

# 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>

April 1997 - volume 18 number 4

## *The Art of Growing Invisible Antennae*

by Nicola Schaefer

In a plane heading for Toronto, where I was to be part of a conference on inclusion of people with disabilities in their own homes within the community, I found myself talking as one does on planes, with a fellow passenger. We were both middle-aged women with adult offspring. Ellen told me about hers and then it was my turn.

“My youngest, Ben, is a tree surgeon in England; next up is Dominic, who’s a freelance photographer in Vancouver, and my oldest, Kate, is a teacher in Winnipeg.”

“Oh, yes,” said Ellen, “What does she teach?”

“She’s not a conventional teacher,” I said. “But I suppose one could say she teaches the art of growing invisible antennae.” Before Ellen’s baffled expression had time to become permanent, I explained further. I told her what an interesting and complex woman my daughter is and how despite, or rather because of, the inconveniences with which she has to contend - including quadriplegia and lack of speech - she is, indeed, a brilliant, full-time (if unpaid) teacher to anyone willing to learn.

As her first student, I told Ellen it took me a while to adapt to her teaching methods. There were no lecture notes to be taken, no essays to be written, no exercises to practice, no books (beyond the generic “Cerebral Palsy: How to Deal with your Wonky Kid” type) to study. There was, and still is, just this lovely person lying or sitting around and challenging me to help her have a life.

Anyone unable to move much, or to communicate beyond body language, needs to have enormous

*continued on page 2*

### *Inside . . .*

<i>Administrators' Corner</i>	3	<i>ISEAS University Forum Meeting</i>	6	<i>Federal Update . . .</i>	15
<i>ISEAS Steering Committee Meeting Minutes</i>	4	<i>ICASE Executive Committee Meeting Minutes</i>	8	<i>Announcements</i>	23
<i>ISEAS University Forum Focus Group Meeting at IUPUI</i>	6	<i>An Indiana Learning Lab</i>	10	<i>Resources</i>	24
		<i>Department of Education News</i>	11	<i>What Do We Know About . . . Students with Disabilities and State Assessments?</i>	25

*Art • continued from page 1*

patience when trying to get their point across. So, too, does the recipient of the information. So one of the first things I learned from Kate was to slow down when I was “listening”, and to try first one thing and then another, and another, until I felt I had understood her. Consequently, I also learned to watch her expressions carefully to see what made her demonstrate different emotions. These emotions included amusement (the trigger for which might be me dropping something on my foot and hopping around cursing, for example), alarm (the approach of a nurse with a needle or a baby brother looming over her with a Tonka truck), dreaminess or contentment (particular pieces or types of music, having a massage), interest (when she was young it was usually food, but when she became a teenager this was superseded by hairy young men), irritation or disdain (being encouraged, sometimes with the necessity of force, to intake fluids when she wanted simply to be left alone), and pure joy (the appearance of a favorite person, perhaps).

A major lesson I’ve learned in life with Kate is the importance of becoming an advocate on her behalf. Originally a shy person who accepted the status quo, I gradually realized that Kate had rights and needs that weren’t being addressed, and wouldn’t be unless I got together with the other parents and, with them, spoke up for our children. Back in the 1970s, when there was literally nothing to assist parents like myself and our children - integrated school, respite care and so

on were but dreams - I remember saying to a friend, “I’m constantly putting up my hand at meetings, typing proposals, phoning bureaucrats; I’m becoming nothing more than an irritant.” “Remember,” said my friend, “irritants create pearls” -referring, of course, to the grain of sand in the oyster that is the beginning of the pearl. It was a good thought.

Kate also teaches philosophy and ethics. Had I not known her, I don’t think I’d ever have appreciated my own life as keenly as I do. Nor would I have given as much thought to ethical questions about amniocentesis, abortion, the implications of the words “quality of life,” or the frightening knowledge that certain individuals are devalued. By her very being, she has encouraged me to ponder these issues and has guided me in my thinking.

Everything Kate has taught me sprang from the same root - trying as far as possible to see and feel life from her point of view. What must it feel like to be stuck in a wheelchair half the time, to be unable to say, “I really fancy a plate of fish and chips and then a meander around the neighborhood, now that spring is here”, to have little or no control over what is done to me or by whom, to be reliant on others for every aspect of my life? I’ve learned to be as empathetic as possible and to try to sense what’s going on in her head - in other words, to grow invisible antennae.

During our conversation (I didn’t do all the talking!), Ellen told me how much she’d learned

from her nephew, who had Down Syndrome. Later she asked me where Kate lived and what she did during the day. I described Kate’s living arrangement and then explained that because there was no suitable daytime occupation in Winnipeg for her when she reached the age to leave school, she stayed in the Multiply Handicapped class - or, as I preferred to call it, Room 107 at Gordon Bell High School until she was 23. Then, she and three other young women (including Diana Tureski, now also in SWES), spent a couple of years in Project Inclusion, an individually designed adult education program at Red River Community College. When a decrease in funding caused the demise of this initiative, I investigated daytime situations for adults with significant disabilities and decided that SWES, operated by DASCH, would be best for Kate. Luckily, she was accepted and has been there ever since.

As we headed down to Toronto, I told Ellen that over the years I’ve often popped into SWES and have noticed with interest and appreciation the way it was developed and adhered increasingly to its mandate of regarding participants as individuals, each with their own specific contributions to make and needs to be met. I also find it immensely gratifying that, almost without exception, the people working in SWES have proved to be among Kate’s most exemplary students. First, they take a real interest in



Art • continued from page 2

Kate as a person and her methods of communicating. Second, they have learned to adapt to her specific and complex needs. And third, I can rely on them to advocate for Kate when necessary. I stressed to Ellen that these good staff people take a similar interest in all the participants in SWES,

and I'm sure they have been as open to learning from them as they have from Kate. I think they would agree that Kate and company are extraordinary teachers.

Nicola Schaefer is a writer and speaker from Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

CITATION: Schaefer, N. (1996, September). The art of growing invisible antennae. TASH NEWSLETTER, 22(9), 30.

SOURCE: GTE INS Severe newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 1/2/97. □

## ADMINISTRATORS' CORNER

Charlene Green, former director of special education at Indianapolis Public Schools and assistant superintendent in Chicago Public Schools, has accepted a new assignment in Nevada. Charlene is the assistant superintendent of the special student services division of the Clark County School District (2832 East Flamingo Road) in Las Vegas, NV 89121.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Position of Director of Special Education is available at Northeast Indiana Special Education Cooperative, 112 South Orchard, Kendallville, Indiana 46755.

