Board.]

I am writing this letter in answer to your questions about CRU credit, academic credit, and license renewal.

It is true that a license renewal applicant will need to obtain a renewal application form from either Teacher Licensing or a

college/university advisor. If the applicant has academic credit for renewal, the licensing advisor will verify that credit. Also, if the applicant has a combination of academic credit and CRU credit, the licensing advisor will verify only the academic credit. It will be the responsibility of the applicant to provide copies of his/her CRU certificates for verification of those CRU credits. (This office provides a program sponsor with a sample certificate which that sponsor prepares and distributes to program participants.)

If the renewal applicant wants to renew with only CRU credits, he/she obtains a renewal application from Teacher Licensing or a licensing advisor and submits it along with copies of his/her CRU certificates to Teacher Licensing.

Some CRU participants do not keep their certificates even though the certificate is marked "retain for your files." We can verify an applicant's CRU credits through our data base if necessary.

Thank you for your interest in providing correct information. □

## ISBA Legal Services Information

The Indiana Supreme Court has issued its ruling in MARION TEACHERS ASSOCIATION V. MARION COMMUNITY SCHOOL CORPORATION, the case involving management's

right to appoint teachers to sole instrumentality committees. The Supreme Court agreed with the IEERB interpretation and ruled that the union has the exclusive right to appoint the teacher

members to sole instrumentality committees. According to the Court, if the union is to conduct



continued on page 15

ISBA • continued from page 14

effective discussions with school management on mandatory subjects of discussion, “it must be able to appoint all those responsible for representing its’ members views.”

However, the Court also acknowledged that where discussion occurs in another forum,

management would not be obligated to allow the union the right to appoint the teacher members. Thus, there may be some opportunity for management to appoint teachers if sole instrumentality committees are not the only avenue for discussion.

The ISBA Legal Services will

be mailing a detailed memorandum on the Courts ruling in January 1997. For additional information telephone 317/639-3591.

SOURCE: ISBA.News bulletin board posting on Indiana SECN 12/11/96. □

## OSERS/OSEP . . .

### Highlights of the Address by Thomas Hehir at the NASDSE Annual Meeting

— At the Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Directors of Special Education in New Orleans during the week of November 18, Thomas Hehir, director of the Office of Special Education Programs, addressed a general session. The following is a summary of his comments.

### The Progress of Special Education

Although this field is closing the gap between persons with and without disabilities in postsecondary and college education, employment, and other arenas, we are too self-critical. We should be celebrating these successes, the most significant education reform of the last 20 years. We should also be informing the public and policy makers that, because we have offered the right to education to students with disabilities for 22 years, these individuals have lives of greater dignity, and the country will reap many benefits from their productivity as citizens and tax payers.

### Accountability

In addressing the accountability theme of the conference, Dr. Hehir pointed to equal access to high standards and high expectations as a mutual goal of NASDSE and OSEP. He reviewed the three components of accountability of the NASDSE model (accountability for input/process; for individual student outcomes; for program effectiveness), and said that most of our attention has heretofore been focused on the input/process component (assessment, Individual Education Plan, free and appropriate public education, etc). While we move to greater emphasis on the other components, there is some tendency to give up on the process emphasis — yet these are critical components for children and their parents and must not be forgotten. “Results monitoring” is replacing “compliance monitoring,” but it is important to look for the procedural compliance factors that most influence good outcomes for kids — the IEP is the central process on which special education relies. We can’t neglect process while we focus more on outcomes.

Dr. Hehir emphasized his commitment to the federal-state partnership between his office and State Directors of Special Education. This partnership is working toward corrective action plans that will improve implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and on how to improve the OSEP discretionary programs. OSEP has reorganized into two divisions (a state improvement division and a support division). The discretionary programs are part of the support program, and they exist only to improve the implementation of Part B and Part H of IDEA. In this regard, teacher preparation has to align as closely as possible to the needs of local schools and state education agencies and respond to their realities and priorities. OSEP will also be examining its technical assistance system to ensure that it is responsive to the needs anticipated for the future. The partnership also needs to continue to develop strong connections among special education, elementary and secondary education, Goals 2000, School-to-Work programs, and many other programs and agencies. Another goal of the partnership is to increase appropriations for special education.

continued on page 16



*OSERS/OSEP . . . • continued from page 15*

### On the Horizon for OSERS

The biggest new initiative coming up for the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services will be a significant initiative on employment of individuals with disabilities. This will be a government-wide initiative, with White House leadership, to promote systemic change across agencies through discretionary funds to support and improve employment for people with disabilities.

