

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>

February 1997 - volume 18 number 2

Survey of Speech-Language Pathology Services in School-based Settings: An Executive Summary

The following report and study are from the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.

A survey of a nationally representative sample of speech-language pathologists working full-time in school-based settings was conducted during Fall 1995 by the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). The purpose of the survey was to document the needs and views of these professionals so that ASHA can best represent them to Federal, State, and local agencies, and the

public. The data will also be useful as a baseline for comparison to future studies. The questionnaire included such topic areas as caseload characteristics, service delivery, bilingual/bicultural services, support personnel, perceived shortages of speech-language pathologists, and demographic information.

Service Delivery

Overall, the traditional pull-out model is the one used by far more respondents than any other, al-

though the collaborative consultation model is used for the majority of children from birth to 2 years old. The classroom-based model is used for between 20 and 41 percent of children with certain disorders. These include (in descending order): disorders requiring services for communication instruction, augmentative/alternative communication, language, cognitive communication, central auditory processing, and aural rehabilitation.

Respondents said that they

continued on page 2

Inside . . .

<i>Administrators' Corner</i>	4	<i>OSERS/OSEP . . .</i>	10	<i>Announcements</i>	22
<i>ISEAS Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</i>	4	<i>The Special Educator and the IDE Law Report</i>	11	<i>Resources</i>	23
<i>Information from ICASE</i>	8	<i>Federal Update . . .</i>	14	<i>Tranquility™ for Special Education</i>	25

Survey • continued from page 1

spent the majority of their hours (54 percent) in direct intervention; they spent the least number of hours in implementing the national education goals, in-service training, hearing screening, and other activities (less than 1 percent each). An equal number of hours was spent in diagnostic evaluations and record keeping (9 percent each). The remaining hours were spent in varying amounts in: parent/staff meetings (5 percent), school staff and committee meetings (3 percent), additional professional activities (2 percent), professional meetings (2 percent), referral and follow-up (2 percent), observation of children (2 percent), additional nonprofessional duties (2 percent), and speech-language screening (1 percent).

Forty-four percent of respondents said they spent some time in monitoring activities such as checking hearing aids, earmolds, FM systems, and classroom amplification systems. The data show that 68 percent of the respondents personally conduct speech-language screening and 35 percent conduct hearing screening, although school nurses and audiologists actually perform most hearing and middle ear screening. One-third of the speech-language pathologists surveyed said that they postpone all services during screening, but an equal percentage continue to provide services to their entire caseload during screening. The remainder of the respondents varied in their responses; some served all IEP and IFSP cases, others did only initial evaluations or referrals, and some conducted screening during the summer. Over half of the respondents indicated that their entire caseload also

continues to receive regular services during annual reviews. About one-third serve all IEP and IFSP cases and less than 25 percent said that they postpone all services.

Overall, respondents spend about 80 percent of their time preparing for and providing direct services and diagnostics. The other 20 percent is spent on activities such as meetings, paperwork, training, and travel between schools.

Bilingual/Bicultural Services

Approximately 10 percent of those surveyed spoke a foreign language; 35 percent of respondents indicated that some percentage of their clients did. Of those with clients who spoke a foreign language, 63 percent of the respondents said that this included less than 10 percent of their overall caseload. When a child spoke a different language than the respondent, 75 percent of the respondents got help from an interpreter parent, bilingual speech-language pathologist, or other person. About one-quarter of our respondents were proficient in a sign language, with most of these respondents using American Sign Language (ASL) or Signed Exact English (SEE).

Caseload Characteristics

Nearly half (45 percent) of the respondents serve children who are 6-11 years old. About one-quarter serve children 3-5 years old, and about the same percentage serve children 12-17 years old. Two-thirds of these children are white, 18 percent are African American, 11 percent are Hispanic, 2 percent are American Indian, and 2 percent

are Asian/Pacific Islander.

Fully 91 percent of the children served by our respondents are served under IDEA-Part B (ages 3-21 with Individual Education Plans — IEPs). The overall mean caseload size was 46 children. More than half the respondents reported a caseload of 40-69 children, and more than one-quarter reported having caseloads of 20-39 children. The remaining respondents reported a caseload of 1-19 (10 percent) and over 70 children (9 percent). The service delivery approach most used was group sessions, and half of the clients served had moderate impairment. Another 26 percent of clients were mildly impaired, 21 percent were severely impaired, and 4 percent were not impaired. The primary diagnosis of most of the children was speech-language impairment only (46 percent), and the most common communication disorders were language (42 percent) and articulation/phonology (28 percent).

Demographics of Respondents

A majority of the respondents held Master's degrees, were certified by ASHA, were female and white (not of Hispanic origin), and worked in public schools (98, 99, 96, 95, and 91 percent, respectively). Two percent were African American, one percent Hispanic, one percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and less than one percent were American Indian/Alaskan Native. About 10 percent of all respondents provide services on a contractual basis; 89 percent were employed by



continued on page 3

Survey • continued from page 2

school districts. Nearly 90 percent of all respondents have either 9 or 10 month appointments, and their respective mean salaries were \$37,664 and \$42,412; their respective median salaries were \$36,443 and \$41,000. The median age was 45, and the median number of years employed as a speech-language pathologist in a school-based setting was 14.

Elementary schools are the primary workplace of 42 percent of the respondents, with 19 and 18 percent, respectively, working primarily in secondary schools and pre-elementary schools. Eight percent primarily work in special settings, such as hospital-based schools and special day and residential schools. Three percent work equally in more than one setting, and 10 percent primarily work in some other school setting. About one-half of the speech-language pathologists surveyed work in more than one school. Fifty percent of the respondents in our survey work in at least one urban school, with 30 percent working in at least one suburban school, and 27 percent working in at least one rural school. On average, our respondents work in two schools. The majority of respondents (56 percent) work in school districts with less than 10,000 students, with more than half of those working in school districts with less than 2,500 students. Twenty-eight percent work in school districts with 10,000-50,000 students, and 15 percent work in school districts with over 50,000 students.

Perceived Shortages of Speech-Language Pathologists and Use of Support Personnel

Among the more interesting

findings of the study is the significant relationship between perceived shortages of speech-language pathologists and both location and size of school districts. Respondents were asked if there were funded but unfilled positions for speech-language pathologists in their school districts, as well as shortages of qualified speech-language pathologists. Fifty-one percent of the respondents indicated that there were funded but unfilled positions in their school districts. Moreover, although nearly 60 percent of respondents in all locations (urban, suburban, or rural) indicated shortages, there was a significant difference between urban versus nonurban and rural versus nonrural schools, indicating an apparent higher need for speech-language pathologists in urban and rural schools than in nonurban and nonrural schools. The significance was highest for urban versus nonurban schools, indicating that the need is greatest in urban districts ($p=.003$).

The size of the school district was also highly significant in relation to the shortages of speech-language pathologists ($p=.00001$). A high percentage of respondents in every size school district said they had shortages. Between 58 and 66 percent of the respondents in districts with 2,500-49,999 students indicated shortages in their districts, and the lowest percentage of respondents reporting shortages were in districts with fewer than 2,500 (47 percent). However, fully 80 percent of the respondents in districts with 50,000 or more students felt there were shortages in their districts. Respondents who reported shortages felt that the major impacts of the shortages on their service delivery were in-

creased caseload, increased work with people without ASHA certification, and decreased quality of service.

These findings correspond to two other findings of the study. First, the response chosen by most respondents as to the greatest challenge they face in their jobs was large caseload, paperwork, and time limitations. Second, although over two-thirds of all respondents did not have support personnel, those who did were overwhelmingly positive about having this resource available to them. These respondents said that having support staff allows them to increase the time they spend on providing direct services, such as spending more time on students with severe disorders, doing more classroom-based work, and providing more sessions for students.

Contact: Cassandra Peters-Johnson, Director, School Services Division, ASHA, 10801 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852; 301/897-5700; fax: 301/571-0457.

