

# 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>

October 1997 - volume 18 number 10

## ***"Indiana Job Connection" Now On-Line at <http://iseasjob.com>***

The ISEAS Project web site has been accessible on the Internet since July 1996. At our home page <<http://www.indstate.edu/iseas>> one can directly access information about the ISEAS Project and staff, the web sites for the Indiana Job Connection, ISEAS Forum, the Cable Newsletter, Conference Information - national and state, IDOE, Division of Special Education, Indiana Department of Education (IDEAnet), ISU-School of Education, Blumberg Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in Education at Indiana State University, and search the ISEAS site. Cinda Long, program coordinator for the ISEAS Project, designed, wrote the pages, and established the links for the site. For the past few months she has been developing a "job bank" as a way to link educators in Indiana to those seeking employment in our state.

Since the ISEAS project exists to support special education administrators in solution seeking, the job vacancy/employment connection presented an appropriate challenge. In the past our monthly newsletter only had space

to post director of special education vacancies. Over its 19 years of existence the ISEAS project has not had the capacity to handle job vacancy postings for positions of teacher, psychologist, speech pathologist, etc. in behalf of local directors of special education.

Administrators were left to the traditional avenues of newspaper, mailings, recruitment, and placement office postings. Unless the special education district was near

*continued on page 2*



*Job Connection • continued from page 1*

a metropolitan area, administrators had less expectations for candidates to contact them.

Telecommunications and the Internet have lifted these constraints. It is increasingly apparent that if “one can perceive it, someone will figure out a way for others to receive it!”

After accessing several job banks available on the Internet, it was decided that the style used by the Michigan Department of Education was the site after which to pattern our Indiana Job Connection. We particularly like their format which allows employers to both post a job vacancy as well as search for candidates. Likewise job seekers, no matter where they live, can post their credentials as well as search for available positions.

After corresponding with our contact at Michigan and talking with our contact in the computer center at Indiana State University, we realized the complexity in writing cgi script programs. Developing a database in which to store the information collected

from prospective employers and job seekers was also beyond our capability.

Besides co-editing and producing a monthly newsletter which is mailed to 748 in-state and 150 out-of-state recipients, Cinda posts and monitors an extensive array of newsgroups. The newsgroups are viewable through the Special Education Communications Network (SECN) provided by the Indiana DOE Division of Special Education. The contents of the national boards are downloaded from GTE Intelligent Network Services through an annual site license agreement. These boards include, CEC.News, Early Childhood, Ed.Personnel, Federal, Inclusive.Ed, Newsletter, Practices, Severe, and Voced.Transition. Other Indiana boards are also available such as the Division News & Notes and the state and national electronic calendar of events.

Therefore, it was a logical next step for us to enlist the help of the professionals at GTE Intelligent Network Services (GTEINS) to assist us in making

the Indiana Job Connection a reality. After several weeks of correspondence, the Indiana Job Connection is now available for use. While Cinda was exchanging data and providing information to the GTE programmers in Dallas, she was writing the html documents and preparing sample search results to provide to the programmers. Sometime in the middle of this development phase, we wondered how someone from out-of-state might better orient his or herself to particular areas of our state in which he or she might be seeking a position. Through her own Internet surfing Cinda has set-up a map of Indiana and its 92 counties. When one “clicks” on the name of a county, descriptive information is available to the extent Cinda was able to find such from the Internet sources.

The Indiana Job Connection is accessible as a link from the ISEAS Project web site <<http://www.indstate.edu/iseas>>. The first page is a map of Indiana with the counties available as a “hot

*continued on page 3*

*Inside . . .*

<i>Administrators' Corner</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>Indiana's Tobacco Laws</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>The Special Educator and IDE Law Report</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Community Resources Coordinator's Meeting Minutes</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Indiana College Network</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Federal Update</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Community Resources Coordinator's Meeting Minutes</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>Department of Education News</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>Announcements</i>	<i>20</i>
		<i>OSERS/OSEP . . .</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Resources</i>	<i>23</i>

*Job Connection • continued from page 2*

link” to individual web sites with information about each county. If your browser does not support graphics, counties are listed individually and alphabetically at the bottom of the same page. Those persons wishing to re-locate to Indiana are able to access information about each county to assist them in choosing the location most compatible to their needs. For direct access to the map of Indiana and its counties go to <<http://www.indstate.edu/iseas/Counties.html>>.

In the space provided on the form, a jobseeker would type his/her name, and then select the position for which they are qualified from the pull-down menu. He/she would next type his/her phone number, street address, current city of residence and current state of residence, followed by the zip code and an e-mail address. Then the jobseeker would post the date he/she would be available to start the position. Finally, if the candidate has any additional comments or information to personalize the "resume," there is an area available

for free text.

If the jobseeker is qualified for more than one position, it will be necessary to submit an additional form for each of the positions for which he/she wishes to apply.

A director or another person authorized to post the job vacancies would type in the space provided on the form - the name of the employer, a contact person, a phone number, street address, and city. The employer would then select from a pull-down menu: the county in which the position is available, followed by the state, zip code and e-mail address. Another pull-down menu is available at this point to select the position for which the vacancy exists. The positions are listed in this way to avoid misspellings or miscommunication of the position available. Then the employer will post the start date and, finally, there is an area to post any additional comments or information for which a space was not provided.

If the employer has more than

one position or geographical location available, it will be necessary to submit an additional form for each of the positions or locations for which he/she wishes to fill.

The jobseeker and employer may search the job connection to find positions or resumes for which a form has already been submitted. Although a position may have been posted, the jobseeker is encouraged to post his/her resume, as well as apply for the posted position. In the same regard, the employer is not limited to contact only the jobseeker who has expressed the desire for that position. He/she is also encouraged to post the vacancy to the database.

After several months of development and refinement, we are pleased to announce the Indiana Job Connection as another support to special education administrators in solution seeking. Visit the Job Connection directly at <<http://iseasjob.com>> or through the ISEAS home page at <<http://www.indstate.edu/iseas>>



***Happy Birthday!***

October 6  
***Paul Ash***  
Division of Special Education

October 7  
***Sally Cook***  
Division of Special Education

October 9  
***Carol Eby***  
Division of Special Education

October 9  
***Susie Thacker***  
ISEAS Project

October 13  
***Susan Price***  
Clay Community Schools

October 27  
***Bob McCaslin***  
Wabash -Miami Area Programs  
for Exceptional Children

October 29  
***Barbara Miller***  
Orange-Lawrence-Jackson-Martin  
Joint Services

## ADMINISTRATORS' CORNER

Bob Marra, director of the DOE Division of Special Education, convened the following members of the OSEP Implementation Team for IDEA 97 during the week of October 6, 1997: Division: Lynn Holdheide, Hank Binder, Susan Reimlinger; Great Lakes RRC: Rhonda Tyree, Larry Magliocca, Jean Beller; OSEP: Larry Wexler, Ken Kienas; P & A: Milo Gray; Parent Center: Scott Carson; Advisory Council: Kathy Wodicka; Teacher: Karen Hendrix; Director: Darcy Hopko; and, Facilitator: Gary Collings

Gary Collings was named to the External Committee for District Level Administrators sponsored by the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents and endorsed by the Indiana Professional Standards Board at its September 17, 1997 meeting. The committee will include eleven members comprised of one classroom teacher, one superintendent, four administrators with corporation level responsibilities, a representative from each of IPSB and DOE, two co-chairs, and an IPSB staff member. The charge of the committee will be to make recommendations to the IPSB concerning standards for district level administrators including superintendents, special education directors, vocational directors, curriculum directors, human resource directors, and business and finance directors.

The Indiana Professional Standards Board has developed new, defined proficiencies for licensure in Early Childhood Education. A draft document is ready for review and comment. You may request a copy of the proposed proficiencies from IPSB (317/232-9000) or contact Mike Lutz in the IU School of Education at Bloomington (812/856-8181).

**Jeff Young** has confirmed the following process to convert a Speech Pathologist's private practice license to a teacher certificate for employment in a public school corporation with the Indiana Professional Standards Board (317/232-9000):

1. The candidate for a speech pathologist position should obtain and complete a Teacher Renewal form from IPSB.
2. A copy of the candidate's current IBESPA license for private practice should be attached to the IPSB renewal form.
3. The candidate will be expected to complete the Criminal Check form provided by IPSB.
4. The candidate is to submit a check for \$5.00 payable to IPSB and mailed with the above three (3) documents.
5. The Director of Special Education may want to request a file copy of these documents.