SOURCE: GTE INS Federal newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 11/25/96.

**Assistive Technology and IEPs** — [Editor's Note: The following is the text of an April 11, 1996 letter from Thomas Hehir, director of the federal Office of Special Education Programs to a concerned citizen as posted on the Division News & Notes bulletin board of the Indiana SECN 12/5/96.]

This is in response to your letter asking whether local educational agencies (LEAs) are required to include a section addressing assistive technology in individualized education programs (IEPs) for children with disabilities.

Assistive technology devices and services must be addressed in a child's IEP to the extent that these devices and/or services are needed to ensure that the child receives a free appropriate public education (FAPE) in accordance with Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Part B).

Under 34 CFR 300.308 of the

Part B regulations each public agency must ensure that assistive technology devices or services, or both, as those terms are defined at 34 CFR 300.5 and 300.6, are made available to a child with a disability if required as part of the child's special education under 34 CFR 300.17, related services under 34 CFR 300.16, or supplementary aids and services under 34 CFR 300.550 (b) (2). As you noted in your letter, the determination as to whether a child with a disability requires an assistive technology device and/or service in order to receive FAPE must be made on an individual basis by the participants on the student's IEP team in accordance with applicable IEP requirements.

The IEP for each child with a disability must contain a statement of the special education and related services to be provided to the child. See 34 CFR 300.346 (a) (3). Thus, if the IEP team determines that a child with a disability requires an assistive technology device or service as part of the child's special education or related services, the specific devices and/or services must be identified in the child's IEP. Similarly, assistive technology devices and services needed to facilitate a student's participation in a regular education program must also be reflected in the child's IEP. See Appendix C to 34 CFR Part 300, question 48. On the other hand, an IEP need not address assistive technology if the IEP team determines that assistive technology devices and services are not needed as part of the child's special education, related services, or supplementary aids and services.

Structure and organization of the IEP document is left to the discretion of the State or local education agency. Each IEP,

however, must satisfy the IEP requirements in Part B, including the above requirements related to assistive technology.

### Personnel Standards —

[Editor's Note: The following is the text of May 17, 1996 letter from Thomas Hehir, director of the federal Office of Special Education Programs, to the senior executive director of the American Association of School Administrators as posted on the Division News & Notes of the Indiana SECN 12/10/96.]

This is in response to your letter dated February 23, 1996, written on behalf of the American Association of School Administrators. In your letter, you request clarification regarding the scope of the personnel standards provisions of Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Part B).

In the situation you describe, the State has only one licensing agency that is authorized under State law to license teachers, and the State statute for licensure currently requires special education teachers to have a bachelors level undergraduate degree and "some" graduate credit. Your specific question is:

"Would it violate IDEA for a state legislature to change the state statute regarding licensure for special education teachers from a bachelors level degree and "some graduate credit" to "a bachelors degree with a major in special education?"

Part B's personnel standards

*continued on page 17*



OSERS/OSEP . . . • continued from page 16

provisions require each State plan to include policies and procedures relating to the establishment and maintenance of standards to ensure that personnel necessary to carry out the purposes of Part B are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained.” 34 CFR 300.153 (b) (1). These policies and procedures must provide for “the establishment and maintenance of standards that are consistent with any State approved or recognized certification, licensing, or other comparable requirements that apply to the profession or discipline in which a person is providing special education or related services.” 34 CFR 300.153 (b) (2). States are required to establish and maintain standards for entry-level employment of personnel in each profession or discipline providing special education and related services to children with disabilities that are based on the highest entry-level academic degree requirement across all State agen-

cies applicable to serving children and youth with disabilities. 34 CFR 300.153 (e). If the State educational agency’s (SEA) standard for personnel in a specific profession or discipline is not based on the “highest requirements in the State across all State agencies,” States are required by 34 CFR 300.153 (c) to develop and implement a plan for the retraining or hiring of personnel to meet appropriate professional requirements in the State.