License Required: Valid Indiana Special Education Directors License (or documentation which signifies eligibility)

Length of contract is 3 years (240 day year) with the following benefits: Insurance is fully paid (all but \$1.00) and includes: Life, group, health, dental, vision and prescription drugs. An automobile is also provided

Applications should be received by May 15, 1997 and anticipated employment date July 1, 1997. Call 1-800-589-5236 to request application or additional information.

\*\*\*\*\*

Directors: April 21-25, 1997 is School Psychology Week in Indiana... so invite a school psychologist to take you out to lunch!

\*\*\*\*\*

A link has been created from the Indiana Division of Special Education Web Site <<http://www.indstate.edu/iseas/dse.html>> called the Master Reference Directory. This site contains all of the correspondence, documents and information with which the Division has been involved concerning special education issues.

### Happy Birthday!

April 14  
**Ann Paetz**  
MSD Lawrence Township

April 14  
**Connie Manous**  
East Chicago City Schools

April 16  
**Rebecca Hartley**  
Division of Special Education

April 21  
**Gary Collings**  
ISEAS Project

April 22  
**Thomas Ryan**  
Noblesville Schools



# ISEAS Steering Committee Meeting Minutes

February 19, 1997

[These minutes are considered unofficial until approval at the next meeting on March 19, 1997.]

**Members Present:**

Brett Bollinger, Southeast Representative; Phyllis Craig, North Central Representative; Mary Jo Dare, Central Representative; Sheila Decaroli, East Representative; Sandra Lange, Southwest Representative; Carson Lantis, Northeast Alternate; Joan Machuca, Northwest Representative; Bob Marra, Director, Division of Special Education; Jeff Young, ICASE Representative

**Staff Present:**

Gary Collings, ISEAS Executive Director and Susie Thacker, ISEAS Executive Assistant

**Others Present:**

Mike Livovich, ICASE Executive Committee Member; Jan Rees, ICASE Treasurer; and, Gwenn Ringger, Northwest Indiana

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM by Gary Collings as ISEAS Executive Director.

**APPROVALS: MOTION: Minutes from the January 29, 1997 meeting were presented. With a motion by Decaroli/second by Young, 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	42.88

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

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

Collings noted that on Friday morning, February 21, during the Division report at the Spring ICASE Conference Bob Marra will discuss the implications of Senate Bill No. 256. If this bill is passed, the Department of Education will be required to conduct a study of the administration of special education programs and to report findings to the special education administration study committee by October 1, 1998. Collings commented that funds from the Administrative Study Keyclub (ASK) might be used to offset expenses for site visits for the study groups. As it now stands, the role of the ISEAS Project will be to prepare documents and facilitate various task group sessions.

**1996-97 Events/Reports:**

*LEASE Academy III:* Collings briefed the Committee on a meeting he had with Joanne Miller of the Gallup Organization to discuss the introduction course on the Teacher Perceiver Process for Phase 1 of ISEAS Academy III.

Miller offered a choice of the following dates: June 16-17 or July 31-August 1, 1997. **CONSENSUS: After discussion, the Steering Committee agreed the earlier dates of June 16-17 would offer participants information and insights in the process in time for interviewing during the summer.** Representatives were asked to give these dates to their roundtables. It was also decided that directors would be given first consideration. Any unfilled slots would be available to personnel directors. At this time approximately 20 participants are anticipated, with tuition at \$195 each, plus travel and overnight expenses for Miller.

Collings also has met with Rebecca Libler, chairperson of the department of educational leadership, administration and foundations at Indiana State University, regarding the Principals Leadership Academy. The Academy is a DOE project with Indiana State University having a contract to provide services and training through her department. Libler will look into the possibility of two or three special education administrators participating in the Principals Academy each year. Collings noted that Libler has plans to revive the director of special education licensing program at ISU through her education administration department.

*Trainers' Bureau:* A survey will be mailed to directors February 24 asking them to list any

*continued on page 5*



*ISEAS • continued from page 5*

members of their staff they would nominate to conduct training sessions in another district. The completed forms should be returned to the ISEAS office by March 28. A Trainers' Bureau Directory will be compiled and made available to directors across the state.

*School-Based Therapies*

*Training Session:* Paul Ash, a member of the IFCEC Planning Committee, will introduce the idea of ISEAS sponsoring a School-Based Therapies Training Topical during the 1998 IFCEC conference.

*Internet: ISEAS Web Home*

*Page:* The address for the ISEAS home page on the Internet web has been shortened to <http://www.indstate.edu/iseas>.

**Conference Sponsorships/ Reports:** *CEC:* Salt Lake City will be the site for the International CEC Convention April 9-13, 1997. The theme for this year's convention is "Celebrating 75 Years of Serving Exceptional Children". The selection of an ISEAS representative to attend the CEC Convention was tabled until March so that representatives could talk with their roundtables.

*LRP:* The annual LRP Legal Conference will be held May 4-7, 1997 in San Diego. Joan Machuca, North Central Roundtable, will attend as ISEAS representative.

*Midwest Special Education Leadership Conference:* The annual Midwest Special Education Leadership Conference will be

held in Breckenridge, Colorado on June 24-27, 1997. Traditionally, ISEAS sponsors the participation of the ICASE President-elect. This will be confirmed by the March meeting.

**University Forum: February 7, 1997 Meeting:** Members of the University Forum met February 7 at the ISDD office at Indiana University in Bloomington to allow special education faculty to join in a discussion about personnel preparation. Five special education directors from Southeast and Southwest Roundtables also participated. Participants discussed the following two questions in three small groups during the morning session: 1) How can IHEs and LEAs work together to support first year experienced and limited license teachers? 2) How can IHEs and LEAs work together to provide authentic and effective field experiences? A Forum business meeting was held during the afternoon. Those attending seem to feel that it was a very positive and productive day. Copies of the full notes from the February 7 meeting are available upon request from the ISEAS office.

*Next Meeting:* The March 7 Forum meeting will be hosted by IUPUI. Members are asked to bring a general educator. The IPSB Reaction Survey will be used to gather comments.

**Other Business: Home Schooling:** Collings reported that the ICASE Board did not feel it was necessary for ICASE to either seek a legal opinion regarding home schooling or bring the issue

to the IAPSS Special Education Committee as had been discussed at the January Steering Committee meeting.