Dr. Tracy Dust, executive director of the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, is retiring October 1, 1998 after years of service with IAPSS and as a local superintendent most recently at New Albany-Floyd County and Martinsville school corporations.

Fred Weintraub, assistant executive director for professional development with the Council for Exceptional Children, will be retiring September 1, 1997 after 30 years with the organization. His efforts in the early seventies, along with others, to develop model state laws has been recognized as the groundwork for the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, now known as IDEA.

Sharon Knoth reminds us that everything that has EVER been posted to the Division News and Notes bulletin board is saved - by topic - on the Division's web page. The web page is created and maintained by Cinda Long on the ISEAS Project staff.

Division's web site address: <http://www.indstate.edu/iseas/dse.html> and the ISEAS Project's web site address: <http://www.indstate.edu/iseas> Please browse "our sites" - and give us your feedback! ☐

## Community Resources Coordinators' Meeting Minutes

August 25, 1997

Those members present:  
Sandy Wooton, Johnson County;  
Terry Tahara, South Bend;  
Geneva Vinson, Elkhart Co.;  
Cathy Pardee, ISD; Ola Smith,  
Shelby Co.; Vicki Hall, Gallahue;  
Steve Scofield, Hancock Co.;  
JoAnn Engquist, Porter County;  
Marsha Mulroony, Dubois-  
Spencer-Perry; Trace Benedict,  
Hamilton-Boone-Madison; Cathy  
McCormick, New Albany-Floyd  
Co.; Karen Hendrix, WCJS; Linda  
Grumley-DeFour, Clark Co.

IDOE: Carol Eby

Guest Speakers: Cynthia  
Feaster, HDB, Inc.

### Role of "CSCs" for 1997-98:

The group reviewed the goals from last year. Marsha requested that the group identify what efforts are occurring throughout the State. This would facilitate creating a network for county wraparound facilitators. Marsha suggested using the wraparound conference to promote that network. Ola shared that in the next few months, counties will receive iv(e) "flex" dollars in amounts of \$10,000 per slot.

The group discussed renaming the group to broaden its perspective to include county wraparound efforts. **The name of Community Resources Coordinators was given to the group.** The purpose is continue to expand wraparound in Indiana by encour-

aging the usage of child/family teams and supportive community teams.

### IDOE Update:

Connie Rahe is still on intermittent leave. Karyn Romer and Carol Eby are the two primary contacts. As of August 18th, IDOE is supporting 350 students. There are 15 applications still pending. Number of residential students has gone up by 7% as of June. Number of alternative services has decreased. Approximately 12% are out of state - this is particularly in the area of TBI and deaf (oral programming). Approximately 45 students are autistic. Those students who are strictly EH has decreased by approximately 5%. State operated placements have also decreased. The largest number of students is in the 11-14 age range.

Carol shared that IDOE is very concerned with the costs of providers of alternative services. There are several concerns about providers marketing themselves to parents. Karen raised the issue of MRO and the concern that needs of students will be overlooked in the desire to meet Medicaid paperwork requirements.

Carol expressed the concern that applications are coming to IDOE where case conference committee decisions have occurred beyond thirty (30) days. There were 6 in June and those were returned to the LEAs. Residential students must have a notification to IDOE that the CCC has recommended residential services within 5 days of the

decision. IDOE will be looking for school corporation support with alternative services.

JoAnn raised the issue of considering shorter contracts, which perhaps reflect more accurate amounts of services and keeps the CCC more focused on the student's on-going needs. IDOE will only approve 1:1 or homebased services for the school year and not beyond.

Indiana Developmental Training Center will be opening on October 13, 1997 at the old Arbor Hospital in Carmel. It will be self-contained at least initially. This facility will be an Indiana branch of Oconomowoc. The population will be similar to the kinds of kids at Silvercrest and Damar. Less intensive services will cost \$211 per day with more intensive services costing \$255 per day.

Carol also shared that IDOE had met with IU including Russ Skiba to develop this year's data collection. The data form will probably not change save for the directions for clarity purposes. The outcome assessment form may become a mandatory part of the data collection, but may need to be reformatted to meet the needs of different populations rather than just EH.

Carol raised the issue of transfer tuition. One significant issue is the services that must be provided by students in group

*continued on page 6*



*CRC • continued from page 5*

homes or alternative families without having had any voice in the development of the IEP. School corporation of legal settlement must count the students who are out of district for ADM.

IDOE is participating in an Implementation Team for purposes of IDEA reauthorization. Carol is working on the alternative educational settings and private schools portions of the Act. Any questions that the group feels need to be addressed in those areas can be given to Carol for consideration. The Division of Special Education will not go into the field to train folks about IDEA at this time. There will be periodic topical bulletins from IDOE.

**Wraparound Conference:**

Cynthia Feaster presented an update on the development of the conference. Although most of the sessions are filled, she did inquire about School to Work presenters. Cynthia has sent out letters to exhibitors, but wants to make sure these exhibitors are supportive of wraparound services. Thus far she has 15 tables available for exhibitors. She is also looking for sponsorships of folks who truly support wraparound services. Marsha requested that the CRCs have a table to serve as a means of networking across the state to ultimately provide a forum for wraparound coordinators to convene. Cynthia gave us Table #4. She offered the Wraparound Info. line to assist the group. Karen suggested contacting all the local mental health centers due to their interest in community-based programming. CRCs will meet on

September 15th to finalize roles and duties at Wraparound Conference.

**Community Teams:**

JoAnn shared that Porter County is moving forward thanks to a new judge. This judge has brought the heads of agencies together. Thus far, the group started with identifying existing services, then progressed to gaps. Specific cases will be discussed at the upcoming meeting to ascertain how things could have been improved. Trace expressed that Hamilton County's team is very large - it includes private providers. His team is developing a resource book for the team. Three cases are reviewed at each meeting. Linda remarked that parents are surprised by the willingness of the Team to help plan for them. Trace's team uses Family Support/Family Preservation dollars.

Marsha shared that small counties are becoming more interactive so that families did not have to start all over. Vanderburgh County has its Community Team together. They will be having an interagency cross-training session so that they will be trained to be child family facilitators. Terry Tahara shared that South Bend is using a Community Team to transition students out of nonsecure settings.

**For the Good of the Cause:**

Karen asked whether folks had seen new legislation requiring school-based LCCs. Ola and Karen will do some research and bring this to the group's attention

next meeting. Steve Scofield will develop next month's agenda. The following meeting dates were suggested:

September 15 th (Monday) -  
Steve Scofield  
December 12th (Friday) - Sandy  
Wooton  
February 26th (Thursday) -  
tentative;  
April 17th (Friday) - tentative;  
June 12th (Friday) - tentative.

Evaluation remains a difficult piece to fulfill. Karen will provide forms she and Ginger's team have developed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 pm. **The next meeting is September 15, 1997 at 9:30 am at ISEAS.**

**Community Resources Coordinators' Meeting Minutes**

**September 15, 1997**

Members present: Ginger Arvin, IPS; Steve Scofield, Hancock-South Madison,; Marsha Mulroony, Dubois-Spencer-Perry; Ola Smith, Shelby County; JoAnn Engquist, Porter County; Geneva Vinson, Elkhart County; Kelli Baker, Pleasant Run, Inc.; Vicki Hall, Gallahue; Sandy Wooton, Johnson County; Cathy McCormick, New Albany-Floyd; Phil Cramer, Adult and Child; Carl Scheib, ACT Services; Karen Hendrix, WCJS.



*continued on page 7*

*CRC • continued from page 6*

Guests: Cynthia Feaster,  
HDB, Inc.

### **Wraparound Conference:**

The group spent the morning covering the following items:

1. Identifying a parent for 1-1:55 session.
2. Identifying someone to contact Judy Kendrick.
3. Sending information to schools regarding InCCBD workshop.
4. Determining content of CRC Exhibitors' table.
5. Identifying host for individual sessions.
6. Identifying participants for opening for Wraparound Conference.
7. Identifying CRCs for time for Exhibitors Table.
8. Providing packet of information to Cynthia Feaster.