CITATION: American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. (1996). FINAL REPORT OF THE SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY SERVICES IN SCHOOL-BASED SETTINGS: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY. Rockville, MD: Author.

SOURCE: GTE INS Ed. Personnel newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 12/12/96. □



ADMINISTRATORS' CORNER

The Division of Special Education maintains a listing of individuals who have expressed an interest in being considered for appointment as Independent Hearing Officers. Our next formal training is scheduled for late February in Indianapolis and this training has been part of the training/selection process.

Article 7 at 7-15-5 (e) speaks to general qualifications for independent hearing officers. If you are aware of individuals who you believe would be qualified and interested in serving as a hearing officer, please have them contact the Division at 317/232-0570.

Judy Gilbert, consultant with the DOE Division of Special Education, had single by-pass surgery, mitral valve replacement, and an opening repaired in her heart on January 9 at St. Francis in Indianapolis. She returned home by Wednesday of the following week. Cards may be sent to her home address at 2959 South Woodridge Road, Shelbyville, IN 46176.

In reply to the January tip-of-the month on e-mail Hank Binder reminds us that on July 2, 1995 he defied the golf odds of 10,344 to 1 against shooting a hole-in-one. He is now "shooting" for the Lottery. (Hank, don't give up your day job!) ☐

ISEAS Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

December 18, 1996

[These minutes are considered unofficial until approval at the next meeting on January 29, 1997.]

Members Present: Patti Kem, North Central Alternate; Mary Jo Dare, Central Representative; Sheila Decaroli, East Representative; Muriel Downey, Northeast Representative; Brett Bollinger, Southeast Representative; Joan Machuca, Northwest Representative; Bob Marra, Director, Division of Special Education; and, Jeff Young, ICASE Representative

Members Absent: Sandra Lange, Southwest Representative

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

Others Present: Jan Rees, ICASE Treasurer

The meeting was called to order at 8:50 a.m. by Gary Collings as ISEAS Executive Director.

Approvals: MOTION:
Minutes from the November 13, 1996 meeting were presented.
With a motion by Dare/second

Happy Birthday!

February 3
Annette Razor
Blue River Valley
School Corporation

February 8
Len Jozwiak
Hammond School
City

February 11
Phyllis Craig
Kokomo Area Special
Education Cooperative

February 11
Kim Moffett
Division of
Special Education

February 22
Mike Horvath
Monroe County Community
School Corporation



continued on page 5

ISEAS • continued from page 4

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:
Southeast: Southwest Roundtable requested approval of their \$500 mini-grant to offset meeting room and speaker costs for roundtable meetings and distribution of materials to participating districts.

MOTION: A motion by Machuca/Dare to accept Southeast Roundtable's mini-grant application was approved.

Northeast: Northeast Roundtable submitted their mini-grant application to support meeting room costs and speaker(s) for the Roundtable retreat tentatively scheduled for May 23, 1997. **MOTION: A motion by Decaroli/Bollinger to accept Northeast Roundtable's mini-grant application as submitted was carried.**

Mini-Grant Reports: East: Regional concerns and a staff development workshop tentatively planned for April were the focus of the last roundtable meeting.

Northwest: A representative from St. Xavier met with their "coffeetable" regarding training for speech/language professionals. A survey will be sent out to

determine needs for training these professionals. Bob Marra will talk with their coffeetable in February regarding alternative placements. A topical workshop on medically fragile children is being planned for March 1997.

North Central: Marilyn Friend, IUPUI, presented at a recent roundtable workshop for teachers and administrators.

Central: Central Roundtable is not meeting every month this year. Electronic student records and computerized IEPs were discussed at the last roundtable meeting. The roundtable is looking for ways to gather information on what computerized IEPs are available and which system is most cost effective. The Steering Committee discussed a possible statewide system as opposed to districts developing their own. The cost is prohibitive for many of the districts. The topic will also be brought up at the ICASE Executive Committee meeting.

Concerns about transitions at the Department of Correction were also discussed at the roundtable meeting.

Northeast: There was no roundtable meeting this month.

Southeast: Southeast Roundtable has been discussing the need for OT/PT training.

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

Administrative Study Keyclub

(ASK): No applications have been received.

1996-97 Events/Reports: Secretaries/Support Staff Seminar: Approximately 105 participated in the annual Secretaries/Support Staff Seminar held November 12, 1996 at the Holiday Inn North, Indianapolis. Evaluation results and comments indicated the seminar was very well received.

LEASE Academy II: Collings reported there were 16 participants in the first session of the ISEAS LEASE Academy held November 20-21, 1996 at the E. B. Ball Center on the Ball State University campus. Those attending had very positive comments about the first session. The second session will be in the Kitselman Center, BSU campus, on 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.

A letter from Nancy Taylor, Indiana Professional Standards Board, clarifying how one renews a license with CRUs directly through her office was discussed. Academic credit renewals go through a university advisor.

LEASE Academy III: Collings reported that The Gallup Organization is interested in conducting a two-day Teacher Perceiver Interview introductory session as a stand alone phase of

continued on page 6



ISEAS • continued from page 5

Academy III during the summer of 1997. Joanne Miller of The Gallup Organization has informed Collings that the ideal size for a two-day session is from 15-25 participants. Two sessions could be scheduled for the same week to double the number of participants if needed. Miller concurred it would be worthwhile considering having directors of special education attend with their respective director of personnel as discussed at the November meeting. The tuition is \$195 per participant plus travel and overnight expenses for the instructor. Collings plans to meet with Miller February 11 or 12 to further discuss this proposal. **CONSENSUS: The consensus of the Committee was that plans for the first phase of Academy III should continue to move forward.**

The second session of Academy III may be presented during the winter of 1998 as a two-day seminar on the Indiana University campus. The proposed focus is Strategic Alliances with an emphasis on communications and marketing.

A revised draft of a survey from the ISEAS Steering Committee to special education directors regarding the theme, timing, and costs of the 1997-98 Leadership Academy III was reviewed. **CONSENSUS: There was a consensus that the revised draft be adopted, adding a note emphasizing that Phase I and Phase II are two stand alone workshops and a commitment would not necessarily have to be made for both. The surveys will be mailed the middle of January**

1997 and should be returned to the ISEAS office by the middle of February.

Trainers' Bureau: Collings presented a revised draft of a survey to be sent to directors asking them to list any members of their staff they would nominate to conduct training sessions in another district. The completed forms should be returned to the ISEAS office. A list will be compiled and made available to directors across the state. **CONSENSUS: The revised draft will be mailed to directors at the end of February 1997.**

School-Based Therapies Training Session: Bollinger noted that after discussion at the November Steering Committee regarding the need for OT/PT training he had sent a memorandum to Southeast Roundtable members asking the following three questions:

1. Is there a need for ISEAS to sponsor a topical conference for OTS/PTs?
2. Should this conference contain a strand that is applicable to administrators and instructional staff to better clarify school based therapies and the roles of the OT and PT?
3. Would this be an opportunity to also include a strand for transportation personnel and school nurses regarding issues related to OT and PT that also affect transportation and school health services?

The response from all roundtable members was an overwhelming "yes".

Joan Machuca also noted Northwest Roundtable's concern about the need for school-based therapies training.

Collings commented that Paul Ash is working with PTs on the possibility of a PT newsletter.

A letter was distributed from Kim A. Duchane, a teacher in the Adapted Physical Education teacher preparation program at Manchester College and currently a member of the Indiana DOE Adapted Physical Education Team led by Ms. Barb Ettl, IDOE Physical Education Consultant. The letter shared the results of a study focusing on the attitude and grading practices of secondary physical educators in inclusionary educational settings and set forth the criteria used.

CONSENSUS: ISEAS should pursue a statewide topical on school-based therapies and that a team approach should be emphasized. Collings will look into planning the topical in conjunction with CEC and the ICASE Winter/Spring Conference February 20-22, 1998.

Home School: Since Phyllis Craig was not able to attend, the topic of home schools will be discussed at a future meeting.