The term “highest requirements in the State applicable to a specific profession or discipline” means the “highest entry-level academic degree needed for any State approved or recognized certification, licensing, registration, or other comparable requirements that apply to that profession or discipline.” 34 CFR 300.153 (a) (2) (emphasis added). In identifying the “highest requirements in the State applicable to a specific profession or disci-

pline,” the requirements of all State statutes and the rules of all State agencies applicable to serving children and youth with disabilities must be surveyed. 34 CFR 300.153 (e).

In the hypothetical situation proposed in your inquiry, the State licensing agency would continue to require special education teachers to attain a bachelor’s degree, just as under the current licensure standard. The proposed legislative change would eliminate the requirement for some graduate credit beyond a bachelor’s degree, but would add a major in special education as a condition for licensure. The conditions for licensure that change in your hypothetical fall outside the scope of the “entry-level academic degree requirement.” Therefore, the hypothetical statutory change described in your letter would not violate Part B’s personnel standards provisions. □

## OCR . . .

**Child Not Required to Test Glucose Out of Class** — The parents of a ten year old with Juvenile Diabetes Millitus, a non-communicable disease, filed a complaint with the Office for Civil Rights. The parents were concerned that while their child has been placed in a regular education class he is required to leave the classroom to test his blood sugar and that this unnecessarily segregates their son based on misperceptions about the disability.

The district responded that there are more than 30 students throughout the district that test their blood

glucose and that all test outside the classroom. This policy was based on the disruptiveness to the overall class, the safety of the other students and “good common sense”. The location for testing is not in the IEP.

The Office for Civil Rights found that the decision concerning testing location was based on a school wide practice and was not based on the needs of the individual student. Addition OCR found that the district had not considered whether in-class testing could be achieved satisfactorily with the use of supplemental aids and services. OCR found the district was in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and had denied the

student a free appropriate public education. The district was ordered to hold an IEP meeting to discuss the testing of blood glucose in the classroom. The district was ordered to submit the IEP addendum and a report of the meeting to OCR.

Reprinted with permission from Parents’ Newsletter on Special Education Law. To obtain more information about this newsletter write to P.O. Box 4571, Chapel hill, NC 27515-4571.

SOURCE: GTE INS ADA.Independent newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 12/9/96. □





# Department of Education News

## ■ CSC Meeting Minutes •

December 9, 1996 — CSCs

**present:** JoAnn Engquist, Porter Co.; Marsha Mulroony, Dubois-Spencer Perry; Sandy Wooton, Johnson Co.; Geneva Vinson, Elkhart; Greg Hilligoss, Richmond; Trace Benedict, Hamilton-Boone-So. Madison; Terry Tahara, South Bend; Ginger Arvin, IPS; Karen S. Hendrix, WCJS; Cathy Pardee, ISD; Cathy McCormick, New Albany; David Jann, Warren Township.

**Guests:** Cynthia Feaster, HBD, Inc.; Michelle Tennell, Juvenile Justice; Edith Ervin, LaPorte Co. Step Ahead, Scott Newton, Child Advocates, Carol Yates, Child Advocates.

**IDOE Staff:** Laurel Elliott, Carol Eby

### CSC Action Plan:

Discussion covered CSC 3 goals:

1. To expand wrap around in Indiana
2. Ways to serve non-CSC Directors of Special Education
3. To encourage the usage of child/family teams and supportive community teams.

Ideas included: focusing on bringing Step Ahead along to accept ownership of the community team process; use of Wrap-around Conference; develop the

concept of Building-Based teams; use of videos on interagency collaboration; sharing of presentation packets; being included in IDOE ARS meeting in early 1997 to discuss the concept of interagency collaboration.

There was discussion about using staffings to do strengths based discovery. Folks were asked to bring presentation materials for next meeting. Karen will demonstrate LitePro next meeting.

Plan of Actions with all recommendations will be mailed along with December's minutes.

### Child Advocates:

Laurel Elliott, Carol Yates, and Scott Newton discussed the work of Child Advocates. Juvenile Justice Task Force and Child Advocates have received a grant to cross-train personnel who deal with children in the adjudicative arena. The training will cover what each representative's role is or should be. The CSCs gave input as to what the training should look like. For the most part, the training would include welfare, juvenile, school personnel in a cross disciplinary setting and would include legal parameters, how to work together, the Guardian Ad Litem program, confidenti-

ality and the sharing of information. It will probably be provided in a regional setting. CSCs cautioned Child Advocates to be mindful of costs, time - it must have relevance or be tied into existing training. Ginger suggested tying in the concept of building-based teaming and using CSCs as part of the training. Child Advocates reported that they intend to do several different kinds of programs. CSCs will try to assist with a list of existing trainings and contacts - to be collected by February's meeting.