### **Senate Bill 400 (Community Services Plan):**

Karen shared a piece of legislation which is a result of the Welfare Reform Act. It is requiring an oversight committee to utilize their iv(e) monies (used for reimbursement for residential services.) It appears that community teams would fit into this plan with \$10,000/child. The money is flexible for each child. ACT is considering using the monies for younger aged children. ACT intends to use its Steering Committee for the role. The committee must be in place by January 1, 1998. It is suggested that community teams work closely with their local welfare offices.

### **Evaluation of Cases Channeled through the Community Team:**

Karen shared the evaluation forms used in her counties to identify how successful or where gaps in services exist. Steve shared how Hancock County is doing its evaluation, a cost for potential placement is identified at the outset. Phil stated that an evaluation needs to include costs involved, client satisfaction and clinical data with a clinical scale. Sandy suggested utilizing what Russ is working on for IDOE be analyzed from an evaluation perspective. Ola suggested that including a cost amount on the referral form to begin the tracking is helpful. Carl shared that their team is able to show dramatic changes in residential placements. Johnson County's budget for residential services has been cut in half. They are able to channel some of those funds into a flexible fund. Overall, ACT believes they are moving in the right direction. In addition to this, folks are coming to the table willing to put monies on the table.

### **For the Good of the Cause:**

Sandy asked how folks are obtaining flexible dollars. Ola shared that they are going to request discretionary dollars from Step Ahead. They are also working with their local high school to work on a recycling program. Both Hancock and Shelby Counties have a Resource Bank which includes any donated services, items, etc. that a family could use, i.e., a haircut. In Steve's county, the Step Ahead

coordinator is managing it. The families are required to write thank you notes. Other counties use Family Support dollars through Step Ahead. Carl suggested considering the Community Foundation.

Carl shared that they are starting to be more focused on plans of support. For example, if a family can come up with a \$1, the team will come up with another dollar. Keith Weidman, originally from Montgomery County, got a group of folks from private sector to contribute an account of \$5,000 and then created a Citizen's Council for referrals to families - then the families would pay back to the bank. He began all of it with a mentoring program. All families on welfare were mentored by an individual from the county who was not on welfare. He is now with Bartholomew County Office of Family and Children.

Carl suggested getting community teams together in team building kinds of activities where the team can get to truly know each other to create a stronger team.

Ola shared how her contract developed between Gallahue and OFC. OFC is able to waive the match for Medicaid. Ola has to have 25 hours per week of billable time/week through Medicaid to break even. Carl has suggested Community Corrections dollars - anything having to do with

*continued on page 8*



CRC • continued from page 7

keeping kids out of Boys' or Girls' Schools. ACT is truly blended - agencies have contributed either in-kind or money. ACT has three (3) case managers. Community Corrections programs are typically begun for adults and are now

picking up kids. They rely on many different kinds of grants.

Sandy reviewed possible agenda items for the December meeting. Karen will fax Sandy names and addresses and phone numbers for flyers.

The regular meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm. CRCs used the remaining time at ISEAS to develop presentations for the Wraparound Conference. **The next meeting is December 12, 1997.** □

## Indiana's Tobacco Laws

[ Editor's note: Following is the text of a September 1997 letter to Superintendents and Principals signed by the Attorney General, Jeff Modisett and the Superintendent of Public Instruction]

Thank you for support of schools which are free of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. There are several changes to Indiana's tobacco laws which directly impact our schools.

\* A person less than 18 years old commits a Class C Infraction if they purchase, accept, or possess tobacco. The fine is up to \$500. (This law does not apply to those who must handle tobacco in

the course of their responsibilities on the job, an exception which should not apply on school grounds.)

\* Operating a tobacco business within 200 feet of a public or private elementary or secondary school is a Class C misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment up to 60 days and a fine up to \$500. (This does not apply to businesses in operation prior to April 1, 1996, or to a business that begin operation at a time when they are not located within 200 feet of a school).

\* Maintaining a tobacco billboard advertisement within 200 feet of a public or private

elementary or secondary school is a Class C misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment up to 60 days, and fines up to \$500.

\* Selling or distributing tobacco to a person less than 18 years old is a Class C Infraction. The person who sell or distributes the tobacco can be fined up to \$500. (This law does not apply to the retailer).

If you believe an individual or business is in violation of these laws, please contact your local law enforcement representatives. We encourage you to use these laws to safeguard our children from one of the most significant threats to their health and lives. □

## Indiana College Network

The Indiana College Network is a service of Indiana's colleges and universities working together through the Indiana Partnership for Statewide Education (IPSE). The goal of the Partnership is to assure that higher education courses are available via distance education to Indiana citizens wherever they may live or work.

Most ICN courses are delivered by Indiana Higher Education Telecommunication System (IHETS) television via satellite from university campuses to local sites, often "live" with the opportunity for interaction.

Some course are videotaped with the opportunity for live

interaction during a limited number of on-campus meetings.

Some general studies courses are also delivered directly into student home via cable or public television, others solely on or in

continued on page 9



ICN • continued from page 8

combination with computers.

Whatever the mode of course delivery, ICN students may obtain support services from a nearby Learning Center, including help with registration as well as access to computers and facsimile machines for course-related communications.

Partnership institutions include the following:

Ball State University  
Independent Colleges of Indiana

Indiana State University  
Ivy Tech State College  
Purdue University  
University of Southern Indiana  
Vincennes University

Each institution is fully accredited and is responsible for the academic quality of the programs it offers. Students enroll with and receive credit from a Home Institution of their choice.

Several institutions offer degree programs via distance education: associate, bachelor's

completion, and master's degrees.

Many undergraduate courses are transferable among institutions, so that students may take courses from several colleges and universities to meet the degree requirements at their Home Institutions.

You can find more information about ICN on the Internet at: <http://www.ind.net/ICN/>

The toll free hotline for the Indiana College Network is 800/ICN-8899. ☐



## Department of Education News

**ISTEP + Final Rule — Completion of Core 40 -** A student who does not receive a passing score on the graduation examination may be eligible to graduate if the principal of the school the student attends certifies that the student will, within one (1) month of the student's scheduled graduation date, complete all the components of the Core 40 curriculum with a grade of "C" or higher in all required and directed elective courses.

### Appeal of graduation exam results

(A) A student who does not receive a passing score on the graduation exam may be eligible to

graduate if all of the following have occurred:

- (1) The student must take the graduation exam in the subject area/areas in which the student did not pass the exam at least one (1) time every year. The student may take the exam once every semester beginning with the school year after the school year in which the student first takes the exam.
- (2) The student must complete remediation opportunities provided by the school.
- (3) The student must maintain a minimum attendance rate of ninety-five percent (95%). (excused absences do not count)

- (4) The student must maintain a "C" average in courses comprising the twenty-two (22) credits specifically required for graduation.
- (5) The student must obtain a written recommendation supporting a request for a waiver from a teacher of the student in the subject area/areas in which a passing grade was not achieved. The principal must agree with the recommendation. There must be written evidence that the student has attained the educational proficiency standard in the

continued on page 10



subject area/areas. This proficiency is based upon: (a) tests other than the graduation exam, and (b) classroom work

- (6) The student must otherwise satisfy all state and local graduation requirements.

(B) For a student who receives special education services:

- (1) The student's teacher of record, in consultation with a teacher of the student in the subject area/areas in which the student has not achieved a passing score, makes the recommendation for a waiver following the directives in (5) of the appeal process.
(2) The students case conference shall: (a) decide how frequently the student will take the graduation exam within the limitations of (1), and (b) determine if the student has met the criteria in section (A)

(C) Except as provided in (2) (a), no student shall be denied the opportunity to take the graduation exam once every semester beginning with the school year after the school year in which the student first takes the exam.

Internet questions and answers <istep@ideanet.doe.state.in.us>

Additional Clarification on ISTEP+ — [Editor's Note: The following is the text of a September 16, 1997 memo from Dr. Steve Grimes, Assistant

Superintendent of the DOE Center for Assessment and Mary Tiede Wilhelmus, DOE Director of Communications as mailed to Directors of Special Education and posted on the Indiana Special Education Communications Network.]

During our regional workshops, a few questions were asked that indicate the desirability of clarification.

Do students who attend nonaccredited nonpublic schools and students who are home schooled participate in statewide testing?

Only students enrolled in public schools or in accredited nonpublic schools (or those seeking PBA accreditation) may participate in ISTEP+.