*IDEAS Videotape Series:*

Directors may pick up their district's copies of the videotapes at the Division or at the IFCEC Conference February 20-22 at the Radisson Hotel at Keystone Crossing. 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, has the manual first as it bears on the K.R. court case in which Anderson is involved.

*"Who are the Children Being Born Today":* The video is available by contacting the ISEAS office.

*"Look Who's Laughing":* The video is available by contacting the ISEAS office.

**Next Meeting: The next meeting will be held on** March 19, 1997 (Wednesday) at the ISEAS office per the following schedule:

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



**ISEAS University  
Forum  
Focus Group  
Meeting at IUPUI**

**March 7, 1997**

**Participants:** Cathy Shea (IUS), Sharon Knoth (DOE), Marlaine Chase (UE), Pat Rogan (IUPUI), Roberta Gajewski (IUPUI), Sharon Lingvai Smith (IUPUI), Pat Tefft Cousins (IUPUI), Chris Leland (IUPUI), Alice Cross (ISDD), Mary Beth Janes (ISDD), Mary Held (IU doctoral student), Mary Ann Dudzinski (VU), Ann Smith (ICASE), Jim Murray (ICASE), Jane Swiss (SFC), Richard Abdul (SFC), Lyle Lloyd (PU), Gary Collings (ISEAS)

There were no participants from the faculties of I.U., ISU, or BSU.

After introductions Shea, as chairperson of the University Forum, commented on the purpose of our morning session. Participants are to compare the Forum's 16 criteria developed in January 1996 to the ten IPSB Standards for Teachers of Exceptional Needs. The two lists are as follows:

The ISEAS/University Forum proposes, as criteria to gauge standards, developed for the **Exceptional Needs** teaching certificates:

Will the standards...

1. Produce special education personnel capable of delivering services in a variety of delivery models?
2. Produce special education personnel capable of delivering services to a diversity of students with special needs, e.g. behavior, hearing, language and communication, vision?
3. Produce special education specialists with in-depth expertise for those students requiring extraordinary services, e.g. behavior, hearing, language and communication, vision?
4. Allow for an increased diversity of candidates choosing a teaching career?
5. Result in better students outcomes (for students ages 0 - 21)?
6. Prepare special education personnel with sensitivity to diversity of all students?
7. Develop teachers who can identify and use community resources to enhance education opportunities for students?
8. Allow for partnerships with students and families in the decision-making process, e.g. IEPs and Transition Planning?
9. Be accepted by all stakeholders, e.g. families of students with disabilities, professional and advocate organizations?
10. Require on-going professional development?
11. Promote collaboration between General and Special Education?
12. Meet or exceed competencies of professional organizations as identified through NCATE, e.g. the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association (ASHA)?
13. Allow part-time (i.e. less than "full load," evening, summer) students to complete coursework in sequence and over a reasonable period of time?
14. Allow Indiana IHEs to provide sufficient number of programs to meet the demands for special education personnel?
15. Increase the number of individuals choosing special education as a career?
16. Assure knowledge of general education curriculum and instructional strategies?

**IPSB Educators of Students with Exceptional Needs - Common Core Standards**

STANDARD #1 The educator of students with exceptional needs is well-versed in the history, philosophy, and foundations of special education as well as in current laws and contemporary issues in the field and uses of this knowledge to enhance educational opportunities for all students.



*continued on page 7*

*ISEAS • continued from page 6*

**STANDARD #2** The educator of students with exceptional needs is knowledgeable of human growth and development and uses this knowledge to provide meaningful learning opportunities.

**STANDARD #3** The educator of students with exceptional needs is competent in selecting, administering, and interpreting a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies and utilizes this information to design, implement, and evaluate instruction and to guide students in self-assessment.

**STANDARD #4** The educator of students with exceptional needs recognizes that optimal learning relates new information to the student's prior experiences and knowledge.

**STANDARD #5** The educator of students with exceptional needs is cognizant of the importance of an active learning environment and designs a setting which fosters an enriching, nurturing and safe climate where diversity and risk-taking are valued.

**STANDARD #6** The educator of students with exceptional needs understands the developmental nature of learning and uses multiple approaches and strategies to provide a variety of activities and opportunities to facilitate student success.

**STANDARD #7** The educator of students with exceptional needs understands the

importance of teaching appropriate social skills and effectively applies and models these strategies in interactions with students, families, and colleagues.

**STANDARD #8** The educator of students with exceptional needs understands reflective practices and the importance of ongoing professional development and applies the knowledge gained to promote both student growth and professional outreach.

**STANDARD #9** The educator of students with exceptional needs is aware of the need to collaborate with families, school colleagues, and the larger community to support students' learning and well-being and actively cultivates these partnerships.

**STANDARD #10** The educator of students with exceptional needs demonstrates an awareness of a wide array of community resources and accesses these services to support students' needs.

For the focus group discussion participants divided into two groups. Swiss facilitated one group that compared the first eight criteria to the ten standards; Chase's group compared the last eight criteria to the ten standards. After lunch representatives of each group reported on the conclusions. Participants will be mailed a draft paper from the morning discussion. The session ended at 1:00 p.m. □

## ISEAS University Forum Meeting

**March 7, 1997**

*[These minutes are considered unofficial until approval at the next meeting on April 4, 1997.]*

**Members Present:** Cathy Shea (IUS), Jane Swiss (SFC), Sharon Knoth (DOE), Mary Beth Janes (ISDD), Marlaine Chase (UE), Lyle Lloyd (PU), Jim Murray (ICASE), Ann Smith (ICASE), Gary Collings (ISEAS).

**Others Present:** Richard Abdul (SFC)

Shea asked for a motion to accept the February 7, 1997 meeting minutes as presented. The motion for acceptance of the minutes by Knoth/Janes was approved.

Janes took notes on her laptop from the morning session reports. Members concurred that the notes should be incorporated into the IPSB reaction format. It was suggested this reaction paper format would be mailed to the morning session participants for their review.

Knoth reported that the LRE videotape series has been approved for CRUs by contacting her. She announced in June five regional workshops across the state will be conducted on Discipline Strategies. There will be follow-up sessions the next two summers. Maggie McLaughlin



*continued on page 8*

ISEAS • continued from page 7

from the University of Maryland will be at DOE on March 21 to discuss statewide assessment.

Janes suggested that the Grants Notebook, which was developed to keep Forum members informed of grant activities, might be transferred to the Forum web page (<http://www.indstate.edu/iseas>).