### HDB, Inc.

Cynthia Feaster presented information about HDB, Inc., which is a venture to assist agencies to train and support them in a variety of endeavors. This includes training.

### Wraparound Conference:

Cynthia Feaster and Michelle Tennell presented an update on Wraparound Conference. Evaluations were very favorable. Over 90% would attend another conference. Overall, the information was very positive and it seemed that folks want more specialized training. The CSCs formally recognized Michelle and Cynthia

*continued on page 19*



for all their help and support. Cynthia discussed next year's wraparound conference plans. It will be held at the Best Western Waterfront on the west side of Indianapolis. It will run from 8:00 am to 8:00 pm. The morning sessions will focus on Skills and Strategies, while the afternoon can center on teams. A special session will occur in the evening for those who cannot attend during the day. This session would have to be clearly focused to meet the needs of a targeted population, i.e., persons who work directly with children through individualized wraparound plans. The CSCs discussed possible sessions:

- \* child/family teaming - hands on training;
- \* GEI and the wraparound process;
- \* strengths discovery - hands on training;
- \* discipline strategies/ interventions - primary prevention programs;
- \* cross-training that covers welfare, juvenile justice, schools;
- \* include gov't/civic leaders;
- \* open forum - judges address community intervention;

It was suggested that 3 strands be created: Skills - Strategies - Teams. Cynthia requested that folks send her additional ideas for sessions.

**Legal Issues:**

Karen provided a one page summary of the residential services presentation at the ISBA Law Seminar. The page includes

tips to keep in mind when considering residential services.

**IDOE Updates:**

Carol Eby reported that Judy Gilbert is ill and may have to have heart surgery soon. Lynn Holdheide will be helping out with Judy's duties; therefore, she will be off of the ARS Team temporarily. IDOE is training case managers of local OFC and other staff on special education. There have been lots of questions regarding educational surrogate parent issues. Bob Marra has been attending several budget meetings. IDOE will be recommending changes with regard to the contract process which will require legislative action.

Carol attends the Dawn Project meetings for Bob. Through this process, Carol has learned only 10% of alternative/residential students are CHINS. This means approximately 1 IDOE kid/month will be able to access this project. The capitated rate is \$4,300/month. The last initial application review meeting for this year will be December 19, 1996. There are 15 applications pending now. The first meeting of the new year will be January 6, 1997.

Carol also stated that when there is a recommendation to place a student in a facility where there is not an on-grounds school and the student would be attending another public school, it would be wise to involve the receiving school corporation in the planning. There have been some plans where the receiving school corporation said they could not fulfill without additional help from

IDOE. (Ex. A student being placed at Damar, but attending RISE).

**For the Good of the Cause:**

If you have individuals eligible for waiver services, get them on lists now even if there are waiting lists. Changes may occur soon. SSI - form letters are being sent to recipients. Everything is being re-evaluated. Clients do have a right to appeal. Lastly, Cynthia Feaster wants any additional mailing lists in preparation for the Wraparound Conference. She does have the lists from Michelle.

**Silvercrest presentation:**

Gigi McKnight was unable to attend today's meeting. JoAnn, agenda planner for February will check with her to see if she can attend February's meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm. **The next meeting is February 10, 1997 from 9:30 to 3:00 pm at ISEAS.**

■ Fall 1997 ISTEP+ Testing Dates — [Editor's Note: The following is the text of a November 15, 1996 memo to Superintendents from Dr. Steve Grimes, assistant superintendent at the Indiana Department of Education.]

At its November 7 meeting, the State Board of Education established the period **September 22 through October 10, 1997**, as

*continued on page 20*



the testing window for the administration of ISTEP+ next fall. The testing window has been lengthened in order to allow more flexibility for school corporations. In developing your testing schedules, you will want to be sensitive to the fact that the Jewish holiday Rosh Hashanah begins at sundown on October 1 and continues through October 2. The State Board of Education strongly recommends that school corporations not conduct testing during Rosh Hashanah. Although the test to be administered in fall 1997 has not yet been developed, you should assume that it will require approximately the same amount of time to administer as did the fall 1996 test.