Students who receive special education services and have an Individual Education Plan (IEP) and Section 504 students who have a Section 504 Plan frequently have tests read to them. Is this true for ISTEP+?

The following test questions may be read to such students.

- Grade 10
Norm-referenced Assessment
Tests 1, 2, 3, and 4 (TCS/2)
Test 5 (vocabulary)
Test 7 (language mechanics)
Tests 8 and 9 (mathematics)

- Graduation Qualifying Exam
Basic Skills Book, Tests 3 and 4 (mathematics)
Applied Skills, Book 1, English/language arts, Session 1 Only

Applied skills, Book 1, mathematics, both sessions 1 and 2

Grade 8

- Basic Skills Assessment
Test 1, 2, 3, and 4 (TCS/2)
Test 8 (language mechanics)
Tests 9, 10, 11 (mathematics)

Applied Skills Book 1, English/language arts, Session 1 only
Applied Skills Book 1, mathematics, both sessions 3 and 4

Grade 6

- Basic Skills Assessment
Tests 1, 2, 3, and 4 (TCS/2)
Test 8 (language mechanics)
Tests 9, 10, 11 (mathematics)

Applied Skills Book 1, English/language arts, Session 1 Only
Applied Skills Book 1, mathematics, both sessions 3 and 4

Grade 3

- Basic Skills Assessment
Test 1, 2, 3, and 4 (TCS/2)
Test 5 (vocabulary)
Test 8 (language mechanics)
Tests 9, 10, 11 (mathematics)

Applied Skills Book 1, Entire Book, Sessions 1 and 2

Some students with Individual Education Plans or Section 504 plans are physically unable to write and have individual plans that call for the use of scribes. How exactly does this work?

The scribe writes down

continued on page 11



*DOE News • continued from page 10*

exactly what the student dictates without any capitalization or punctuation inserted. Every time the student pauses, the scribe begins writing on a new line. No

presumption is made about whether a pause is indicative of the use of a comma, a period, or any other punctuation. When the student has finished dictating, the

written text is presented for the student to indicate capitalization and punctuation. The final document is then sent for scoring. □

## ***OSERS/OSEP . . .***

**OSERS Letter to Senator on Suspensions of Less Than Ten Days** — The following letter was recently sent to Senator Frist (R-TN) from Judith E. Heumann, Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education Programs and Rehabilitative Services, concerning the “less than 10-day suspensions” questions that have arisen from the IDEA Amendments of 1997 (Public Law 105-17).

Dear Senator Frist:

This is in response to your letter dated August 18, 1997, concerning the potential misrepresentation of the provision in Public Law 105-17 permitting the removal of a student with a disability from school for up to ten school days for the violation of school conduct codes.

We are aware, as your letter indicates, that one interpretation that is being suggested is that Public Law 105-17 prohibits school personnel from removing a disabled student from school for up to ten days without providing the student educational services. However, we would not interpret the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 as requiring that educational

services be provided during this time period. Please be assured that we expect to be issuing guidance this month consistent with this interpretation. Even though the provision of educational services during this time period is not required, we believe that good practice would be to review as soon as possible the circumstances surrounding the events that led to the child’s removal and consider whether the child was being provided services in accordance with the individualized education program (IEP) and whether the behavior could be addressed through minor classroom or program adjustments or whether the child’s IEP team should be reconvened to address possible changes in that document.

Thank you for writing and underscoring the importance of this matter. A copy of the relevant Department guidance will be forwarded to you as soon as it is issued. If we can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,  
Judith E. Heumann

SOURCE: GTE INS Federal newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 9/18/97.

**Guidance on the Supreme Court’s Decision in *Agostini v. Felton* and Title I (Part A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act** — On June 23, 1997, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision in *Agostini v. Felton* holding that supplementary instructional services under Part A of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title 1) may be provided in religiously affiliated private schools (private schools) without violating the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment.

In doing so, the Court expressly overruled its 1985 decision in *Agostini v. Felton*, 473 U.S. 402 (1985). The FULL TEXT of the Court’s decision may be found in U.S. Law Week (at 65 U.S.L.W.4524) and on the Internet: <http://supct.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/96-552.ZS.html>

This decision will have a positive impact on Title I services for both public and private school children because it eliminates the legal necessity for costly and often



*continued on page 12*

OSERS/OSEP... • continued from page 11

less educationally effective alternative arrangements for delivering Title I services to private school students. Local educational agencies (LEAs) need to consult with representatives of private school children as soon as possible regarding implementation of the Court's decision.

In July 1997, the U.S. Depart-

ment of Education issued its GUIDANCE, reflecting the Department's interpretation of the Title I statute and regulations, and the Court's decision in Agostini.

The Department will not take any enforcement action against State educational agencies (SEAS)

and LEAs if they conform to this guidance.

For a complete copy of the Guidance document (71 pages in length), you may refer to the web site of the American Association of School Administrators (below) and click on "Latest Word." <http://www.aasa.org> □

## The Special Educator, and Individuals with Disabilities Education Law Report

*[Editor's Note: The following captions reference the Individuals with Disabilities Education Law Report, (IDELR), The Special Educator (TSE), The Early Childhood Reporter (ECR), which are published by LRP Publications.]*

*For reference, the reader is reminded that a set of IDELR and ECR volumes is maintained in both the Division and ISEAS offices. Issues of The Special Educator newsletter are provided by subscription through ISEAS for each special education planning district in Indiana.*

### Individuals With Disabilities Education Law Report

Volume 26, Issue 3

August 21, 1997

#### Judicial Decisions...

District Had No Obligation To Evaluate Student During Disputed Timeframe-Indiana. **Sanders by Sanders v. DeKalb County Central United Sch. Dist.**, 26 IDELR 257 (N.D. Ind. 1996).

A district upheld two due process decisions which concluded a school district did not violate the IDEA when it failed to evaluate a middle school student for ADD during a four year time period.

Private School Ordered To Readmit Indefinitely Suspended Student With ADHD, ODD, and Depression. **Bercovitch v. Baldwin School**, 26 IDELR 266 (D.P.R. 1997).

Court Requires District To Provide Aide During Bus Rides of Student With Tracheostomy Tube. **Skelly v. Brookfield LaGrange Park Sch. Dist.** 95, 26 IDELR 288 (N.D. Ill. 1997).

Certified Nurse-Teacher Was Not Required To Provide Services to Student With Tracheostomy Tube. **Rhode Island Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Educ. v. Warwick Sch. Comm.**, 26 IDELR 271 (R.I. 1997).

7th Circuit States IDEA Amendments Are Not Retroactive. **Doe by Doe v. Board of Educ. of Oak Park & River Forest High Sch. Dist.** 200, 26 IDELR 282 (7th Cir. 1997).

*continued on page 12*

**OSERS/OSEP . . .**

PART B Does Not Require Parents Be Given Notice of Procedural Standards Under Section 504. **Letter to Anonymous**, 26 IDELR 321 (OSEP 1997).

OSEP Clarifies Notice Requirements Regarding IEP Meetings. **Letter to O’Conner**, 26 IDELR 320 (OSEP 1996).

**OCR . . .**

OCR Addressed Application Of Section 504 in Correctional Facilities. **Letter to Copenhaver**, 26 IDELR 397 (OCR 1997). □

**FEDERAL UPDATE . . .**

■ **Educating One and All: Students with Disabilities and Standards-Based Reform** Editors: **Lorraine M. McDonnell, Margaret J. McLaughlin, and Patricia Morison**

Published in the summer of 1997 by the National Academy Press, this is the report of a study that took place over two years (1995-96) for the Committee on Goals 2000 and the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities. The study included solicitation of information from various sources, including analyses of the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP); analyses of legal entitlements of students with disabilities; a workshop of participants from ten organizations representing general education or disability groups with an interest in standards-based reform; and research support by several organizations

and individuals, such as The Robert LaFollette Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota and the National Center for Educational Outcomes at the University of Minnesota. The report is available for \$42.95 plus \$4 for shipping.