Swiss reported that she has received the Distance Education

file from Littlejohn. Lloyd asked that Distance Education be discussed at a future meeting. He reported that Purdue will offer an assistive technology one-credit course (AUS/EDPS590T) over IHETS the week of July 28. Contact Jenny Towler in the Division of Continuing Education at Purdue for course registration information. (Phone: 765/494-7943; FAX: 765/496-2484; E-Mail:

JLTOWLER@STEW-O1MS.CEA.PURDUE.EDU)

**Next Meeting:** April 4, 1997  
ISEAS Office  
10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

**To be Discussed:**

- Review Standards Reaction Paper
- Distance Education
- May 2 Forum Meeting at ISU ☐



# Information from ICASE

## ICASE Executive Committee Meeting

February 19, 1997

Radisson Hotel - 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), Carson Lantis (NE), Mary Jo Dare (C), Brett Bollinger (SE), Sheila Decaroli (E), Phyllis Craig (NC), and Sandra Lange (SW)

OTHERS PRESENT: Bob

Marra, Tom Doyle, Judy Flowers, Patti Kem, Sharon Henderson, Gwenn Ringger, Susie Thacker

I. Approvals  
A. **MOTION: After a motion by Young/Machuca, the January 29, 1997 Executive Committee minutes were approved as submitted.**

B. Rees presented a comprehensive balance sheet showing a total equity of \$35,938.50 and docket of outstanding bills in the amount of \$1,704.15. **MOTION: After a motion by Dawson/Bollinger, the January 31, 1997 Treasurer's Report and docket of bills were approved as submitted.**

II. Strategic Plan: 1996-97  
A. Goal I: Encourage communication, support, and promotion of

administrators of special education.

No membership report/guidelines were presented.

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

Livovich reported on the various roundtable topical conferences which have been completed and are in the planning process. Clarifications were offered for the Northwest topical in March, the East topical in April and Central's topical in June.

Livovich introduced Topical Conference Guidelines - Options A and B. The primary difference in the two options was in the distribu-



continued on page 9

tion of the proceeds. After considerable discussion there was consensus that the intent was to assure that no Roundtable would suffer a financial loss under any circumstances by sponsoring a topical conference.

All roundtable proceeds will be maintained in the ICASE treasury with a subaccount for each of the roundtable credits/debits.

**MOTION: After a motion by Decaroli/Dare Option B was approved with the following amended language: 10. Roundtables taking part in planning and implementing topical conferences will receive an equal amount of 50% of the proceeds from all topical conferences. The remaining 50% of the proceeds will be maintained in the ICASE treasury.**

The full text of Option B as approved is to be made available to members through the roundtable representatives.

Livovich and Machuca facilitated a brainstorming session of emerging trends and issues as possible ideas for future topical conferences. The following items were ranked highest: infant and early childhood, IDEA reauthorization, agency collaboration, statewide assessment (gateway), extended school year, behavior management. **ACTION: Topics listed are to be discussed at next month's Executive Committee Meeting.**

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.

Henderson gave a Legislative and Policy Committee update. Draft proposals for Procedures for Special Committees, President's Checklist for Establishing a Special Committee, Practice Regarding Accessibility for ICASE Sponsored Activities, and Policy and Procedures on Fiscal Management were reviewed. **MOTION: A motion by Young/Machuca to accept the revisions in the four areas was approved.**

There was discussion regarding clarification of the draft of Issues and Importance Relative to Reauthorization of IDEA. **ACTION: Changes will be made and presented to the Executive Committee at the March meeting.**

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

Bollinger briefed the members on the February 7 meeting of the University Forum at Bloomington. He stressed the need for local directors to let university trainers know what local districts need and expect. He encouraged directors to participate in other planned meetings of the University Forum to address personnel preparation needs.

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

Marra discussed the results of the OHI survey which the ICASE Executive Committee requested

directors to complete by February 7. The data indicated a variety of medical conditions with the majority of services falling within the resource services. The results of the survey will be distributed. The overall growth in special education is approximately 3% each year. Members discussed the loss of students with moderate and emotional disabilities.

Marra noted that SB 256 had been amended to include statewide assessment issues. He will discuss this bill in detail tomorrow after the general business meeting.

Marra briefed the members on SB 400 which offers flexible funding between agencies. This bill proposes new language for a three agency board to replace the Department of Health in the governing process. Students classified under either CHINS or as delinquent would no longer be differentiated. Cost sharing is also proposed. Multi-agency collaboration will be needed with local communities developing their own protocols. Another section of this bill calls for a cost study to be conducted at the state special institutions.

G. **Next Meeting:** The next meeting will be held on March 19, 1997 at the ISEAS Office.

**Time:** 10:15 a.m. Division Report  
11:00 a.m. ICASE Executive Committee Meeting



# An Indiana Learning Lab

In October 1989 the ISEAS Steering Committee approved a lighthouse application for Dr. Trent Rager, director of the Green-Sullivan Special Education Cooperative, and his LEA superintendent, to visit a school district in Everett, Washington. They were interested in exploring how Title I and Special Education programs were being merged to reduce duplication and improve services in the state of Washington. Upon their return they noted that the state department of education was one key element in allowing the necessary flexibility. Unfortunately the barriers in Indiana were not quickly removed. The scene, however, is changing at both the federal and state levels.

In February 1997 Valree Kinch, director of special education at Eastbrook Community Schools in Upland, provided information about their merged system which was launched last semester. Their model is known as the Maximum Achievement Learning Lab (M.A.L.L.). Now into their second semester Valree reports that the staff is even more excited about the outcomes.

The M.A.L.L. is a model that Jackie Hubbard, an elementary principal, and Valree had the opportunity to observe while at a conference in Texas. It is a service delivery model that allows any student in the building to receive assistance for any purpose. At Eastbrook they have combined Title, Special Education, Remediation, and Enrichment

programs into one center that serves the entire school population. The M.A.L.L. has become a completely label free environment that children feel privileged to attend. The M.A.L.L. staff works to modify curriculum to keep student in their general education classes as much as possible. They service students in classrooms as well as provide pull-out assistance for students; however, one of the greatest advantages to the pull-out services with the M.A.L.L. model is that the classroom teachers get to decide when is the best time for the students to leave the class.

The M.A.L.L.'s goals are to:

1. Service all students.
2. Identify student's individual needs and provide teachers with resources to meet those needs.
3. Teach students to be responsible learners.
4. Collaborate with teachers to keep students in the classroom as much as possible.
5. Provide an extended reading and writing program.
6. Provide enrichment services.
7. Provide reading remediation.