IPSB Exceptional Needs: The Steering Committee agreed that the Draft Standards for Teachers of Exceptional Needs document from the Indiana Professional Standards Board should be



continued on page 7

ISEAS • continued from page 6

available to all special education directors throughout the state. [Later in the day the ICASE president distributed a copy of the document to each roundtable representative. She asked that each roundtable conduct a focus group session and forward the results to her.] A copy of this document is available by contacting the ISEAS office at 800/654-7327.

Conference Sponsorships/reports: NASDSE: Sheila Decaroli reported on the 59th Annual NASDSE Meeting which she attended as ISEAS delegate November 17-20, 1996 in New Orleans. The theme of the meeting was "Accountability in a World Class Education System for Individuals with Disabilities". Decaroli reviewed the high points of Tom Hehir's presentation and discussed the following handouts as distributed: NASDSE's Vision for Balanced Accountability, CASE Paper on LEA Accountability to Local Shareholders and the SEA Role, Warren County (Bowling Green, KY) Progress Report forms, and Ysseldyke's paper on Including Students with Disabilities in State Assessment Programs.

An e-Mail newsgroup message highlighting the NASDSE keynote address of Dr. Marshall (Mike) Smith, Deputy Secretary of Education, was circulated. Dr. Smith addressed the topic of "Education Reforms and Accountability". Dr. Smith (1) reviewed the new initiatives of the U.S. Department of Education that will be part of the Budget Reconciliation or other legislation in the next six months, (2) outlined the funding initiatives that are cur-

rently underway and/or planned to help meet the four technology goals, and (3) addressed standards based education and accountability.

Decaroli briefed the group on the K.R. v. Anderson Community School Corporation case which Anderson won in the Seventh Circuit Court based on federal regulations and statutes. The statutes clearly make distinctions on difference of voluntary placements. The DOE interpretation is that a private school's offer of services is discretionary.

In the October 1996 Term the U.S. Supreme Court accepted a petition for a writ of certiorari (#96-323). David Gottshall, Anderson school attorney, feels that if the case is to be heard at all, it will not be argued until 1997-98. The Department of Justice will join Anderson schools in their argument.

The local Anderson newspaper has printed an editorial against public funds going into private schools.

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: December 6, 1996 Meeting: University Forum members met on December 6 in conjunction with the Indiana Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (IACTE) Winter Meeting at Indiana Wesleyan University, Keystone Crossing.

The next meeting of the Forum will be February 7, 1997 in the ISDD office at Indiana University Bloomington.

Other Business: IDEAS Videotape Series: The videotape series "Indiana Designs for Educating All Students, (IDEAS), is now completed and will probably be distributed in January. As the videos will be quite bulky, possible ways of handling distribution were discussed. The thirteen-tape series is facilitated by Marilyn Friend, IUPUI.

Special Education Law and Practice: The LRP manual "Special Education Law and Practice" has been purchased by ISEAS and is available for rotation throughout the roundtables. Sheila Decaroli, East Roundtable, will have the manual first as it bears on the K.R. court case in which Anderson is involved.

"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: The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 29, 1997 at the ISEAS Office

- 8:00 AM - Coffee and Rolls
- 8:30 AM - ISEAS Steering Committee Meeting
- 10:30 AM - Division Report and ICASE Executive Committee Meeting





Information from ICASE

ICASE Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

December 18, 1996

Holiday Inn North -
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-President), Joan Machuca (NW), Muriel Downey (NE), Mary Jo Dare (C), Brett Bollinger (SE), Sheila Decaroli (E), Patti Kem (NC), Marilyn Faris (SW)

Others Present: Bob Marra, Roger Williams, Pat Pierce, Tom Doyle, Mary Jo Sparrow, Cheryl Corning, Sharon Henderson, Judy Flowers

I. Approvals

A. **MOTION: After a motion by Kem/Downey, the November 13, 1996 Executive Committee minutes were approved as submitted.**

B. Rees presented a com-

prehensive balance sheet, docket of outstanding bills, and description of Treasurer's duties.

MOTION: After a motion by Young/Decaroli, the November 30, 1996 Treasurer's Report showing a balance of \$32,884.17 was approved as submitted. MOTION: After a motion by Dare/Young, the December 1996 docket of bills was approved for payment. MOTION: After a motion by Decaroli/Bollinger, the job description/treasurer's duties were approved as submitted with correction of reference to "legislative liaison."

II. Strategic Plan: 1996-97

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

1. Nominations - Dawson gave the 1996-97 report from the Nominations Committee as follows: Jan Rees for a second term as treasurer (1996-98) and Jim Sands as president-elect for 1997. **MOTION: After a motion by Machuca/Dawson the report of the Nomination Committee was approved as submitted.**

2. Technology - Kem distributed a Technology Survey

to determine what directors have Internet usernames and access to the system. Roundtable representatives will distribute the survey. Dawson is working on an ICASE home page and needs to determine where to locate it.

3. Membership - Flowers reported that the Membership Committee meeting will need to be rescheduled. The committee wants to review COCASE language in the constitution and will continue its work on the theme of the Spring Conference.

Young asked for nominations for Meritorious and Distinguished Service Awards. Flowers asked for names for Honorary membership.

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

1. Guidelines - Richmond reviewed a fax from Livovich recommending 50% of the proceeds be credited to the sponsoring roundtable. The remaining questions are how and for what may these funds be expended?

continued on page 9



ICASE • continued from page 8

2. Richmond reported that she and Young met regarding the general disbursement of ICASE revenue; they recommend that: (a) scholarships be paid from the ICASE treasury with no future fundraising events; and (b) statewide professional development on selected topics be provided. As an example, Richmond distributed a training proposal from the Institute for Applied Behavior Analysis in North Carolina. No action was taken at this time.

Machuca noted that the Northwest Roundtable is planning its topical conference on the Medically Fragile in the conference room of the Empress Pavilion at Gary, Indiana on March 14. Members discussed how the location next to the Empress Casino might be viewed by the membership. It was acknowledged that some might have concerns; the Northwest group was encouraged to proceed with an informative program to include Melinda Maloney and Bennett Leventhal from the University of Chicago.

Richmond distributed the IPSB Draft Standards for Teachers of Exceptional Needs.

ACTION: Richmond asked that each roundtable conduct its own focus group review and provide the feedback to her.

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. Legislative - Doyle reviewed a draft of the 1997 Legislative Agenda which was proposed as a coalition initiative primarily with IAPSS, ISBA, and COVOH. **MOTION: The motion by Young/Kem to accept the 1997 Legislative Agenda as revised after discussion was accepted.**

2. Policy - Henderson reviewed the charges of the Public Policy Committee with a papers clarifying terminology and recommendations for disposition of previous ICASE documents. The Public Policy Committee will continue its work through June 1997 pending a constitutional change to establish it as a standing committee.

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

1. Dawson reported on the confirmation of presenters for the ICASE Spring Conference.

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

Marra requested names for a small group to review new forms for the Alternative Residential Services to meet either January 28 or 30 or the week of February 10th.

The Division has had numerous requests for training on how

to access other dollars/resources from other agencies. A related item is for what are the other agencies responsible. Marra suggested that this may be a future ISEAS topical.

Marra distributed copies of the 1997-99 Biennium Budget proposal (11/20/96) from the State Department of Health. Members questioned why the state institutions would view themselves as the 'court of last resort' as quoted in the report overview. As members questioned the data, Marra requested the directors work with him to provide comparable data from the public school arena. **AC-TION: Richmond suggested that each roundtable representative collect the relevant data from each region. Marra could then convene the representatives to compile the overall data from the field.**

Marra also disseminated a 12/20/96 draft report to the Commissioner of the Department of Health from a Task Force on the Governance of ISBlind and ISDeaf. Marra noted that this report is not for general circulation but he does not know what will become of it. Members expressed concern with the report's recommendations and consequences.