**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES** (excerpts from the Executive Summary)

“Available data on post-school outcomes for students with disabilities suggest that they do not fare as well as youth in the general population with respect to achievement, high school graduation, enrollment in postsecondary education, and employment. However, outcomes vary tremendously, especially among students with different types of disabilities. Data about students with disabilities are further complicated by the absence of a simple, unambiguous method for defining and identifying which students have disabili-

ties. Although the IDEA and implementing regulations specify 13 categories of disabilities, criteria for defining these categories are not clearcut, and many states and school districts use modified taxonomies. There are particular problems in distinguishing students with mild cognitive disabilities, such as mild mental retardation and learning disabilities, from some students who are low-achieving. Indeed, identification and classification practices vary so greatly that a student who is identified in one of these categories in one school district may not be so identified in another, and the overall reported prevalence of disability varies across states from approximately 7 to 15 percent of the school-age population.”

“The diversity among students

*continued on page 12*



## FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 13

who are identified as having a disability means that individual students may participate to varying degrees in the common elements of standards-based reform. Because some students with disabilities already participate fully in the general education curriculum, participation in common standards and assessments for them will be compatible with their individualized programs, with or without appropriate accommodation or supports. For a small percentage of students, the goals of the predominantly academic general education curriculum are not relevant to their life goals; these students, many with significant cognitive impairments, often need a completely individualized curriculum. However, alternatives will need to be carefully crafted that still represent challenging expectations for these students. There is another group of students with disabilities who may require some modifications to the common standards and assessments to ensure compatibility of their individualized programs with the standards framework. Decisions will have to be made on an individual basis about whether and what kinds of alterations are appropriate to the common standards, curricula, instruction, and assessments; decisions about participation may differ for any given student as he or she progresses through school."

POST-SCHOOL OUTCOMES, CURRICULUM, AND INSTRUCTION

"Special education has traditionally focused on a broad set of knowledge and skills that go beyond academic goals. To be well prepared for life after school, some students with disabilities require specific instruction in such areas as general workplace readiness, vocational skills, and independent living skills. . . ."

"The content standards developed thus far by states focus mainly on academic content in language arts, mathematics, science, and other core academic subjects; to date, vocational and workplace skills have received far less emphasis. Although these academic goals are relevant for many students with disabilities, questions arise about whether the content and performance levels embodied in these academic state standards are useful and realistic learning goals for some students with disabilities, and whether the instructional time required to help these students progress toward standards would take valuable time away from teaching more relevant skills. It is important that broader outcomes and school-to-work transition planning not be neglected in the move toward standards-based reform."

"Instructional methodology is another area in which standards-based reform and special education sometimes diverge. Research has identified characteristics of effective instruction for many students with disabilities, including individually referenced

decision-making that focuses on individual student needs, intensive methods of delivering instruction, and structured teaching of discrete skills in an explicit context. By contrast, the pedagogical methods incorporated into many state standards emphasize active learning, group projects with high cognitive demands, and students "constructing" knowledge from various experiences and information sources. To be effective and maintain student motivation, teachers will need sufficient flexibility to teach students with disabilities in the way they learn best. Furthermore, some students are unlikely to attain certain advanced analytical skills regardless of instructional methods."

"Given these considerations, it will be necessary to develop a defensible decision-making procedure to determine the appropriateness of the common content standards for individual students with disabilities. At least three factors should be considered for each individual: the relation of common content standards to desired post-school outcomes, the age of the student, and the extent to which instruction focused on standards takes time away from other instructional goals. A revised IEP system may be necessary to ensure consistency and accountability during this process."

continued on page 15



## FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 14

### ACCOUNTABILITY AND ASSESSMENT

"For an unknown number of students with disabilities, participation (in large-scale assessments) will mean providing some form of testing accommodations — in other words, providing some students with nonstandard forms of test administration and response. Such accommodations are intended to remove irrelevant barriers to performance. Students with disabilities are entitled by law to assessment accommodations that seek to offset any distortions in scores resulting from their disabilities. But determining which accommodations are appropriate for whom and under which circumstances is difficult. In some situations — for example, for a student with an orthopedic impairment who may not be able to perform such motor tasks as holding a pencil or measuring an objective with a ruler — testing accommodations would not obviously affect the underlying construct being measured, such as mathematical reasoning. In other cases — for example, a student with a reading disability who is required to do advanced word problems in mathematics — it is not clear how accommodations, such as an oral reader, may affect the construct being measured. Furthermore, the lack of clear criteria for describing the functional characteristics of disability exacerbates the difficulty of designing valid accommodations. Without such criteria, it is difficult

to determine whether or not the disability is directly related to the construct being measured. Almost no empirical data are available to inform guidelines about the effects of accommodations on the meaningfulness of the resulting scores. Currently, decisions about participation in assessments and the use of accommodations are made idiosyncratically by local educators with little or no accountability."

### IMPLEMENTATION

"The number of students with disabilities who may need accommodations or other modifications in standards and assessments is unknown and will depend on a number of factors, including behavioral characteristics and severity of disability, extent of participation in the general education curriculum, and the instructional needs of students. The need for accommodations and modifications will also depend on the nature of a district's or state's particular content standards, performance standards, and assessments — which vary significantly from place to place."

"Considerable uncertainty exists about the resource levels that will be needed to support standards-based reforms. These policies are likely to entail additional costs for developing assessments, acquiring technology, implementing new governance models, and increasing through research our understanding of the

relationship between curricular strategies and student learning. Because standards-based reform envisions new approaches to instruction, assessment, and classroom organization, considerable investment in professional development will also be needed. Further, we do not know what kinds of programs and resource levels are required to help all students, including those with disabilities, meet high, challenging standards."

### RECOMMENDATIONS

"The committee was not asked to evaluate the merits of standards-based reform, nor could it do so adequately, given the recency of the policy; this report thus neither endorses standards-based reform nor encourages such efforts. Similarly, the committee was not charged with evaluating current special education law, policy, or practice; this report thus should not be considered an endorsement of that policy framework, either. The recommendations that follow represent the committee's advice to states and local communities that have already decided to proceed with standards-based reform and that want to make these reforms consistent with current special education policies and practices. . . ."

"Underlying these recommendations are two principles:



*continued on page 16*

## FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 15

\* All students should have access to challenging standards;

\* Policy makers and educators should be held publicly accountable for every student's performance.

These assumptions are consistent with the goals of both standards-based reform and special education policy, but they are not often met in practice. All of our recommendations flow from these principles, although some apply to policies and decisions about individual students, and others apply to the education system as a whole. Together they form a possible approach for integrating students with disabilities in standards-based reform.

**RECOMMENDATION 1:**  
States and localities that decide to implement standards-based reforms should design their common content standards, performance standards, and assessments to maximize participation of students with disabilities.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:**  
The presumption should be that each student with a disability will participate in the state or local standards; however, participation for any given student may require alterations to the common standards and assessments. Decisions to make such alterations must have a compelling educational justification and must be made on an individual basis.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:**  
The committee recommends strengthening the IEP process as the formal mechanism for deciding how individual students with disabilities will participate in standards-based reforms.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:**  
States and localities should revise policies that discourage maximum participation of students with disabilities in the common accountability system and provide incentives to encourage widespread participation.

**RECOMMENDATION 5:**  
When content and performance standards or assessments are altered for a student with a disability:

- \* The alternate standards should be challenging yet potentially achievable;
- \* They should reflect the full range of knowledge and skills that the student needs to live a full, productive life; and
- \* The school system should inform parents and the student of any consequences of these alterations.

**RECOMMENDATION 6:**  
Even if the individual needs of some students require alterations of the common standards and assessments, the committee strongly recommends that these students should be counted in a universal, public accountability system.

**RECOMMENDATION 7:**  
Assessment accommodations should be provided, but they should be used only to offset the impact of disabilities unrelated to the knowledge and skills being measured. They also should be justified on a case-by-case basis, but individual decisions should be guided by a uniform set of criteria.

**RECOMMENDATION 8:**  
States and local districts should provide information to parents of students with disabilities to enable them to make informed choices about their children's participation in standards-based reform and to understand the consequences of those choices.

**RECOMMENDATION 9:**  
The committee recommends that, before attaching significant stakes to the performance of individual students, those students should be given an opportunity to learn the skills and knowledge expected of them.

**RECOMMENDATION 10:**  
Given the enormous variability in the educational needs of students, the committee recommends that policy makers monitor the unintended consequences of participation in standards-based reform, including consequences for students with disabilities.



continued on page 15

## *FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 16*

### RECOMMENDATION 11:

The committee recommends that states design standards policies that realistically reflect the time lines and resource levels needed to implement standards-based reforms.