Teachers use the M.A.L.L. in the following ways:

- independent study
- help with class projects
- enrichment opportunities
- reading remediation
- oral testing
- one on one assistance
- research via computer or book
- reward time

- assistance on class assignments
- peer tutoring
- reteach lessons
- modify materials
- taping textbooks
- assessing individual students - provide learning style information
- highlighting materials (textbooks, worksheets, etc.)
- providing supplemental materials
- teaching study skills (i.e. planning for projects, organizations, test taking skills, etc.)
- group work
- computer time with assistance
- creating study guides

This program, which is located adjacent to the school library, meets all special education needs; gives remediation time for grades K-4, and offers a Writing Workshop for grades 5-6; assistance is also available for any student needing general education modifications or help.

The program is staffed with two certified and three noncertified personnel. Finances come from Title I Remediation, Special Education. Other sources of funding might be Gifted and Talented grants and General Fund monies.

For additional information, contact Valree Kinch at Eastbrook Community Schools (765/998-1750). □





# Department of Education News

---

## ■ Graduation Examination Procedures for Students Enrolled in Special Education

— [The following is the text of a February 24, 1997 memo from Bob Marra, director of the DOE Division of Special Education, to local directors as posted on the Division News & Notes bulletin board of the Indiana SECN 2/25/97.]

As districts begin scheduling Annual Case Reviews for students enrolled in special education, the Department of Education is receiving numerous questions regarding Indiana's graduation examination procedures. Beginning with the class of the year 2000, every Indiana student must meet high education standards in English and mathematics, in addition to all other state and local graduation requirements, in order to be eligible to graduate from high school with a diploma. To meet these standards, a student must:

receive a score at or above the Indiana Academic Standard on the Grade 10 ISTEP+ test; or

successfully complete all components of the Core 40 curriculum as established by the

State Board of Education; or

successfully appeal the student's test results under criteria adopted by the State Board of Education.

**Question 1:** Must all students, including special education students, take the ISTEP+ test?

**Response:** A student is required to take the graduation examination in order to receive an Indiana diploma.

The graduation examination is a part of the ISTEP+ program. Students that have difficulty with the test on their first attempt will have four additional opportunities two times in Grade 11 and two times in Grade 12 to pass the test.

**Question 2:** Will testing accommodations be permitted for special education students?

**Response:** Any identified accommodations/modifications employed in performance on other tests and in classroom instruction would be applied to the graduation examination. Department officials are working closely with test publishers to obtain valid scale scores for special education

students who takes the Grade 10 ISTEP+ under accommodated conditions and to identify any procedures that must be followed by schools when administering accommodated ISTEP+ tests.

**Question 3:** What if the case conference committee believes that a student is not capable of taking the ISTEP+, even with accommodations?

**Response:** Students enrolled in special education that are unable to take ISTEP+ are still eligible to receive a certificate of achievement upon completion of the public school educational program.

**Question 4:** Doesn't the Indiana Administrative Code (IAC) state that special education students can take minimal courses and still receive the same diploma as other students?

**Response:** No. Under Article 7 at 511 IAC 7-13-3(d) it specifies that: "Students enrolled in special education shall, provided the minimum credit requirements are met (emphasis added), receive a diploma which is

*continued on page 12*



not differentiated from the diploma received by nondisabled students.”

Question 5: What is Core 40?

Response: Education, business, labor, and government leaders in Indiana have agreed on course completion expectations for Indiana high school students. These expectations are called Core 40 a single, flexible high school curriculum which, except for elective courses, is based on a single set of agreed-upon competencies. Core 40 includes a series of academically challenging courses in English, mathematics, science, and social studies. A student also must complete directed electives selected from foreign language, fine arts, computers, and technical career areas.

Question 6: If students do not pass the graduation examination after five attempts beginning in Grade 10, how are students' test results appealed?

Response: The State Board of Education's proposed rule establishes the criteria under which students may appeal their graduation examination results. The Board will conduct six public hearings on the proposed rule at sites across the state from February 24, to March 12, 1997.

**■ Indiana DOE Quarterly Report** — [Editor's Note: The Quarterly Report provides

information to the Indiana State Board of Education on recent judicial and administrative decisions affecting publicly funded education. Should anyone wish to have a copy of any decision noted herein, please call Kevin C. McDowell, General Counsel, at 317/232-6676. Following are two excerpts from the October-December 1996 issue.]

### Time-out Rooms

In Rasmus v. State of Arizona, 939 F.Supp. 709 (D. Ariz. 1996), an eighth-grade student with an emotional handicap alleged that his Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights were violated by a school's use of a locked, windowless time-out room. The room was really more of a closet in the school's alternative classroom. It was approximately 6' X 4' X 8' 10" with plywood walls and a carpeted floor. There was no furniture, but there was an overhead light, fire sprinkler, air vent and viewing peephole. The door was equipped with two exterior steel bolt locks. The student had become involved in an altercation with another student. A classroom aide separated the students, directing the plaintiff to remove his jacket and shoes and empty his pockets before entering the time-out room. The student spent approximately ten minutes in the locked room. The student exhibited no trauma when he exited the closet. In fact, he was not involved in any other incidents the remainder of the school year. The student's parents were notified the same day he was confined to the time-

out room. The parents asked the Fire Department to investigate. A deputy fire marshal found that the locks violated the fire code. The locks were removed. The parents also initiated a complaint with the Arizona Department of Education (ADOE) under 34 CFR 300.660-300.662 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Although the ADOE has developed and disseminated guidelines for the use of non-aversive behavior management practices, including time-out rooms, ADOE's complaint investigator found no IDEA violations. The court noted, however, that the school violated many of the principles in the ADOE guidelines for time-out rooms, including the following:

- \* The student's individualized education program (IEP) contained no provision for seclusionary time-out.
- \* The written permission of the parents was never obtained.
- \* Seclusion occurred without regard to any specific behavior management program.
- \* The school had not developed any policies or procedures for the use of the time-out, deferring instead to the discretion of the adult present.
- \* The time-out room violated the fire code.

continued on page 13



*DOE • continued from page 12*

- \* The time-out room did not permit staff to see the student at all times nor the student to see anyone outside.