Marra observed that if the General Assembly gets involved in reviewing the Property Tax,

continued on page 10



the school formula will likely receive little attention. Marra and Binder have been reviewing potential state budget increases for the MoMh, combining EH and LD, and particularly the impact of ADD on the OHI count. The need for a funding stream to offset the impact of related services was mentioned by a member as an area of mounting concern as pressure increases for family counseling, recreation therapy, transition,

etc. All agreed that we need information on how to consistently calculate our expenditures.

Marra reported that the Advisory Council has asked the Division to look at current and future Cooperative structures. He also commented that the electronic student record may present an opportunity to look at integrated options with CODA and perhaps the DOE Educational Information Systems.

F. Other Business -

G. **Next Meeting:** The Next meeting will be held on January 29, 1997 at the ISEAS Office
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

□

OSERS/OSEP . . .

Use of Part B Funds Beyond the Age of 22 —

[Editor's Note: The following is the text of a March 18, 1996 letter from Thomas Hehir, director of the federal Office of Special Education Programs, to the state director of the Michigan DOE Office of Special Education Services as posted on the Division News & Notes bulletin board of the Indiana SECN 12/4/96.]

This is in response to your letter to Dr. JoLeta Reynolds of the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) dated December 21, 1995. Your letter concerned an inquiry made to this Office by letter of July 10, 1995 from Director of Special Education Programs, Wayne County Regional Educational

Service Agency, asking whether funds under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Part B) could be used to support the continued out-of-State, private facility placement of a student who has had his twenty-first birthday.

In our response dated October 11, 1995, we advised Ms. Mathey that while Part B funds can be used for individuals up to their twenty-second birthday, unless State law terminates the entitlement to a free appropriate public education at an earlier age, we would need further clarification from Michigan on whether individuals who have had their twenty-second birthday "are considered to be children with disabilities' under State law,

and whether the services provided these individuals are considered to be 'preschool, elementary school, or secondary school education' (34 CFR 300.8 (c)) in Michigan." Your December 21, 1995 letter states your conclusion that Michigan does not consider children over 21 years of age to be "children with disabilities" as the term is used by the IDEA.

In light of your determination that these individuals are not "children with disabilities" within the meaning of Part B, it is our conclusion that Michigan and its public agencies may not use Part B funds to serve students beyond their twenty-second birthday. □



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 24, Issue 8

October 3, 1996

Judicial Decisions . . .

10-Year-Old With Profound Autism/MR Required Self-Contained Special Education Placement With Limited Mainstreaming. **Student v. Somerset County Board of Educ.**, 24 IDELR 743 (D.Md. 1996).

Student With Cerebral Palsy and Speech Impairment Not Eligible for SSI Benefits. **Howard v. Chater**, 24 IDELR 740 (9th Cir. 1996).

Telephone Testimony of Out-Of-State Witnesses Not Permitted Under IDEA. **Walled Lake Consolidated Schs. v. Jones by Thomas**, 24 IDELR 738 (E.D. Mich. 1996).

Judicial Appeal Must Be Limited To Matters Raised at Due Process. **County of San Diego v. California Special Educ. Hearing Office**, 24 IDELR 756 (9th Cir. 1996).

State Where Natural Parents Resided Must Pay for Education of Student With Disability in Family Home. **Catlin by Catlin v. Sobol**, 24 IDELR 767 (2d Cir. 1996).

District's Refusal To Allow Student With Multiple Disabilities To Participate in After-School Recreational Program Not Discriminatory. **Shoreline (WA) Sch. Dist. No. 412**, 24 IDELR 774 (OCR 1996).

Individuals With Disabilities Education Law Report

Volume 24, Issue 9

October 17, 1996

Judicial Decisions . . .

Unilateral Private School Placements: Parents Can Receive 'Interim Assessment' of Financial Costs Pending District's Appeal. **Susquenita Sch. Dist. v. Raelee S. by Heidi S.**, 24 IDELR 839 (3d Cir. 1996).

continued on page 12

TSE • continued from page 11

Daycare Center Employees Required To Perform Blood-Glucose Testing of Children With Diabetes. **Stuthard v. KinderCare Learning Centers Inc.**

OSERS/OSEP...

Payment for Part H Services Is Permissible Where Parents Will Not Incur Financial Loss. **Letter to Thaler**, 24 IDELR 858 (OSEP 1996).

State's Proposal To Change Licensing Requirement Did Not Violate IDEA. **Letter to Hunter**, 24 IDELR 856 (OSEP 1996).

If Behavior Assessments Is Not Related To Preplacement Evaluation/Initial Placement, State Law Determines Whether Consent Is Required. **Letter to Bannon**, 24 IDELR 857 (OSEP 1996).

OSEP's Reauthorization Proposal Strengthens Disciplinary Measures for Behavior Unrelated to Disability. **Letter to Collins**, 24 IDELR 855 (OSEP 1996).

IEP Must Identify Assistive Technology Services Which Are Necessary for FAPE. **Letter to Anonymous**, 24 IDELR 853 (OSEP 1996).

Students With Diabetes May Be Eligible For Special Ed, Depending Upon Effects of Disease. **Letter to Anonymous**, 24 IDELR 854 (OSEP 1996).

State Did Not Show Difference in Duties/Supervision of Speech Providers To Warrant Lower Degree Requirements. **Letter to Black**, 24 IDELR 851 (OSEP 1996).

State's Use of Part B Funds for Students Past Age 22 Depends Upon Whether State Considers Them Disabled. **Letter to Baldwin**, 24 IDELR 850 (OSEP 1996).

The Special Educator

Volume 12, Issue 5

September 27, 1996

Rulings Frown At Damages Under IDEA. 3rd Circuit's ruling in **W.B. v. Matula**, 23 IDELR 411, **Thompson by Buchanan v. Board of Special School District No. 1**, 24 IDELR 677 (D. Minn. 1996), **Brantley v. Independent School District No.625**, 24 IDELR 696 (D. Minn. 1996).

5th Circuit Rejects Presumption for Neighborhood School. **Flour Bluff Independent School District v. Katherine M.**, 24 IDELR 673 (5th Cir. 1996).

continued on page 13

TSE • continued from page 12

Judicial Decisions . . .

IEP, Placement Must Be Based On Disability Diagnosis. **Friedman by Friedman v. Vance**, 24 IDELR 654 (D. Md. 1996).

Tutors Were Entitled to Same Salary as Classroom Teachers. **State of Ohio ex rel. Fleming v. Rocky River Bd. of Educ.**, 24 IDELR 658 (Ohio Ct. App. 1996).

Without Other Agreement, Private School Was Stay-Put Placement. **Doe by Doe v. Independent Sch. Dist. No. 9 of Tulsa County, OK**, 24 IDELR 681 (N.D. Okla. 1996).

Compensatory Education a Just Reward for Pre-Trial Detainee. **State of Connecticut Unified Sch. Dist. #1 v. Department of Educ.**, 24 IDELR 685 (Conn. Super. Ct. 1996).

7th Circuit: Re-evaluation Could Be Done Despite Parents' Objections. **Johnson by Johnson v. Duneland Sch. Corp.**, 24 IDELR 693 (7th Cir. 1996).

OCR . . .

Private Schools' Obligations Toward Students with Disabilities. **Letter to Zirkel**, 24 IDELR 733 (OCR 1996).

Individuals With Disabilities Education Law Report

Volume 24, Issue 11

November 28, 1996

Judicial Decisions . . .

Bad Faith/Gross Misjudgment Necessary To State Valid ADA/Section 504 Claim. **Smith by Townsend v. Special Sch. Dist. No. 1**, 24 IDELR 1003 (D. Minn. 1996).

District's Failure To Evaluate, Place Preschooler With PDD Results in Private School Reimbursement. **Robertson County Sch. Sys. v. King**, 24 IDELR 1036 (6th Cir. 1996).

The Sixth Circuit awarded private school reimbursement in a case where a district failed to evaluate and place a preschooler with pervasive developmental disorder, and notify the child's parents of procedural rights.

OSERS/OSEP . . .