### RECOMMENDATION 12:

The committee recommends a long-term research agenda to address the substantial gaps in knowledge about the schooling of students with disabilities and the impact of standards-based reforms. Areas needing particular attention include research on the school experiences of students with disabilities, the potential of computer-based technologies, how local decisions are made about students' curricular opportunities, alternative student credentials, and the relationship between testing accommodations and validity

“As with any worthwhile undertaking, implementing these recommendations will require effort and a willingness to change. The logistical and technical challenges are great and rendered more difficult by the need for political and value choices. But the outcome will be worth that effort if acting on these recommendations can begin to build a foundation for blending two very different approaches for improving education for all students with disabilities.”

CONTACT: National Academy Press at 202/334-3313 or 800/624-6242 or at the web site <<http://www.nas.edu/new>>.

CITATION: McDonnel, L. J., McLaughlin, M. J., & Morison, P. (1997). *EDUCATING ONE AND ALL: STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AND STANDARDS-BASED REFORM*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

**Extra Credit for Doing Poorly** - by Robert J. Sternberg — [Editor's Note: This article was posted on the GTE INS VocEd.Transition newsgroup August 26, 1997. The original article apparently appeared in the New York Times on August 25, 1997.]

Imagine an educational system that subverted the goal of education — one that discouraged students from discovering their strengths and instead encouraged them to get ahead based on their weaknesses. When it comes to learning disabilities, that is what the American educational system has become.

The way Federal law has been interpreted, students with certain diagnosed learning disabilities are legally entitled to take high-stakes standardized tests without time limits and in enhanced environments that allow them, for example, food and drink or assistants to record their answers. They are entitled to extensive free tutoring in school, help with note-taking and explanations of test questions.

And in some universities, students are excused from difficult

courses, like math or foreign languages, because they have been found to have a disability in these subjects. It's no wonder, then, that some parents have sought to have learning disabilities diagnosed in their children to make them eligible for such benefits.

Boston University recently tried to curtail some of the benefits given to students with learning disabilities. For example, it refused to exempt them from foreign-language requirements. But last week a Federal judge ordered the university to re-evaluate that policy, awarded a total of \$30,000 to six students who sued the university and ordered the institution to stop requiring such students to take extra tests to certify their disabilities.

The Boston University case has raised important questions about the special treatment of such students. More than 2.5 million children are classified as having learning disabilities, and they benefit from Federally financed special education programs. The cost of serving special education students, about half of whom have learning disabilities, is about \$3.25 billion each year.

The basket of benefits some of these students are offered rewards them not for achievements based on their abilities, but for embrac-

*continued on page 16*



## FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 17

ing their deficiencies — or, in some cases, the appearance of deficiencies that may actually have been misdiagnosed. What we now have is a system of well-intentioned but sometimes misguided entitlements.

Originally, the diagnosis of a disability was supposed to identify children who needed special help.

According to the United States Department of Education, about 20 percent of American students have learning disabilities, although only about 5 percent have been diagnosed.

But we have no way of knowing how many children have learning disabilities that are not being diagnosed. And we have no way of knowing how many children who have received such a diagnosis really have learning disabilities.

One reason for this is that psychologists and educators themselves do not all agree on the criteria for making a diagnosis. The greatest agreement is on reading disability, but there is a lack of full consensus on how to identify students with such disabilities.

According to the Fourth Edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychiatric Association, learning disabilities can involve deficient math, writing, reading or other

skills. Someone with a reading disability, for example, would have comprehension skills that fall far below expectations based on age, measured intelligence and education. But these definitions are elastic and can lead to misdiagnoses.

Yet even students with genuine disabilities should not be able to use them as an excuse for not learning. Students who have trouble learning need extra training to surmount their difficulties, but they must also face the challenge of obtaining the basic skills they need to get along in the world. We should be helping such students to find their often considerable strengths and to make the most of them. To the extent that accommodations accomplish this goal, I support them.

Though some students who receive generous accommodations for learning disabilities may gain in the short run, with improved grades and test scores, the long-term implications can be disturbing. Such students may simply not be able to handle the careers they have been able to enter with the extra assistance they have received. Indeed, the saddest aspect of the fixation with entitlements is that, while helping these students succeed in school, we are setting them up for possible failure later on.

Our society has created a cult of self-esteem in which we make it

hard for children to fail.

But there are great advantages to failing. That is how we learn how to correct our weaknesses. And that, in turn, is one of the first steps to success.

Robert J. Sternberg, a professor of psychology and education at Yale, is the co-author, with Elena L. Grigorenko, of the forthcoming "The Trojan Horse: America's Learning Disability 'Gift' to Its Young."

Copyright 1997 The New York Times Company

 **The Supply of Teachers** — This is an excerpt from *AMERICA'S TEACHERS: PROFILE OF A PROFESSION, 1993-94*, published in July 1997 by the National Center for Education Statistics, 555 New Jersey Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20208-5574.

The vast majority of the nation's teachers are experienced teachers who continue to teach from year to year. In 1993-94, 93 percent of teachers had taught during the previous year and were continuing to teach, either in the same school or in a different school. About 5 percent of teachers were new to the profession.

continued on page 19



## FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 18

In discussions of how to cope with anticipated teacher shortages (based largely on substantial increases in K-12 enrollments that are projected), researchers and policy makers have suggested that teachers who have left the profession — one component of what is sometimes termed “the reserve pool” — may be a potential source of new hires. In 1993-94, about 2 percent of all teachers had returned to the profession after leaving for at least a year.

Traditionally, women have favored teaching as an occupation precisely because it allowed easy exit and re-entry, facilitating long absences from the labor force to care for young children. . . . and about one-fifth of 1993-94 returning teachers had most recently spent time homemaking or child rearing. However, returning teachers had done a number of other things as well: another one-fifth had been working in jobs outside of elementary/secondary education before returning; 16 percent had been students themselves; and another 39 percent had been substitute teaching, teaching at the preschool or post secondary level, working in some other position in elementary or secondary education, in the military, or unemployed and seeking work. Almost no teachers came back to the classroom from retirement.

CITATION: Henke, R. R., Choy, S. P., Chen, X., Geis, S. Alt, M. N., & Broughman, S. P. (1997, July). AMERICA'S

TEACHERS: PROFILE OF A PROFESSION, 1993-94. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, pp. 95-96.

SOURCE: GTE INS Ed. Personnel newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 9/2/97.

### WHAT ARE THE WORK-PLACE DISABILITY LAWS?

During the last few years, employees have been exposed to many new laws, regulations, and acronyms. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), and Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) impact upon the workplace. These are different laws enacted at different times with different purposes, and are not totally uniform. You should know about these.

THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) — The ADA is a federal anti-discrimination statute designed to remove barriers for individuals with disabilities. The ADA seeks to ensure equal access to employment opportunities regardless of whether someone has a disability. Title I prohibits discrimination against any qualified applicant or employee with a disability in all aspects of employment.

FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT (FMLA) — FMLA requires covered employers to

provide up to 12 weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave to “eligible” employees for certain family and medical reasons. Employees are eligible if they have worked for a covered employer for at least one year, and for 1,250 hours during the previous 12 months, and if the company employs at least 50 people within a 75-mile radius. There are some areas of interaction between FMLA and ADA. These areas include medical conditions and reasonable accommodations.

A condition that qualifies as a serious health condition may or may not satisfy the ADA definition of disability. Temporary impairments of short duration constitute a serious health condition, but are not disabilities. Conversely, being a person with a disability (e.g., quadriplegia) does not necessarily constitute having a serious health condition.

The concept of reasonable accommodation under the ADA and FMLA are different. For example, an employee undergoing chemotherapy for cancer may request a modified work schedule as a reasonable accommodation under the ADA; it must be provided unless the employer can prove it would create an undue hardship. The same employee could request time off as FMLA leave. The employer must grant an eligible employee up to 12 weeks

continued on page 20



## FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 18

of unpaid FMLA. There is no undue-hardship exception.

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT (OSHA)** — The OSHA Reform Act requires an employer to furnish a work environment that is free of recognized hazards causing or likely to cause death or serious injury, as well as to comply with government safety and health standards. There are some areas of interaction between OSHA and ADA. These areas include standards and reporting requirements. In complying with specific OSHA standards, employers may want to

consider incorporating ADA reasonable accommodation concepts. For example, OSHA requires employees to label, in writing, certain toxic materials and give written materials explaining their potential dangers to employees. An ADA reasonable accommodation could be also using the universal symbol for poison, and providing verbal warnings of the potential danger of certain toxic materials.