**■ ISTEP+ Questions and Answers** — Q1: Does the ISTEP+ Remediation Grant Program replace the former summer remediation program?

A1: Yes. The former summer remediation program has been replaced by the ISTEP+ Remediation Grant Program, which was adopted by the Indiana General Assembly in 1995. School corporations are not limited to summer remediation under the current program, but can provide programs which take place throughout the school year as well as during the summer. Further, regulations applicable to the former summer remediation program (such as a minimum of 80 hours of instruction and no more than 10 students per classroom) are no longer in effect.

Q2: Will there be any difference between regular summer school and summer ISTEP+ remediation and preventive remediation?

A2: There will continue to be a distinction between regular summer school and summer ISTEP+ remediation and preventive remediation programs. School corporations are entitled to claim reimbursement for teacher and aide salary costs related to their regular summer school programs. Reimbursement through the regular summer school program cannot be claimed for any costs relating to a summer ISTEP+ program. Further, costs for regular summer school programs for which reimbursement is claimed will not count toward the local match requirement for the ISTEP+ Remediation Grant Program.

Q3: Are school corporations required to participate in the 1997 ISTEP+ Remediation Grant Program?

A3: Participation in the ISTEP+ Remediation Grant Program is not mandatory. See IC 20-10.1-17-7.5(a) which provides, "The governing body of a school corporation may establish a remediation program or a preventive remediation program under this chapter." Funding for the 1997 ISTEP+ Remediation Grant Program has been made available to all school corporations. School corporations that choose not to participate in the 1997 program will not receive their funding allocation.

Q4: Can a school corporation use ISTEP+ Remediation Grant Program funds to pay for the excess costs associated with a full-day kindergarten program?

A4: It depends. If a school corporation implements a full-day kindergarten program for which all kindergarten-age students are eligible to enroll, no ISTEP+ funds can be used to pay for the costs of such a program. If the corporation systematically selects those kindergarten students who require further work in a full-day program, the program will be considered a qualifying program for which ISTEP+ funds may be used. However, even where the use of ISTEP+ funds is permitted, such funds can only be used for those costs in excess of what it would cost to operate a half-day kindergarten program.

Q5: May a school corporation use ISTEP+ funds to pay for the fringe benefits costs of teachers and aides employed in programs that qualify for ISTEP+ funding?

A5: Yes. Fringe benefits will generally be expanded out of the 26490 expenditure account series [i.e., 26491 (PERF), 26492 (social security), 26493 (Workman's Compensation), 26494 (group insurance), 26497 (TRF), etc.]. However, except for those funds transferred into the Transportation Operating Fund, school corporations must expend funds out of either the 16100 (Remediation Programs) or 16200 (Preventive

continued on page 21



*DOE • continued from page 20*

Remediation Programs) expenditure accounts. Accordingly, school corporations which want employee fringe benefit expenditures to count towards their local match requirement should expend such funds out of either 16100 or 16200 using the appropriate object account (211 for Social Security - Noncertified, 212 for Social Security - Certified, 215 for PERF, etc.).

Q6: Will salaries paid to Title I teachers and aides represent allowable expenditures?

A6: Federal funds that a school corporation receives through Title I are to supplement, and not to supplant funds relating to other programs. Accordingly, salaries paid to staff for their employment through a Title I program will not represent allowable expenditures. Expenditures relating to a Title I program are not to be budgeted out of either 16100 (Remediation Programs) or 16200 (Preventive Remediation Programs) expenditure accounts. Compensation paid to Title I staff for duties unrelated to their Title I responsibilities may be included in either these two accounts where such duties relate to a remediation or preventive remediation program. For example, the salary and employee benefits costs related to a Title I aide's duties in an after-school or Saturday remediation program could be included in either 16100 or 16200 account.

Q7: Will transportation costs directly attributable to a remediation or preventive remediation program be considered part of the corporation's local

match requirement?