LEA Decides Appropriate Services, But Remedies Available to Parents To Contest. **Letter to Everett**, 24 IDELR 1045 (OSEP 1996).

OSEP Provides Guidance Regarding LRE and Transportation for Preschoolers. **Letter to Neveldine**, 24 IDELR 1042 (OSEP 1996). For more information on this subject see also **Letter to Wessels**, 24 IDELR 1043 (OSEP 1996).

continued on page 14

*TSE • continued from page 13***Individuals With Disabilities Education Law Report**

Volume 24, Issue 12

December 26, 1996

Judicial Decisions. . .

Court Finds Regular Ed Is LRE for 11-Year-Old With Autism, Persuaded by Evidence of Success. **Hartmann by Hartmann v. Loudoun County Bd. of Educ.**, 24 IDELR 1171 (E.D. Va. 1996).

IDEA Does Not Require Accommodation of Parents' "Ideal" Educational Program. **Wall by Wall v. Mattituck-Cutchoque Sch. Dist.**, 24 IDELR 1162 (E.D.N.Y. 1996).

Age Eligibility Rule Upheld, Despite Inclusion of Sports on Student's IEP. **Beatty by Beatty v. Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic Ass'n**, 24 IDELR 1146 (W.D. Pa. 1996).

Insurance Company Required to Contribute Towards Settlement and Defense Costs. **St. Paul Fire and Marine Ins. Co. v. Missouri United Sch. Ins. Council**, 24 IDELR 1143 (8th Cir. 1996).

Partial Success, Frustration of Due Process, and Overlawyering Prompted Court To Reduce Attorney's Fees By One-Half. **P.S. v. Contoocook Valley Sch. Dist.**, 24 IDELR 1141 (D.N.H. 1996).

Attorneys' Fees Refused Where Placement Process Well Underway at Time of Due Process Hearing. **Moncrieffe-Taylor v. Vance**, 24 IDELR 1160 (D. Md. 1996). □

FEDERAL UPDATE . . .

A Commentary on Inclusion by Frank Laski — This fall children with disabilities across the country are going to schools that opened with enrollments at an all time high. We go back to the pre- "right to education" years (1971) for similar enrollment levels above 51 million students. The population forecasters call for three million additional students within the next decade - students who will need more schools, (or in South Florida, trailers), 200,000 more teachers and billions in additional educa-

tion and transportation expenditures.

Most observers attribute the steady growth in enrollments to rising birthrates (especially among us older folks) and immigration. Less noted is the significant growth in kindergarten and pre-school and the larger percentages of 18 year olds and older remaining in school. In 1971, 37.5% of children ages 3-5 were in pre-school, today over 60% are in school. This year, one million more 5 year olds are in kindergar-

ten than were in 1971. At the other end, nearly one-third of eighteen year olds are on high school rosters.

While it is apparent that children with disabilities are contributing to the "newly discovered" enrollment trends and will be directly affected by the latest failure of rational planning for the education of our children, not much has been said about children with disabilities or special educa-

continued on page 15

FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 14

tion in the recent public reports. This itself is an interesting phenomenon, given that these children constitute over 10% of the growing school population and over the last few years have been the subject of much media and public attention. Increasing costs and growth of numbers of children with disabilities in the schools have been treated by 60 Minutes, Time, and other media as afflictions upon our education system.

By focusing on special education issues in isolation - apart from regular education - it has been simple to suggest and even conclude that education for children with disabilities is the problem and that containing, cutting back and eliminating it is a sensible solution.

When increasing numbers and costs in general education are noted, quite a bit attention is appropriately given to generating resources to meet demands and creative solutions to overcoming barriers presented by those demands. No sensible person suggests that the children are the problem. No one says aloud "just too many darn kids; let's cut out the five year olds".

But those same people, putting blinders on and examining the growth can say as the new Czar of Education opined "we are in the midst of a silent genetic catastrophe."

It is useful to consider some of the implications of this latest

education crisis for children with disabilities.

Education for children with disabilities as it exists was conceived, nurtured and matured at a time when generally school enrollments were declining or leveling off. Overall pupil-teacher ratios were dropping (22.3 pupils per teacher in 1971, 17.4 today). Demands on classroom space and school facilities was less intense than now. In the late seventies and early eighties, finding class space in neighborhood schools to bring children into their home school was rarely a problem.

Today enrollment trends fuel the fears that children with disabilities and their families are in competition with other children and their families. Over the next few years, we can anticipate arguments like:

* Placing a child with a disability in an already crowded class will take away from the education of the other children;

* Instead of providing related services and assistive technology to a child with disabilities, we could have provided computers for six other children;

* Providing extended year programs for children with severe disabilities hurts other extra-curricular programs for other children.

These arguments can be made and believed only by those who

view special education and children with disabilities as separate and apart from education for other children. We as advocates for children with disabilities and as professionals identified with special education often act and react in ways that reinforce this false framework that defines education for children with disabilities - not as special education (i.e. education that is as special as that education that ought to be provided to all children), but as a special interest.

Only when we insist that "special education issues" be debated in the context of regular education will we have practical approaches to important issues affecting all children. How far from this we are is illustrated by a recent report in the New York Times. The Times reported in September that high level New York City school officials were seriously exploring options to deal with the 90,000 students for whom there was no room. Among the best options was "looking to see if any large classrooms are being used by special education classes.... If so, those classrooms might be partitioned so that two special education classes could be held in the same space."

It is easy to dismiss the idea as a joke, but the notions that students with disabilities can be treated as public housing tenants

continued on page 16



FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 15

and that the creation of two segregated classrooms instead of one is an educational solution to anything are ideas that are extreme but logical extensions of our willingness to compartmentalize special education.

Instead of further partitioning and trailerizing special education classes, why not - in this circumstance - look into inclusion?

Is it because:

* Inclusion requires careful planning among teachers, parents, and principals and cannot be ordered from central purchasing?

Is it because:

* Inclusion requires significantly increased resources in regular classes, and smaller class sizes?

Is it because:

* Inclusion requires changes in classroom instruction supported by intensive clinical training of teachers?

Is it because:

* Local commitments to inclusion requires a commitment to education that benefits all children?

It's all of the above and more. All of the necessities for inclusion for children with disabilities are necessities for effective education for all children. If we are not able

to deal with the present school crisis and premise future reforms on that truth, we will be building more partitions.

CITATION: Laski, F. (1996, September). Up front. TASH NEWSLETTER, 22(9), 3.

SOURCE: GTE INS Inclusive Education newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 12/10/96.

Are Special Education Costs Rising? —

The Center for Special Education Finance was established in 1992 to address a comprehensive set of fiscal issues related to the delivery and support of special education services to children throughout the U.S. CSEF's mission is to provide information needed by policymakers to make informed decisions regarding the provision of services to children with disabilities, and to provide opportunities for information sharing regarding critical fiscal policy issues.

The Fall 1996 issue of THE CSEF RESOURCE, a newsletter published by CSEF, includes an article concerning the escalation of special education costs. The article, written by Jean M. Wolman and Thomas B. Parrish, CSEF Staff, questions whether the rising costs are reality or myth.

The final section of the article concerns questions to address regarding this issue. Following is that particular piece of their article

which was titled: "Escalating Special Education Costs? Reality or Myth?" by Jean M. Wolman & Thomas B. Parrish, CSEF.

Questions to Address

Returning to some questions posed earlier: Are special education costs and enrollments escalating? Enrollments clearly continue to grow and, as expected, contribute to rising costs. However, special education cost information is neither sufficiently current nor adequate to clarify the magnitude, causes, and implications of this growth.

Are expenditures rising faster than should be expected or accepted, and is special education encroaching on general education resources? If yes, to what extent is this due to the shifting of costs previously borne by other public agencies and also to the overall constraints placed on education budgets, especially in relation to other labor-intensive public sector activities such as health care and public safety?

Clearly, the perception is alive and perhaps warranted that the current levels of public resources are not sufficient to meet the education needs of all students. Here again, however, the supporting data are not clear.