**WORKERS' COMPENSATION LAWS** — Each state has its own workers' compensation laws and second injury fund. The

employers' return-to-work policies and procedures for an employee who is injured or disabled must be consistent not only with state workers' compensation laws, but also with ADA, FMLA, and OSHA regulations. It is important to remember that the ADA does not distinguish between reasonable-accommodation requirements for employees with work-related injuries and illnesses as opposed to non work-related injuries and illnesses.

GTE INS ADA.Independent newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 10/11/96. □

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

**USDOE Meetings on IDEA Regulations** — The following notice of public meetings about IDEA Amendments of 1997 was posted in the Federal Register on September 17, 1997 (Vol.62, No.180).

**SUMMARY:** The Secretary announces a series of seven public meetings to obtain public comment on the anticipated Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) for 34 CFR Parts 300, 301, and 303 to implement the statutory requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 (IDEA Amendments of 1997), Pub. L. 105-17. In the alternative, should the NPRM not be published by the

time a meeting or meetings are held, the Secretary will use the meeting or meetings as an opportunity to receive public comment on how to regulate to implement the statutory provisions of IDEA Amendments of 1997.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The Department anticipates in the near future publishing a Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) for 34 CFR Parts 300, 301, and 303 to implement changes occasioned by the IDEA Amendments 1997. The purpose of the meetings is to take public comment on the NPRM, if it has been published by the date of the meeting or meetings, or, if the NPRM has not been published

by that meeting date, to receive public comment on how to regulate to implement the statutory provisions of IDEA Amendments of 1997. This effort is part of a broader initiative to provide opportunities for full and open input from the various constituencies interested in the programs administered by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS).

### Regional Meetings

Individuals who wish to make a statement at any of the regional



continued on page 21

*Announcements • continued from page 20*

meetings are encouraged to do so. Time allotted for each individual to testify will be limited and will depend on the number of speakers wishing to testify at each session. It is likely that each participant choosing to comment will be limited to four minutes. Persons interested in making oral public comment will be able to sign-up to make a statement on the day of the regional meeting at the Department's public meeting on-site registration desk on a first-come-first-served basis. If no time slots remain, then the Department will reserve a limited amount of additional time at the end of each hearing to accommodate those individuals. (Every effort will be made to have ample time to hear all individuals who wish to make a statement.)

Any individual who will need accommodations for a disability in order to participate in a regional meeting (e.g., interpreting services, assistive listening devices, materials in alternate format) should notify Laura Black Price at 202-205-8969 (voice) 205-5465 (TDD), or 202-260-0416 (fax) by no later than 14 days prior to the meeting the individual will attend. We will attempt to meet requests received after this date, but cannot guarantee availability of the requested accommodation. All regional meeting sites are accessible to individuals with disabilities.

The dates and location of the seven regional meeting appear below. The U.S. Department of

Education is announcing these public meetings in advance of the publication of the NPRM so as to allow interested parties sufficient time to schedule travel and accommodations, as necessary. The Department has made arrangements for a limited number of rooms at a special government per diem room rate that participants may reserve at their own expense. All costs for these rooms will be the participant's own. To reserve a room at these rates you must inform the hotel that you are attending the regional meeting of the U.S. Department of Education and make reservations prior to the reservation expiration date indicated below. When making reservations, individuals must indicate the need for any special accommodations.

Individuals from OSERS and other offices of the Department of Education will be available at the meetings to receive public comment on the NPRM, if it has been published by the date of the meeting, or if the NPRM has not been published by the date of the meeting, to receive public comment on how to regulate to implement the statutory requirements. Participants are particularly encouraged to express their support for or raise concerns about specific sections of the proposed regulations and, if possible, to provide recommendations for specific regulatory language. A copy of the IDEA Amendments of 1997 is available on the world wide web at ([www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP/](http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP/)).

#### Dates, Time, and Location of Meetings:

Boston: Thursday, October 23, 1997, 2:00 pm-7:00 pm. Logan Ramada Hotel 75 Service Road Logan International Airport Boston, MA 02128 Reservations: Call toll-free 1-800-272-6232 or 617-569-9300. Cut-off date for discounted room rate: October 1.

Atlanta: Monday, October 27, 1997, 2:00 pm-7:00 pm. Radisson Hotel Atlanta 165 Courtland & International Blvd. Atlanta, GA 30303 Reservations: Call toll-free 1-800-833-8624 or 404-659-6500. Cut-off date for discounted room rate: September 26.

Dallas: Tuesday, October 28, 1997, 2:00 pm-7:00 pm. Radisson Hotel Dallas 1893 West Mockingbird Lane Dallas, TX 75235 Reservations: Call toll-free 1-888-588-9846 or 214-634-8850. Cut-off date for discounted room rate: October 13.

Washington: Tuesday, November 4, 1997, 1:00 pm-5:00 pm. (No hotel rooms have been reserved for this regional meeting) Government Services Administration (GSA) Building, Auditorium, first floor, 7th & D Streets, SW (Use main entrance off D Street) Washington, DC 20407 Contact Laura Black Price at 202-205-8969 (voice), 205-5465 (TDD), or 202-260-0416 (fax) by Friday, October 31 to place your name on the list of attendees for entrance

*continued on page 22*



**Announcements • continued from page 20**

into the building.

Denver: Tuesday, November 18, 1997, 2:00 pm-7:00 pm. Four Points Hotel 3535 Quebec Street Denver, CO 80207 Reservations: Call toll-free 1-800-328-2268 or 303-333-7711. Cut-off date for discounted room rate: October 26.

San Francisco: Friday, November 24, 1997, 2:00 pm-7:00 pm. Holiday Inn Select/Chinatown 750 Kearny Street San Francisco, CA 84108 415-433-6600 Reservations: Call toll-free 1-800-243-1135 or 415-433-6600. Cut-off date for discounted room rate: October 16.

Chicago: Monday, November 24, 1997 2:00 pm-7:00 pm. Sheraton North Shore 933 Skokie Boulevard Northbrook, IL 60062 Reservations: Call toll-free 1-800-535-9131 or 847-498-6500. Cut-off date for discounted room rate: November 3. Dated: September 12, 1997. Howard R. Moses, Acting Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

For information regarding the statutory requirements of IDEA Amendments of 1997, call JoLeta Reynolds or Thomas Irvin at 202-205-5507. Persons wishing to obtain additional information regarding the regional meetings should call Laura Black Price at 202-205-8969 (voice) or 202-205-5467 (TDD). Individuals who use a telecommunication device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 be-

tween 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

Individuals who cannot attend the meetings are invited to send written comments. Comments on the NPRM should be directed to Thomas Irvin, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education, Room 4607, MES Building, 330 C Street, SW, Washington, DC 20202, or fax your comments to 202-260-0416. Comments should specifically reference the section or sections of the NPRM being referred to and must be received not later than 90 days after the publication of the NPRM in the Federal Register.

### **How to Help North Dakota Schools Damaged by**

**Floods** — Several centers have been set up in North Dakota to accept contributions to assist schools damaged in the spring 1997 floods.

**BOOKS AND TEACHING SUPPLIES FOR TEACHERS:** Contact Joyce Hinman, Bismarck Public Schools, 400 East Avenue E, Bismarck, ND 58501; 701-221-3117, Ext. 147

**CASH DONATIONS:** Contact Sandy Glas, Director, Grand Forks Foundation for Education, P.O. Box 5475, Grand Forks, ND 58206.

**Teacher Training at NASA** — The National Science Teachers Association (NSTA)

offers NASA educational workshops for elementary school teachers (NEWEST) and NASA educational workshops for math, science, and technology teachers (NEWMAST). This training is composed of:

- \* A two-week, expense-paid workshop at one of the NASA Centers;
- \* Personal experience with NASA's state-of-the-art research and development;
- \* Updating of knowledge and development of new interdisciplinary and team teaching strategies;
- \* Model integration of the national standards in mathematics, science, and technology.

Applications to participate in this program must be received in the NSTA office by February 20, 1998.