A7: It depends. School corporations are permitted to allocate a portion of their funding for transportation costs in an amount up to 5 percent of the total costs associated with a particular remediation program. Amounts so allocated will be transferred from the General Fund to the Transportation Operating Fund. Funds transferred in accordance with these limitations, and properly reported on the corporation's Remediation and Preventive Remediation Grant Program Application, will be counted as part of the corporation's local match. Actual transportation costs directly related to a particular Remediation program which are in excess of funding transferred from the General Fund will not be counted as part of the corporation's local match. Further, school corporations which pay for all transportation costs relating to their remediation and preventive remediation program with available Transportation Operating Fund monies rather than transferring remediation and preventive remediation funding will not count any transportation costs as part of their local match.

Q8: Are school corporations obligated to provide remediation to students who reside within their geographical boundaries but who are enrolled in a nonpublic school?

A8: As a general principle, a nonpublic school student is entitled to participate in academic and vocational programs offered by a public school corporation if

the student: 1) has legal settlement in the corporation; 2) meets the eligibility criteria for the program; and 3) is willing to enroll in the corporation on a part-time basis. Based on this principle, which itself is based on State Board of Education administrative law decisions and an official opinion of the Attorney General, the Department of Education believes that a nonpublic school student is entitled to participate in ISTEP+ remediation and preventive remediation programs offered by the school corporation in which the student has legal settlement. The student must enroll in the corporation and meet the appropriate eligibility criteria (a Tier 1 or Tier 2 student who took ISTEP+ in Spring 1995, or a student who meets the locally developed public eligibility criteria). The Department does not believe that the school corporation is required to give any preference to nonpublic school students or to modify its program to accommodate nonpublic school students. This would include no extraordinary requirement to provide transportation.

While the 1997 General Assembly may consider funding remediation and preventive remediation programs for nonpublic school students, the 1997 program does not include such funding. Public school corporations may be able to include nonpublic school students enrolled in remediation and

*continued on page 22*



preventive remediation programs in the corporation's ADM count. The Department has previously taken the position that a nonpublic school student may be counted for ADM if the student is enrolled in an approved course, curriculum, or educationally related activity that is part of the instructional day. The Department's position is that enrolling a nonpublic school

student for one class per week is not sufficient to include the student in ADM. If a nonpublic school student is enrolled for at least one class per day, the student may be counted in ADM.

For additional information about the Remediation and Preventive Remediation Program, please contact: Dr. Marlene

Knopp, Center for Assessment, Research, and Information Technology, Room 229 State House, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798; Telephone: 317/232-9050; email: istep@ideanet.doe.state.in.us

Source: November 15, 1996 Memo to Superintendents from Dr. Suellen Reed, Superintendent of Public Instruction. □

## FEDERAL UPDATE . . .

**Ω Final Wrap-up of 104th Congress** — With the 105th Congress warming up and getting ready for action, we wanted to provide a final wrap-up of the 104th Congress and some of its actions that address issues of concern to readers of the Federal Newsgroup. So, for one final time, the 104th Congress action included:

—Appropriations for FY 1997: The FY 1997 education budget was increased by \$2,051.6 million. The legislation, P.L. 104-208, was signed into law at the end of September.

—Appropriations for FY 1996: Not quite as rosy as the current budget, the FY 1996 budget cut education funding by \$456.6 million. P.L. 104-134 was signed into law in April of 1996.

—Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: An unfinished piece of legislation. The House passed its reauthorization bill, H.R. 1578; the Senate was unable

to get its bill, S. 3268, to the Senate floor. Attorneys' fees and discipline were some of the more contentious issues in the debate.

—Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996: More commonly referred to as welfare reform, this legislation replaced Aid for Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Emergency Assistance, and JOBS with a single grant to states. The legislation, P.L. 104-193, was signed into law in August 1996.

—Healthy Meals for Healthy Kids Act of 1996: This legislation amended the National School Lunch Act to provide flexibility for meeting nutritional guidelines. P.L. 104-149 was signed into law in May 1996.

—Telecommunications Act of 1996: The Snowe-Rockefeller amendment in this legislation requires that schools, libraries and hospitals, especially schools in rural areas, receive a discount for

telecommunication services. The amount of the discount has not yet been announced. The law, P.L. 104-104, was signed in February 1996.

—Vocational Education, School-to-Work, and Adult Education legislation: Both chambers worked hard on bills to consolidate vocational education and adult training. The House bill was H.R. 1617 and the Senate's version was S. 143. Both chambers passed their respective bills, but the legislation was stalled in conference. When the conference bill finally emerged, it was greeted with little support. Hence, no final action was taken.