Answers to questions such as the following would help to clarify



continued on page 17

FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 16

perceptions related to the issue of encroachment:

—What are the “real” costs of serving students with and without disabilities?

—How do state and local agencies deal with especially high-cost students? How are these costs best borne by the public—through local, state, or federal support?

—To what extent has responsibility for bearing these costs shifted from other public agencies to special education? From federal to state to local agencies?

—Are inroads in efficiency needed? What is being done? What might be done?

—What is the outlook for the future, and what demographic trends and education reforms might affect it?

As the demand for scarce resources continues to escalate, education agencies at all levels must share responsibility and accountability for bearing the costs of educating all students. On this broader level, questions like these need to be addressed:

—How are we using our education dollars as a nation? As states? As local school districts?

—How can districts and states use their existing dollars more effectively? How can we enhance educational productivity?

—How do national and state policies affect the implementation of shared costs and enhanced productivity? If they do not, what can be done to support cost sharing more effectively?

Next Steps

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and CSEF recognize the need to address these challenging issues, and recently established a committee of experts to guide a systematic examination of issues of this type. As part of this effort, we will be developing a series of “fact sheets” to address key issues related to the costs of special education and perceived encroachment. We look forward to sharing this information with our readers in the near future.

For more information about the resources and services available through CSEF, contact CSEF at Center for Special Education Finance, American Institutes for Research, P.O. Box 1113, Palo Alto, CA 94302-1113; 415/493-3550 (phone); 415/858-0958 (fax); e-mail: CSEF@AIR-CA.ORG; or http://www.air-dc.org/csef_hom.

SOURCE: GTE INS Federal newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 12/9/96.

FCC to Determine Rates for Access to the “Info Superhighway” — On February 8, 1996, President Clinton signed

into law the Telecommunications Act of 1996. This law affects affordability of telecommunications services for schools, libraries, and rural health care providers. The law mandates that the FCC create a federal-state Joint Board and that this board make recommendations about what services are eligible for discounts and what those discounts should be.

By November 8, the Joint Board will recommend action on the issue of whether schools and libraries will receive substantially discounted rates in order to access the Information Superhighway. The recommendations of the Board, made up of three FCC Commissioners, four State Public Utility Commissioners, and one consumer utility advocate, will influence the final decision of the FCC by May 8, 1997. The decision will determine for the next decade the rates that schools and libraries will pay for telecommunications services.

“Informal” comment on the FCC decision will not be accepted after November 8. Secretary of Education Richard Riley testified before the Joint Board and urged members to ensure that schools and libraries are able to afford connections to the educational resources that can be found on the Information Superhighway. “Every effort should be made to give our nation’s schools and

continued on page 18



FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 17

libraries free access to the new telecommunications world that is now emerging or at least access at substantially discounted or affordable rates,” said Riley.

President Clinton has set a goal of having every classroom and library connected to the Internet by the year 2000.

A related activity being sponsored by the Education Department is “NetDay.” NetDay is a nationwide effort which calls for volunteers to help wire schools for connection to the Internet. Because of a successful NetDay in California, 30 other states are planning NetDays.

For information on NetDay activities in your state, call: 1-800-55-NET96. Also available at this number is information on state contacts, a wiring kit and local business partners.

For more information about the FCC’s upcoming decision, go to the FCC site on the World Wide Web at: <http://www.fcc.gov>.

Department of Justice Strikes Again — Did you ever wonder who and where these so-called “disability inspectors” came from and from whom? Have you ever gone to a business owner and asked about accessibility concerns only to find out that said business owner swears he’s been inspected and has received a certificate that his business is in ADA compliance?

Well, according to a recent investigation by the Department of Justice hundreds of people who spent millions of dollars buying phony disability-access inspector licenses and useless skid resistant chemicals, which actually can make surfaces more dangerous for wheelchair users, will be getting their money back.

The scam, first detected in October 1994, was first investigated by a multi-agency federal force involving the Justice Department, the Customs Service, the Internal Revenue Service, the U.S. Secret Service and the Postal Inspection Service.

The repayment follows a federal grand jury indictment last February of six family members and two associates on charges of mail fraud, wire fraud and money laundering. Seven of the defendants have pleaded guilty and now face up to a maximum of five to ten years in prison.

Under the scam, investors were told they could earn up to \$45,000, per year inspecting businesses for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). For up to \$10,000, a sham company, National Consulting Institute, Inc. NCI sold people ADA inspector licenses—even though the law does not authorize licenses.

Using a standardized form, the NCI victims would inspect a business and for a \$100 fee send the form back to the company for

processing. When the form revealed potential violations, the victims would charge between \$400 and \$1,000 to tell the business what steps it had to take to avoid a lawsuit. The information sought by the form was not adequate to determine whether the business was complying with the ADA.

“The ADA is a common sense law that seeks to make businesses accessible to millions of Americans with disabilities,” said Associate Attorney General John Schmidt. “We will not permit con artists and swindlers to scare businesses into thinking the ADA requires more than is reasonable.”

Under a second scam, investors were sold skid resistant adhesive chemicals to be used by businesses seeking to become safer for wheelchair users. There is no specific requirement for skid resistance under the ADA. The investors, who paid between \$10,000 and \$14,000 to store the chemicals, were told that company salesmen would sell the chemicals to businesses in their area and they would make \$5 or more on each gallon sold.

After an investor purchased the chemicals, the sham company would make fake small orders of about \$100 each for a few months. By the time a victim realized the fraud, the defendants were hidden

continued on page 19



FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 18

behind layers of sham corporations and could not be located .

The Justice Dept. sent out about 800 letters on June 28, 1996 to individuals who invested in these scams notifying them that they may be able to get some of their money back. Federal agents have seized \$3.1 million in cash and property.

“This investigation uncovered a massive telemarketing, money laundering conspiracy to defraud hundreds of citizens out of millions of dollars,” said George Weise, Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service. “Customs and other Treasury bureaus will strive to target, investigate and dismantle all facets of international money laundering.”

After each of the eight are sentenced, which was expected to begin in August, the U.S. District Court in Tampa will order the seized assets to be sold and the proceeds to be distributed.

Anyone who believes they were misled by NCI or any other party or has questions about the ADA, should call the Justice Dept's ADA Information Line at 800-514-0301 or 800/514-0383(TDD).

SOURCE: GTE INS ADA.Independent newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 9/18/96.

Is Assistive Technology Always Expensive? — To

many educators, assistive technology and the schools conjures up images of high tech, high cost items for students and time-consuming strategies for teachers. Currently, there is debate within the Senate about provisions within the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requiring consideration of a child's assistive technology needs when developing the child's Individual Education Plan (IEP). In fact, the assistive technology provision is one of the issues that is contributing to the Senate's gridlock on its reauthorization bill.

The United Cerebral Palsy Associations (UCPA), in an effort to educate policymakers and school officials about the cost of assistive technology, has provided the following information.

UCPA says that assistive technology can include:

-A rigged up wooden item, such as something to raise a school desk to allow a student in a wheelchair to use the same desk as other students.

-A special switch added to a classroom tape recorder to allow a child with a disability to be able to turn it on.

-A small plastic item like a pencil grip that allows a child who has difficulty holding a pencil to hold that pencil so that he or she can do their schoolwork.

-Colored blocks to enable a

child with severe visual impairments to participate in motor activities with other children.

-A plastic or wooden tray added to a wheelchair so that a child who cannot effectively use a table or desk will have a place to write.

The above items are all very low-cost. And, it is true that assistive technology can include more expensive items such as a computer or a speech device. However, the requirement that consideration of a child's assistive technology needs be included when developing a child's IEP does not mean that the school must pay for the technology.

UCPA points out that assistive technology is being paid for through:

-Medicaid -private insurance - donations -private sector non-profit organizations -lending libraries that loan out and recycle assistive technology -school systems -disability-specific programs, such as an early intervention program or a rehabilitation program.