Contact: NSTA, NEWEST/NEWMAST-V, 1840 Wilson Blvd, Arlington, VA 22201-3000; fax: 703-522-5413. <http://www.nsta.org/programs/new.htm>

### **Authors Looking for Grandparents to Interview**

— Donald Meyer and Patricia Vadasy are creating a book for grandparents of children with special needs. To make this book as practical and "real" as possible,



*continued on page 23*

*Announcements • continued from page 22*

they are seeking contributions from grandparents who are willing to share their thoughts about what it means to have a grandchild with special needs. They are also seeking contributions from parents and others who know how a child's disability can affect all family members.

To obtain a copy of a Contributor's Packet, contact: Don Meyer, Grandparent Book Project,

c/o Sibling Support Project, Children's Hospital and Medical Center, PO Box 5371, CL-09, Seattle, WA 98105-0371; 206/368-4912; 206/368-4816 (fax); dmeyer@chmc.org (e-mail).

When requesting a packet, please identify yourself as a parent, grandparent, or other family member. The entire Contributor's Packet may also be found at Sibling Support Project's

Web page at the following address: <http://www.chmc.org/departmt/sigsupp>

From IN\*SOURCE Reports, Spring 1997, Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs, 809 N. Michigan St., South Bend, IN 46601-1036; 219/234-7101

SOURCE: July PIP, Pacer Center, Mpls., MN ☐

# RESOURCES

**Online Directory** — A Directory of Indiana Disability-Related Services by County, a listing of the major service agencies has been mounted on the World Wide Web (<http://www.isdd.indiana.edu/~cedir/directory.html>). Alicia Wissel, Marilyn Irwin, Melanie Hounshell, and Sharon Soto from the Center for Disability Information and Referral (CeDIR) compiled the directory. Those who do not have access to the Web can purchase a print copy from CeDIR for \$15.00 plus \$3.00 for shipping and handling. The Web version of the directory will be updated as revisions are identified, and the print copy will be revised each year. For further information, contact CeDIR at 812/855-9396.

Source: FYI Newsletter (September 8, 1997) from the Institute for the Study of Developmental Disabilities.

**Researchers Outline Training For Special Education Aides** — To ensure aides for students with disabilities are effective in regular classrooms, researchers from three universities recommend that schools:

- \* Hire aides for classrooms, rather than for specific students, to benefit all students;
- \* Require school staff to undergo "awareness training" about the harmful effects of excessive supervision;
- \* Provide training in instructional procedures that help disabled students learn through typical class activities;
- \* Clarify that teachers are supposed to be the instructional

leaders for all students; and

- \* Include disabled students "physically and programmatically" in activities planned for others, rather than let them be excluded by aides.

Furthermore, the special education professors say aides should receive training that includes supervision by teachers and have an opportunity to plan lessons.

"Helping or Hovering? Effects of Instructional Assistant Proximity on Students with Disabilities" in the fall issue of *Exceptional Children*, is \$15.50 from Council for Exceptional



*continued on page 24*

**Resources • continued from page 23**

Children, 1920 Association Dr.,  
Reston, VA 22091, 888/232-7733.  
Summaries are on the Internet at  
<http://www.cec.sped.org>, or e-  
mail Michael Giangreco at  
[mgianfre@zoo.uvm.edu](mailto:mgianfre@zoo.uvm.edu).

SOURCE: Special Education  
Report, September 3, 1997

**Special Education Re-  
sources on the Net** — \* Big  
Page of Special Education Links  
at [http://www.mts.et/~jgreenco/  
special.html](http://www.mts.et/~jgreenco/special.html)

\* Network on Technology &  
Special Education at [http://  
www.edc.org/FSC/NCIP/](http://www.edc.org/FSC/NCIP/)

\* Special Education Lesson  
on the Net at [http://  
www.pacificnet.net/~mandel/  
SpecialEducation.html](http://www.pacificnet.net/~mandel/SpecialEducation.html)

\* Section 504 manual: [http://  
inform.ospi.wednet.edu/sped/  
Publications/504.html](http://inform.ospi.wednet.edu/sped/Publications/504.html)

\* Virtual Assistive Technol-  
ogy Center at [http://  
www.sped.ukans.edu/%7Edlance/  
atweb.html](http://www.sped.ukans.edu/%7Edlance/atweb.html)

**World Wide Web Re-  
sources** — To view the follow-  
ing information connect to: [http://  
www.schoolnet.ca/sne/  
snewww.html](http://www.schoolnet.ca/sne/snewww.html)

ADD (Attention Deficit  
Disorder)  
Autism and Related Disorders  
Blindness/Sight Impairments  
Cerebral Palsy  
Deaf/Hearing Impairments  
Developmental Disabilities,

MR  
Down Syndrome  
Dyslexia  
ESL (English as a Second  
Language)  
Family Support  
Fetal Alcohol Syndrome  
Fragile X Syndrome  
Friends of the SNE  
General Information  
Gifted Education  
Government and Institutions  
Integration and Inclusion  
Learning Disabilities  
Miscellaneous  
Multiple Sclerosis  
Muscular Dystrophy  
Psychology and Psychiatry  
School Resources  
Technology and Special  
Needs  
University Resources  
Youth at Risk  
Training Companies  
Cultural Accommodation

### **A Fact Sheet: "A Back To School Special Report: The Baby Boom Echo". U.S. Department of Education, August 1996**

Between 1996 and 2006 . . .

Total public and private school enrollment will rise from a record 51.7 million to 54.6 million;

Public high school enrollment is expected to increase by 15 percent;

The number of high school graduates will increase 17 percent, 14 percent by 2001;

About half of the states will have at least a 15 percent increase in the number of high school graduates, with the Western states having almost a 30 percent increase in high school graduates;

College enrollment is projected to rise by 14 percent;

Hispanic-Americans and Asian-Americans will be the fastest growing segments of the student population.

To maintain current K-12 student service levels in 2006, the nation will need about.....

190,000 additional teachers;

Over 6,000 more schools;

Approximately \$15 billion in additional annual operating expenditures.

By 2030, the maturing of the baby boom echo generation will stabilize a long-term decline in the ratio of workers to retirees at 2.6 to 1.



## *Training for Life*

Nearly 3,000 Special Olympics athletes will compete this fall in their Area Bowling Tournament. Attend your Area Bowling Tournament and see how your students are “Training for Life.”

### **Area Bowling Tournaments**

**Area 1:** Lake, Porter, LaPorte, Newton and Jasper counties November 1 Site: Stardust Bowl II

**Area 2:** St. Joseph, Elkhart, Starke, Marshall and Kosciusko counties November 15 Site: Chippewa Bowl, South Bend

**Area 3:** La Grange, Steuben, Noble, DeKalb, Whitley, Allen, Huntington, Wells and Adams counties November 21 Site: Pro Bowl West/Georgetown Bowl, Fort Wayne

**Area 4:** Benton, White, Carroll, Warren, Tippecanoe, Clinton, Fountain, Parke, Putnam, Vermillion and Montgomery counties November 1 Site: Market Square Lanes/Star Lanes/Crawfordsville Lanes/Arrowhead Lanes

**Area 5:** Fulton, Miami, Wabash, Cass, Howard, Pulaski and Tipton counties November 8 Site: Don Lowery Lanes East, Kokomo

**Area 6:** Grant, Blackford, Jay, Madison, Delaware and Randolph counties November 15 Site: Village Bowl, Muncie

**Area 7:** Vigo, Clay, Owen, Sullivan, Greene, Knox, Daviess and Martin counties November 15 Site: Terre Haute Bowling Center

**Area 8:** Boone, Hamilton, Hendricks, Marion, Hancock, Morgan and Johnson counties November 15 Site: Western Bowl, Indianapolis

**Area 9:** Henry, Wayne, Rush, Shelby, Fayette, Union and Franklin counties November 1 Site: Do Re Mi Bowl/Richmond 40 Bowl

**Area 10:** Monroe, Brown, Bartholomew, Decatur, Lawrence, Jackson and Jennings counties November 8 Site: Classic Lanes, Bloomington

**Area 11:** Gibson, Pike, Dubois, Posey, Vanderburgh, Warrick, Spencer and Perry counties November 15 Site: Diamond Lanes/Willow Lanes, Evansville

**Area 12:** Orange, Crawford, Washington, Harrison, Floyd, Clark, Scott, Jefferson, Ripley, Dearborn, Ohio and Switzerland counties November 8 Site: Daisey Lanes, New Albany/Anderson's Alley, Madison

For more information, please contact Indiana Special Olympics at 1-800-742-0612.