—Immigration Reform Act: An attempt to provide states with the option to exempt educational services for children of illegal immigrants was deleted prior to passage of the bill.

A variety of other bills were

continued on page 23



## FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 22

introduced during the 104th Congress. Among these issues are four that will probably receive attention in the 105th Congress:

—Parental Rights and Responsibilities Act: This legislation would codify parental rights as a constitutional right and would allow parents more authority to “direct the upbringing of the child.”

—School Prayer: Legislation to allow for state-mandated school prayer.

—Local Empowerment Grants: A proposal to block grant all “similar” federal funds at the local level.

—Saving Our Children Act:

A variation of a school-choice voucher proposal.

In addition, the 105th Congress will have to attend to some major pieces of education legislation:

—Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: Once again, the Congress will work to reauthorize this legislation.

—Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act: The Perkins Act was included in the vocational education consolidation package that was worked on in the previous Congress. The Congress will once again try to develop a package that will improve and

consolidate federal vocational education programs.

Higher Education Act: This legislation authorizes spending on the Pell Grant student-aid program, student loans, and several smaller student-aid and college-grant programs. The President’s direct-lending program will be closely looked at. Spending authority for this program expires on October 1 and many are already predicting that a temporary extension will need to be granted because the Congress will be unable to pass a new bill by October 1.

SOURCE: GTE INS Federal newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 11/27/96. □

## RESOURCES

**"Ready, Willing, and Able? What the Record Shows About State Investments in Children 1990-1995"** — The National Association of Child Advocates has recently published the first-ever study of state investments in children in six issue areas: income support, child care, health care, abuse and neglect, juvenile justice and nutrition. Expenditures, service levels, and unmet needs data from 1990-1995 were gathered from 12 states and two cities. The findings show how

children have fared in state budgets, provide comparable data across states, and form a baseline for judging the performance of individual states as devolution progresses. The report also documents the significant role of federal funding in supporting children’s programs and identifies future trends and challenges. Please contact NACA for a copy of "Ready, Willing, and Able? What the Record Shows About State Investments in Children, 1990-1995." Cost: \$12

Contact: NACA, 1522 K

Street, NW, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20005; Phone: 202-289-0777; Fax: 202/289-0776; E-mail: HN1315@handsnet.org or NACA1@erols.com.

**Advising Parents and Advocates on Managed Care for Children with Mental, Emotional, or Behavioral Disorders** — States’ escalating adoption of managed care in public mental health systems

continued on page 24



*Resources • continued from page 23*

poses special risks for children with serious mental, emotional or behavioral disorders. Two new publications explain the risks and offer strategies for avoiding them.

"Your Family and Managed Care" is a 16-page pamphlet with information for families of children with mental, emotional or behavioral disorders about choosing a managed behavioral health care plan and working with the plan in which they are enrolled. The text explains how a well-managed plan can improve their child's access to services, lists pitfalls they should watch for, and offers a checklist to evaluate whether a plan is family-friendly. The pamphlet is also published in Spanish. The single-copy price is \$3.50 plus \$1.10 postage and handling, with discounts available on orders of 15 or more.

"A Family Advocate's Guide: Managing Behavioral Health Care for Children and Youth", offers guiding principles on how managed care should work for children with mental, emotional or behavioral disorders and recommended strategies for assuring that state systems adhere to these principles. The 34-page booklet includes a glossary of the terms used in managed care and four handouts that advocates can copy to inform the state policymakers and managed care entities about family issues. The booklet is also published in Spanish. Single copies, at \$9.95 plus \$4 postage and handling, include the family pamphlet in the same language, with discounts on the \*Guide\* alone for 10 or more.

Both publications were produced by the Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, the leading national legal advocacy organization for people with mental disabilities, in collaboration with the Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health, a national parent-run organization focused on the needs of children with mental, emotional or behavioral disorders and their families.

To order, send check or Visa/MasterCard authorization to:

Publications Desk, Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law, 1101 15th Street NW, Suite 1212, Washington DC 20005; FAX: 202-223-0409; email: [pubs@bazelon.org](mailto:pubs@bazelon.org); website: [www.bazelon.org](http://www.bazelon.org)

Contact by Phone: Lee Carty at 202-467-5730

**Children with Disabilities Play, Too** — National Lekotek Center's toll-free Helpline offers toy ideas for families of children with disabilities by calling 800-366-PLAY.