The school argued that the guidelines should not have legal effect because they were merely guidelines which had not been incorporated into law. The court noted that the ADOE referred to the guidelines and incorporated references to these principles when it conducted its IDEA complaint investigation. Although the court found the ten-minute, time-out seclusion period to be a *de minimus* violation of the student's Fourteenth Amendment rights such that the school was entitled to summary judgment on this issue, the court found there was sufficient merit to the Fourth Amendment issue that trial would be warranted. The court noted that time-out room for indeterminate periods without regard to a student's age or emotional disability may be excessively intrusive and thus may violate the relaxed Fourth Amendment standard for school officials.

For other cases involving time-out rooms, see the following:

1. Hayes v. Unified School Dist. No. 377, 877 F.2d 809 (10th Cir. 1989). The Rasmus court relied heavily upon Hayes, distinguishing its facts from the Rasmus dispute. The two students in Hayes had behavioral problems. The students' parent was advised of her IDEA procedural safeguards prior to giving written permission for the stu-

dents' placement in a behavioral management program (Personal/Social Adjustment, or PSA, program). At times during the school year, the students were required to stay in a 3' X 5' time-out room. The parent never challenged this through IDEA due process nor sought a change of placement. Failure to exhaust IDEA remedies precluded the civil rights action in court. Notwithstanding this, the 10th circuit court made the following observations or adopted them from the district court:

- \* Short-term removals for disciplinary reasons are not "changes of placement."
- \* However, the use of time-out rooms can be challenged through IDEA procedures.
- \* The school's use of time-out rooms was related to the provision of appropriate educational services to these students because:
  - (a) The use of the time-out room was rationally related to the school's educational function to teach students rather than suspend them out of school;
  - (b) The students could be directly supervised at all times;
  - (c) The location of the time-out room allowed the students placed there to continue with their classroom instruction; and

- (d) The school had a policy which strictly regulated the placement of students in the time-out room.

2. Dickens v. Johnson County Bd. of Ed., 661 F.Supp. 155 (E.D. Tenn. 1987). The court found no constitutional infirmity with the school's use of a time-out room which consisted of a three-sided cardboard partition which was not attached to a wall and could easily be removed. The area contained a desk and enabled a student placed there to see and hear the teacher as well as observe the chalkboard.

### Service Dogs

Although most people are familiar with guide dogs who assist blind or visually impaired individuals, there are increasing numbers of service dogs which perform a variety of everyday tasks which their masters cannot because of physical impairments. A number of states have passed laws regarding the accommodations of persons with disabilities and their guide or service dogs. Indiana had two such laws. I.C. 16-32-3-2 requires people who operate public accommodations to permit access to individuals with disabilities and their guide or service dogs, and further prohibits charging an additional fee to such individuals. This law also permits access to public accommodations by "a guide dog trainer while engaged in the training process of a guide dog. . ." "Public accommodation" is defined as "an

*continued on page 14*



*DOE • continued from page 13*

establishment that caters or offers services, facilities, or goods to the general public.” See the Buchanan case, *infra*. In addition, I.C. 22-9-6-5 prohibits discrimination against disabled individuals and their guide/service dogs by persons who rent or lease property. There have been few reported cases involving public school districts and students who require guide or service dogs.

1. Letter to Goodling, 17 EHLR 1027 (OCR 1991). The Office for Civil Rights, in answer to an inquiry from a member of Congress, stated that “if not allowing a student to bring a service dog into the classroom would effectively deny the student the opportunity, or an equal opportunity, to participate in or benefit from the education program [of a recipient of Federal financial assistance], then the recipient school would be in violation of Section 504 [of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973] and its implementing regulation.”

2. Gaudiello v. Delaware County Intermediate Unit, 796 F.Supp. 849 (E.D. Pa. 1992), involved a thirteen-year-old student with severe physical limitations due to spinal muscular atrophy. The student used a wheelchair and was slated to be mainstreamed into general education classes upon entering middle school. Although this case never addresses a significant issue because of the parents’ failure to exhaust administrative remedies under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, it does contain some background information on the

training and function of service dogs for mobility-impaired individuals. In this situation, the service dog can turn lights on and off, open and close doors, carry the student’s books, pick up objects, bring the telephone to the student, and perform a number of other functions which actually enabled the student to participate in more school functions.

3. Clark County School District v. Buchanan, 924 P.2d 716 (Nev. 1996), addresses a different aspect of service dogs and public accommodations: the extent to which a teacher who trains service dogs may bring such training dogs to the school where she teaches. Buchanan is the music teacher for an elementary school. She is also a volunteer helping-dog trainer for Canine Companions for Independence. “Helping dogs, “ as distinguished from guide dogs for the blind or visually impaired, are trained to perform hundreds of daily functions for their disabled masters, most of whom have impaired mobility. Buchanan needs to train such dogs to become acclimated to a host of environments and to refrain from contact with humans unless directed to do so. The school refused to permit Buchanan to bring the dog into her classroom, asserting that the presence of the dog would be a distraction to instruction, frighten children afraid of dogs, or present a health risk to children allergic to dogs. The school acknowledged that it would permit the dog if Buchanan required a helping dog, and further acknowledged that state law precluded the school

from refusing admittance to a person training a helping dog. But the state law was meant for non-employees of the school, the school asserted. The court, in upholding the trial court’s injunction against the school, noted that the school district did not attempt to negotiate a reasonable compromise with Buchanan; there were many other animals in other classrooms; there were no known children allergic to or afraid of dogs; another Nevada school district permits teachers who are volunteer trainers to bring training dogs into their classrooms; and the injunction requires the teacher to adhere to reasonable restrictions imposed by the school district to prevent health problems. The Nevada law makes it unlawful for a “place of public accommodation” to refuse admittance or service to a person who requires “a guide dog, hearing dog or other service animal. . .” A public school is defined as a “place of public accommodation.” Two separate dissenting opinions believe the majority have expanded the meaning of “admittance or service” and also believe the statute was not meant to apply to employees of the “public accommodation” who are volunteer trainers. □



## FEDERAL UPDATE . . .

### ■ Transition Systems Change Projects: Policy Recommendations

The following policy recommendations were prepared by participants at the 1996 National Transition Network Annual Project Directors' Meeting in Washington, DC.

The following policy recommendations are based on four years of evaluation information on the transition systems change program funded by the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS). To date, 45 states and the District of Columbia are participating in this systems change program. The recommendations are also based on conversations with three groups of transition systems change project directors: (a) states with large numbers of youth with disabilities in their special education system, (b) states in the fifth and final year of their projects, and (c) other project personnel specifically interested in such discussions. Each general recommendation is followed by specific implications of the recommendation as they pertain to the transition of youth with disabilities from school to life in the community.