To summarize, school systems and families have a variety of sources to tap when looking for ways to pay for assistive technology. And, assistive technology items need not always be high-

continued on page 20



FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 19

tech and high cost, but can be a simple item that allows students with disabilities to participate in classroom activities.

SOURCE: GTE INS Federal newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 9/23/96.

Graduating into Debt: The Burdens of Borrowing for Graduate and Professional Students — Published in 1996 by The Education Resource Institute and the Institute for Higher Education Policy, this report responds to the fact that “no comprehensive studies of graduate and professional student borrowing have been conducted” and there is “no central course of information regarding borrowing trends at the graduate and professional level.” Drawing on information from various sources, the report advances understanding about the “growing loan debt facing the graduate and professional student cohort of American higher education.”

Since many roles in general and special education require graduate training, this information is also useful as a factor influencing personnel supply and demand. The following are highlights from the report.

* Although many graduate and professional students work while in training, the costs of graduate education require most of them to seek financial aid. Typi-

cally, these students are not eligible for need-based aid (e.g., Pell Grants) offered to undergraduate students. Thus, loans have increasingly become the dominant form of financial aid for students in graduate schools and professional schools.

* Federal student loan borrowing has increased dramatically. More than one million graduate and professional students are currently borrowing about \$7.7 billion per year (up from \$4.4 billion in 1993). Among graduate and professional students, the 74 percent increase in borrowing exceeds the 54 percent increase in total student loans. Although graduate and professional students comprise less than 14 percent of students in American higher education and 19 percent of all student borrowers, they actually borrow 28 percent of the total student loan funds.

* Low-income students and students from minority populations are those most likely to borrow at the graduate and professional levels. The borrowing rates are highest for Black and Hispanic students; 62 percent of Black (non-Hispanic) students and 60 percent of Hispanic students borrow, as compared with 54 percent of white, non-Hispanic students.

* Professional school graduates face repayment burdens that are prohibitively high in some cases, particularly for those choosing lower-paying, public

service oriented jobs.

* Doctoral recipients generally appear to have modest repayment burdens (as compared with those in medical, dental, and law programs). For example, Ph.D.s in Engineering in 1993 had a median cumulative debt of \$9,300 (with a monthly payment of \$113); doctorates in social sciences had a median cumulative debt of \$14,500 (with a monthly payment of \$176). These monthly amounts represent from 2 to 5 percent of the average monthly salaries for Ph.D. recipients, depending on the field of study.

* The average monthly student loan payments and monthly earnings among doctoral recipients in several fields are shown in the box on page 21. Although salary data for Education are not shown, readers may add salary figures from their own states.

To request a copy of the full report, contact: The Education Resources Institute, 330 Stuart Street, Suite 500, Boston, MA 02116-5237; 1-800-255-TERI, Ext. 4762; fax: 617/451-9425.

CITATION: The Education Resources Institute and The Institute for Higher Education Policy. (1996). GRADUATING INTO DEBT: THE BURDENS OF BORROWING FOR

continued on page 21



FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 20

Doctorate	Monthly Loan Payment	Starting Salary
Mathematics	\$ 103	\$ 39,500
Computer science	103	56,513
Physics/astronomy	103	50,600
Chemistry	103	50,933
Engineering	113	55,200
Life sciences	119	41,600
Education	123	Not shown
Social sciences	176	42,600
Humanities	121	32,800
Other	146	Not shown

with nine areas of proposed research inquiry, and asked to indicate the areas of interest to their state. The research areas included: rate of retention, home language and economic status, changes in disability classification, rates of suspension and expulsion, graduation rate, post-secondary status, family satisfaction with services, mobility rate, and provision of ESOL/ESL services. The one area of interest to all states was graduation rate. The area of least interest (five states) was mobility rate. Three state representatives indicated that their states would also be interested in achievement data, in reference to the general education curriculum, on students who received special education services under the age of five years.

Copies of the report are available from Project FORUM at NASDSE, 1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320, Alexandria, VA 22314, 703/519-3800 (phone), 703/519-3808 (fax).

SOURCE: GTE INS Federal newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 10/29/96. □

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS. Boston, MA: The Education Resources Institute.

SOURCE: GTE INS Ed. Personnel newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 10/21/96.

State Education Agency Perspective on Longitudinal Research in Early Childhood Education — Project FORUM, a federally-supported project housed at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) recently released a report titled, "Longitudinal Research on Children Who Received Early Childhood Special Education Services: The State Education Agency Perspective."

The report was authored by Joy Markowitz. Following is the abstract for the report.

In response to the growing need for data on the outcomes of early intervention and preschool special education, Project FORUM and the National Early Childhood Technical Assistance System (NEC*TAS) at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) collected information from eight states regarding their priorities for longitudinal research on students who received special education services under the age of five years. Several states were included that had served children with disabilities under the age of five years since the 1970's. State directors of special education, or their designee, were presented



ANNOUNCEMENTS

1997 William M. Evans Scholarship — The law firm of Bose McKinney & Evans is pleased to offer the 1997 William M. Evans Scholarship, to honor the memory of its founding partner Bill Evans. The William M. Evans Scholarship pays tribute to Bill's commitment to excellence in education and his personal dedication to children with disabilities.

This \$2,000.00 scholarship will be awarded to an Indiana public high school **special education** student (as defined by 511 IAC 7) who is pursuing post-secondary education in 1997-98, such as enrollment in a university, college, junior college or vocational training program.

The William M. Evans Scholarship will be awarded on the criteria of personal achievement, future goals, leadership potential, and financial need.

Last year was the fifth year for this scholarship offering. The 1996 scholarship winner was Stephanie Brumbaugh of Warsaw, Indiana.

1997 APPLICATION FORMAT: Each Indiana special education planning district is invited to submit as many official applications for scholarship consideration as deemed

necessary; there is no longer a restriction on the number of applicants that will be accepted from a given district. However, for scholarship consideration an applicant must be an Indiana resident, a member of an Indiana public high school senior class, and **currently** classified as a special education student.

An application packet with instructions was mailed to all Indiana Directors of Special Education by December 13, 1996. We suggest that your district begin the search for its appropriate candidates now. The deadline for submission of the completed application will be March 14, 1997.

We hope that your special education planning district will choose to honor its special education students by taking part in the 1997 William M. Evans Scholarship application process. Please contact Candy Morrison at 317/571-0051, if you have further questions.

University of Indianapolis Seminars — The University of Indianapolis will present two seminars in March: "The Oppositional/Defiant Child" will be held March 24, 1997 and "The Conduct Disordered Child" will be held on March 25.

The registration fee of \$79 for one workshop or \$135 for both includes materials and is payable to the University of Indianapolis.

The presenter is Dr. James D. Sutton who is an educator, psychologist, and author. Dr. Sutton has authored numerous books, guides, and cassette training programs for child service professionals, his most recent being *Children of Crisis, Violence and Loss*. His current project is a book for parents titled *If My Kid's So Nice... Why's He Driving Me Crazy?*

The workshops will be presented at the Holiday Inn Southeast, 5120 Victory Drive in Indianapolis. Telephone Kay Auerbach (317/788-3271) for a registration form. There are three ways to register: **PHONE:** 317/788-3353; **FAX:** 317/788-3300; **MAIL:** The University of Indianapolis, Center for Continuing Education and Management Development, 1400 East Hanna Avenue, Indianapolis, IN 46227

□



RESOURCES

OT/PT Newsletter — A copy of *CROSSINGS*, a newsletter for Indiana's school-based OTs and PTs is being sent to all DSEs to share with appropriate staff. *CROSSINGS* is intended to provide network and communication opportunities to school-based OTs and PTs and to assist with LEA recruitment and retention efforts. Lisa Kloc and Linda Kinkade, both of Gibson-Pike-Warrick, are the driving forces behind this communication effort. For a copy of this publication, contact Paul Ash at the Division of Special Education (317/232-0570).