Created in 1995, the toll-free Lekotek Toy Resource Helpline was developed to provide individualized assistance in selecting appropriate toys and play materials for children with disabilities. During the first year of operation, Lekotek received over 1,500 calls from parents, family members and professionals (from organizations serving thousands of clients) who work with children with disabilities.

Made possible by a grant from Toy Manufacturers of America's American Toy Institute, the Lekotek Toy Resource Helpline addresses an important need: facilitating successful and rewarding play experiences for children with disabilities.

Individuals can reach Helpline by calling 800-366-PLAY (TTY: 847-328-0001) Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (Central Time). A certified Lekotek Leader will be available to answer questions on toys and creative play ideas for children with disabilities.

For more than 15 years Lekotek, a 501 (c)(3) nonprofit organization, has provided play-based programs for children with disabilities and their families at 62 centers in 16 states and Puerto Rico.

For more information, please contact the National Lekotek Center at 800-328-0001

National Lekotek Center, 2100 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, IL 60201-2796; 847/328-0001 (V/TDD); 800/366-PLAY; Fax: 847/328-5514, Internet: [lekotek@interaccess.com](mailto:lekotek@interaccess.com) □



## Tongue-In-Cheek

**[Editor's Note:** Did any of you know that the hometown of our director of the Northeast Indiana Special Education Cooperative, Wild Bill McKinney, is Buffalo, Wyoming? Bill sent me this article by Sage Brush Sven in the Buffalo Bulletin which is published every Thursday. Happy trails.....]

Have you ever noticed the ability some people seem to have when it comes to getting to the heart of the matter?

It seems to the Bench Sitters there are a lot of people living in this part of the country who can “boil down” all the baloney in any discussion and reduce it to a single sentence. . .and sometimes to a single word.

Down at the Feed Store this week some of the regulars were talking about “newcomers.”

After several lengthy descriptions, one of the boys said, “newcomers are people who see things that are different and then complain because nobody will change them.”

This group of philosophers also came up with some other definitions. They said. . .

A journalist is a person with nothing on his or her mind and the power to express it.

Education is what's left over when you've forgotten everything you ever learned.

An economist is someone who doesn't have the personality to be an accountant.

A football fan is a guy who yells at the quarterback for missing his receiver, and then can't find his car in the parking lot.

An expert is a guy who may not have all the answers, but could get them if they would just give him a government grant.

Meanwhile back down on the Main Drag this week we heard a good story from Bill Sand. Bill is 84-years-young, and he tells us he knows a couple of elderly sisters who live back on the east coast.

A while back they were watching the news on the television and saw stories about a big fire in California. It was near a town where their first cousin lived, so they decided to call and see if she was okay.

When they called, they asked if the big fire was a threat to her.

“What fire,” she asked.

“Oh, that's right,” the sisters said. “We forgot we're four hours earlier than you are out there in California.”

Don't know if Bill was pullin' our leg or not, but it got a good laugh.



ISEAS  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, ROOM 701  
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
TERRE HAUTE, IN 47809  
\*\*\*\*\*  
ISU ACCT. #: 5-47033

BULK RATE  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Terre Haute, IN  
Permit No. 48

**ISEAS Cable**  
**Published by:**  
**Indiana Special Education**  
**Administrators' Services**  
**School of Education, Room 701**  
**Indiana State University**  
**Terre Haute, IN 47809**  
**812/237-2828**  
**FAX 812/237-4326**

**Gary D. Collings, Editor**  
internet: collin@speced.state.in.us  
**Cinda L. Long, Associate Editor**  
internet: soelong@befac.indstate.edu  
**Becky Phillips, Student Assistant**  
**Mendy Schultz, Student Assistant**

*The Cable is a newsletter published monthly for special education administrators as a dissemination activity of the ISEAS Project. This newsletter does not have any official authority and the information contained therein should not be acted upon without professional advice. The reader is invited to duplicate any part and/or forward the issue to interested persons.*

*No endorsement of contents of this newsletter by either the Indiana Department of Education or Indiana State University is implied.*

*Supporting Special Education Administrators in Solution Seeking*