1. Develop policies that promote coordination and integration of federal and state programs in order to meet the needs of all

youth, regardless of the level of their ability.

- \* Establish common language and eligibility criteria across agencies and programs.

- \* Approach the development and implementation of legislation, policies, and procedures with a view of permissiveness rather than restrictiveness.

- \* Develop incentives for collaboration including evaluation procedures and funding initiatives.

2. Direct all current and future policies and programs towards the achievement of youth, regardless of the level of their ability, living in the community as full, participating members.

- \* Ensure that the array of programs and services available to youth address both their academic and nonacademic needs.

- \* Include youth with disabilities in large scale national assessments.

- \* Include youth with disabilities in the establishment and use of standards.

- \* Collect longitudinal data that identify the results of policy and programmatic efforts to meet the academic and nonacademic needs of all youth, regardless of their ability level, to live in

their communities as full, participating members.

3. Retain the essential and necessary procedural safeguards and incentives that ensure individuals with disabilities and families have access to quality programs and services.

- \* Ensure that future federal legislation and reauthorization efforts do not eliminate essential procedural safeguards.

- \* Establish effective mechanisms for work incentives.

4. Increase the involvement of people with disabilities and their families in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of public policies, programs, and services.

- \* Provide incentives, including fiscal and staff support, to ensure the meaningful involvement of people with disabilities and their families in the development, implementation and evaluation of policies, programs, and services

5. Ensure that future funding initiatives incorporate strategies and approaches proven to bring about needed systems change.

- \* Require future systems



*continued on page 16*

## *FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 15*

change projects to implement change activities at both state and local levels.

\* Require related agencies to share authority and responsibility for development, implementation, and evaluation of systems change project resources and activities.

**CITATION:** National Transition Network. (1996). **TRANSITION SYSTEMS CHANGE PROJECTS: POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS.** Champaign, IL: Author.

**SOURCE:** GTE INS Voted.Transition newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 3/12/97.

### **Trends in the Well-being of America's Children and Youth** —

The following findings were published in Fall 1996 by the Policy Information Center (PIC), Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Room 438F, Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Washington, DC 20201.

The report, **TRENDS IN THE WELL-BEING OF AMERICA'S CHILDREN AND YOUTH: 1996**, is the first annual report from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to present the most recent, most reliable data on five key areas in the lives of children and youth. These areas

are: population, family, and neighborhood; economic security; health conditions and health care; social development, behavioral health, and teen fertility; and education and achievement. The report contains two sections. The first is a "quick reference guide" describing national trends for seventy-four indicators of child and youth well-being. All of these indicators are based on data collected by the federal government. For each indicator, tables and graphics illustrating trends are given, accompanied by a narrative describing the most pertinent features of the data. The second section contains a review of trends in the socio-demographic characteristics of children, youth, and their families. The section emphasizes historical trends, treating long-term shifts that in some cases cover two centuries.

On the whole, the quick reference guide presents data from the 1970s to the 1990s although some data are presented for periods prior to the 1970s, as are some projections into the 21st century. The report shows that the number of children under age eighteen has varied widely: between 1950 and 1960, the number of children increased from 47.3 to 64.2 million, then rose to 69.6 million in 1970, and fell to 63.7 million in 1980. It is projected that the number of children will rise to 73.6 million by the year 2010. The report also presents data on children as a percentage of the population. For

example, in 1950, children constituted 31 percent of the population; by 1960, the proportion had increased to 36 percent. However, by 1990, children constituted only 26 percent of the population. As well as presenting data for the population as a whole, the report gives information on the racial and ethnic composition of U.S. children and on immigrant children.

Data on economic security is also presented, including charts on trends in mean family incomes, children in poverty, child support nonpayment, the impact of cash and near-cash transfer programs on poverty, and welfare receipt and dependence. Another section of the report presents data on health conditions (such as infant and child mortality, teen motor vehicle accident, homicide, and suicide deaths, general health conditions, and abuse or neglect). It also examines health care for children, including data on health insurance coverage, prenatal care, and immunization. The social development and behavioral health of all children and fertility of teenagers are also represented in the data, as are education and achievement.

There are both positive and negative trends reported. On the positive side, the rate of full immunization for two-year-olds

*continued from page 17*



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

has increased while the infant mortality rate continues to decline. Teen births for those aged fifteen to nineteen declined between 1991 and 1993, although the teen birth rate is still higher than it was twenty years ago. In education, mathematics and science proficiency has increased, while the proportion of children who watch six or more hours of television a day has decreased. However, negative trends are also apparent. For example, the mortality rate for minority youth has increased, as has the proportion of children living in single-parent households. The poverty rate for children and youth has increased and the rate of children living in extreme poverty has increased dramatically. Finally, for many indicators of well-being, minority children and youth fare much worse than their white counterparts.

The second part of the report traces changes in the socio-demographic characteristics of children, youth, and their families over a long historical period. In some cases, it goes back to the first Census of the United States, taken in 1790. The section, titled "Population Change and the Family Environment of Children," discusses demographic issues such as population size and composition, the geographic distribution of the population, marriage and divorce, childbearing and family size, life expectancy and mortality, and household size and composition. The report notes that, over the past 150 years, there have been

major changes in several areas that directly affect children's lives. The revolutionary shift to non-farm work by fathers, the dramatic reduction in the size of the average family, and great increases in the average level of schooling have all affected children's family environment. More recently, increases in mothers' labor force participation, and in mother-child families with no father present in the home have also contributed to vast changes in children's life situations.


The report maintains that: a fundamental cause driving these seemingly disparate changes was the desire of parents to improve, maintain, or regain their relative social and economic status compared with other families, when confronted with changing and often uncertain, difficult, or precarious social and economic conditions. (pg. 251)

Finally, the report discusses using children as the unit of statistical analysis. It notes that, although it may seem apparent that research on children should be conducted in this way, until recently most studies have used parents, adults, or families as the units of statistical analysis. The report suggests that existing databases, such as censuses, registration systems, and surveys, should be re-analyzed using children as the unit of statistical analysis. One effort to do so is the Bureau of the Census's planned annual Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD). Data from this and

other efforts will help to inform public policy debate on welfare and health care reform, as well as other areas of public interest.

This report was sponsored by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. Section I was produced under contract by Child Trends, Inc. Section II was written by Donald J. Hernandez of the United States Bureau of the Census. The report's project officer, Matt Stagner, may be reached at 202/690-5653. Copies of the report's executive summary only (PIC ID No. 6170) are available from the PIC. Copies of the full report are available from the Government Printing Office (stock number 017-022-01336-6) at a cost of \$26.00. Call 202/512-1803.