SuccessAbilities! — 1003 Practical Ways to Keep Up, Stand Out and Move Ahead at Work by Paula Ancona is now available from, Center on Education and Training for Employment Vocational Instructional Materials Laboratory, 1900 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210; 614/292-4277; 800/848-4825

National Working Smarter columnist Paula Ancona has been helping people make their job easier and their careers stronger since 1988. Now, hundreds of her most relevant tips are presented in an easy-to-use handbook. It's packed with useful tips busy working people can use today. The order number is CETA-ABLTS (\$14.95). Call the Center on Education and Training for Employment for further information.

Sixth Annual National Education Goals Report — The sixth annual national education goals report has been released by the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP). The 1996 National Education Goals Report indicates that the nation's schools still have along way to go before meeting the education goals set in 1989. The annual report is an assessment of the work that the states are doing to meet the education goals by the year 2000.

The report includes 25 core indicators of progress toward the eight education goals. In 1989, six education goals were established; however, when the Goals 2000: Educate America Act was enacted, it codified the six national education goals and added two additional goals. The goals focus on school readiness, school completion, student achievement and citizenship, teacher education and professional development, mathematics and science achievement, adult literacy and lifelong learning, safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools, and parental participation.

The report indicates that there has been improvement on five of the 25 core indicators:

- Mathematics achievement has improved among students in grades 4 and 8.
 - More students overall and more female students are receiving math and science degrees.
 - Incidents and threats and injuries to students at school have declined.
- However, in other areas, the report indicates that progress is static. For example, the nation's high school graduation rate is the same (about 86%), there is little change in the reading scores of 4th and 8th graders, and the gap in college enrollment rates between white and minority students is the same.
- The National Education Goals Panel, however, remains optimistic. Since many states have developed or are developing academic standards, members of the panel are hopeful that continued progress will be made.
- A copy of the Goals Report can be requested from the National Education Goals Panel, 1255 22nd St., NW, Suite 502, Washington, DC 20037.
- The proportion of infants born with health risks has decreased.
 - More families are reading to their children on a regular basis.

continued on page 24



Resources • continued from page 23

Internet Citations —

Remember those graduate papers which were to have proper citations according to APA or other style manuals? Well, have you ever wondered how to cite electronic resources? (I actually hadn't either.) Anyhow, leave it to the Internet to provide that information as follows:

For APA, see: www.nyu.edu/pages/psychology/WEAPAS
 For MLA, see: www.cas.usf.edu/english/walker/mla.html
 For Chicago Style, see: library.ccsu.ctstate.edu/~history/docs/chicago.html

SOURCE: FYI Newsletter (11-25-96) published by ISDD with Internet home page: <http://www.isdd.indiana.edu>

Project APPLES

Videotapes — Goals:

- 1) To provide technical assistance and inservice training to assist in the development and enhancement of service delivery systems for pre-school-age children with disabilities.
- 2) To provide technical assistance and inservice training to assist in the collaboration with infant and toddler programs to promote comprehensive, coordinated programs and services to children with disabilities, birth to age 5, and their families.

Each month throughout the

school year Project APPLES sponsors APPLES Magazine, a monthly interactive satellite inservice program, offering topics of interest to early childhood educators. Videotapes of each hour and a half APPLES Magazine are now available from Macomb Projects (each videotape \$49.95).

Having Fun Together...Music & Developmental Activities for Use with Young Children - Jill Tatz

Using Computers to Enhance Communication - Project ACTT

Behavior Management - Dr. Eric Ward

Rutland Center Developmental Therapy Model - Karen Davis

ISBE Early Childhood Representatives - Sandra Crews & Audrey Witzman

Planning the Learning Environment for Young Children - Dr. Judy Helm & Dr. Robert Collier

Integrating the Computer Into the Early Childhood Curriculum - Linda Robinson, Char Ward, & Letha Clark

Genetics: A Family Affair - Teresa Hadro

Emergent Literacy in Young Children - Dr. Kathy Barclay

Play for Growing - Mary Sinker

Communication with Parents...The Management of Differences - Al Smith

If you wish to purchase a copy of any of the programs, contact: Project APPLES, 28 Horrabin Hall, Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL 61455.

Purchase orders may be faxed 309/298-2305 or phoned 309/298-1634.

Clearinghouse on Assessment Information —

The National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing is a federally funded research center and a clearinghouse on assessment reforms that works with educators at the district and state levels.

The consortium of seven universities, known as CRESST, is housed at UCLA's Center for the Study of Evaluation.

CRESST serves as the most centralized resource for research and information about assessment. The center publishes a newsletter, which is available at no cost.

For more information or to receive the newsletter, contact CRESST at 10920 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 900, Los Angeles, CA 90024; 310/206-1532. □



***Tranquility™* for Special Education - Customized Electronic Forms Software**

Tranquility™ is a customizable software product for producing practically all forms planning districts are responsible for, not only IEPs. The product is currently in it's third (3rd) school year of use within eight (8) planning districts throughout Indiana. The eight districts have varying levels of size, logistics, and experience with *Tranquility™*.

The program was developed by Tranquility Solutions, Inc., an Indiana based software company, with input by special education directors, administrators, and teachers. Their staff includes former educators. They remain up-to-date with IDEA and Article-7 modifications and changing user needs. Tranquility Solutions has regular meetings with the staff at the Division of Special Education to ensure *Tranquility™* is the most effective and efficient system on the market.

When analyzing *Tranquility™*, the key points to consider are:

System Sophistication:

- a) **Flexibility / Adaptability** - *Tranquility™* can adapt to and address a planning district's sophisticated needs
- b) **IEM/CODA System Interface** - *Tranquility™* ties into the State supported IEM/CODA student management system - eliminates need for two separate systems
- c) **Generalized Solution** - practically all forms (ITPs, 504s, Psychological Reports which feed into Case Conference Reports, Causal Conferences, etc.) are in *Tranquility™*, not just IEPs
- d) **Goals and Objectives** - option available to use state provided Goals and Objectives bank or customize the list to planning district's individual needs
- e) **Students Transferring within District** - handles electronic transferring of data for students who move from school-to-school or corporation-to-corporation within your planning district
- f) **Customized Output** - various types of output can be produced from the Case Conference: a) Progress Charts to accompany grade cards, b) Student Profile reports for general education teachers, c) Data Entry Summary Sheets for data entry personnel, d) other reports
- g) **Individualization** - able to create truly Individual forms/documents for each student
- h) **Expandability** - also used in General Education for Career (4-Year) Plans and Portfolios
- i) **Present Level of Performance (PLEP)** - if desired by a planning district, there is an option which allows PLEP to be maintained with each long term IEP Goal

Service and Support:

- a) **On-Site Training** - district's staff trained not only at start-up, but also on yearly basis
- b) **Knowledgeable support staff** available during the day
- c) **Documentation** - extensive special education specific user and training manuals developed, as well as on-line and paper-based general user manuals available
- d) **Tranquility Solutions, Inc.** is a software company with a vision to serve the needs of special education
- e) **Product Enhancements Address Article-7 Changes** - yearly improvements are made to ensure the needs of special education are met

Other Key Points:

- a) **Coordination with State Division of Special Education**
- b) **Ease of use**
- c) **Monitoring** - Compliance assured
- d) **Reporting** - reports available to help districts monitor and analyze information
- e) **Time Savings** - once initial data entered, only updated data needs to be entered
- f) **Quality** - *Tranquility™* is currently in it's third school year of use
- g) **Existing Customer Base** - colleagues from other districts available to help in startup process and gain advice for on-going use of *Tranquility™*
- h) **Output Quality** - forms are easy to read, more information tends to be recorded for students

Tranquility™ can operate on a network and is available for both Windows (3.1 and 95) and Macintosh based personal computers. For your information, *Tranquility™* will be presented on Friday of the spring 1997 IFCEC conference. The product has been or will be presented at Roundtables throughout Indiana.

Contact Jim Stukenborg at 219/935-9191 for additional information or to schedule a presentation on the *Tranquility™* software.