SOURCE: GTE INS  
Ed. Personnel newsgroup posting  
on Indiana SECN 12/16/96.

 **Factors that Influence the Performance, Development and Supervision of Paraeducators in Inclusive Classrooms** — Nationwide school boards, superintendents, principals, teachers, and parents are seeking ways to better serve and improve the quality of education for all children and youth who



*continued from page 18*

## *FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 17*

have disabilities, who come from diverse cultural and ethnic heritages, who have limited English proficiency, or who may have other special needs that place them at-risk. This article is concerned with an important but under-recognized issue confronting the field. It is the need to develop policies, standards and infrastructures for improving the employment, placement, preparation and management of paraeducators (paraprofessionals, teacher aides/assistants, transition trainers/job coaches, occupational, physical and speech therapy assistants) in inclusive classrooms and other education settings.

It has been more than 40 years since teacher aides were introduced into classrooms to enable teachers to spend more time in planning and implementing instructional and related activities (Gartner, 1971). The duties of teacher aides are no longer limited to recordkeeping, preparing materials, monitoring students in lunch rooms and study halls, or maintaining learning centers and equipment. In today's schools they are active participants in all components of the instructional process and the delivery of other direct services to children, youth and/or their parents. As a result, they have become "technicians who are more accurately described as paraeducators just as their counterparts in law and medicine are designated as paralegals and paramedics" (Pickett, 1989).

Continuing efforts to reshape education systems and practices to provide individualized, inclusive education services for students with disabilities and other special needs have led to differentiated staffing and the redefinition of roles and duties for all teachers. These changes are particularly apparent in the duties of special educators. In addition to their duties as diagnosticians of student needs, planners of age and ability appropriate curriculum activities, facilitators of learning and assessors of student performance and progress, teachers have become front-line managers. These new administrative duties require teachers to confer regularly with early childhood, elementary and high school teachers and related services personnel in order to plan for and coordinate efforts to effectively include children and youth with disabilities into general education. In addition, teachers frequently serve as the primary liaisons between the school and home in order to involve parents in all aspects of their child's education.

An added dimension to the management functions of teachers are their responsibilities for directing and integrating paraeducators into the service delivery team, providing on-the-job coaching to paraeducators and assessing their performance (French & Pickett, 1995; Pickett, Vasa & Steckelberg, 1993; Putnam, 1993).

The move toward differentiated staffing across program lines in various education settings has had a profound impact on the nature and complexity of the roles of paraeducators (French & Pickett, 1995; Passaro, Pickett, Latham and HongBo, 1994; Pickett, 1994; Hofmeister, 1993). Paraeducators increasingly are expected to work at higher levels of independence and to actively participate in the delivery of education and related services. In inclusive classrooms and transitional programs serving children and youth with disabilities, under the direction of either a special education or general education teacher, paraeducators: instruct individual and small groups of students; assist with functional assessment activities; administer and score standardized tests; collect and record data about student performance and behavior; and provide information about community resources and services to parents (Passaro, Pickett, Latham, & HongBo, 1994; Pickett, Faison Formanek, 1993; Snodgrass, 1992).

While all of the issues described above affect paraeducators employed in all general, special and compensatory education programs, there is one concern that is unique to paraeducators employed to facilitate the inclusion of children and youth with

*continued on page 19*



## *FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 18*

disabilities into general education. It is the practice of assigning a paraeducator to work one-to-one with an individual student who has a disability. This practice, created in the early 1980s during the initial stages of the movement to unify general and special education, inhibits rather than fostering interaction between students with and without disabilities, and increases reliance on an adult(s) rather than helping the student achieve independence. Informal interviews with teachers and paraeducators and observations in classrooms conducted by the author of this article have identified the need to reassess this approach. These interviews and observations seem to indicate that assigning paraeducators to the class/program rather than directly to the student makes the program more flexible, helps to insure that the teacher spends more time with the student with disabilities, enables the team to provide individualized assistance to other students who can benefit from it, and removes barriers that may exist between students because of the constant presence of an adult (the paraeducator) (Pickett, 1996).

Issues connected with the employment, assignment, preparation and management of paraeducators are for the most part afterthoughts in the public policy arena. Despite increased utilization of paraeducators and increased emphasis on the instructional nature of their roles and responsibilities, few State

Departments of Education, and local education agencies are working together to 1) develop skill and knowledge standards that recognize the evaluation in the roles of paraeducators; 2) set standards for competency-based training and career development for paraeducators; and 3) establish comprehensive systems of professional development for paraeducators that include on-the-job coaching, in-service training and access to post-secondary education for paraeducators interested in becoming teachers (Pickett, 1996b).

Further compounding the current situation is the fact that teachers are not prepared at either the undergraduate or graduate level to direct the work of paraeducators and, therefore, in most districts management and assessment procedures and standards are informal, or in far too many cases, non-existent (French & Pickett, 1995; Pickett, Vasa & Steckelberg, 1993).

To address all of these issues, State Departments of Education, local education agencies, faculty in two and four year personnel preparation programs, unions and parents need to join forces for the purpose of finding more effective ways of tapping the resources of paraeducators in differentiated staffing arrangements, as well as setting standards for their employment, preparation and supervision and establishing infrastructures that will assure the availability of

opportunities for professional development.

### References

French, N.K. & Pickett, A.L. (1995). *THE UTILIZATION OF PARAPROFESSIONALS IN SPECIAL EDUCATION: ISSUES FOR TEACHER EDUCATORS*. Position paper prepared for the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Gartner, A. (1971). *PARAPROFESSIONALS AND THEIR PERFORMANCE: A SURVEY OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND SOCIAL SERVICES PROGRAMS*. New York: Praeger Publishing

Hofmeister, A. Paraprofessionals in special education: Alternatives to casteism. *UTAH SPECIAL EDUCATION*, 14 (3), 1993

Passaro, P, Pickett, A.L., Latham, G & HongBo, W. The training and support needs of paraprofessionals in rural special education settings. *RURAL SPECIAL EDUCATION QUARTERLY* 13 (4) Fall, 1994.

Pickett, A.L. (1996). *A STATE OF THE ART REPORT ON PARAEDUCATORS IN EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES*. New York: National

*continued on page 20*



## *FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 19*

Resource Center for Paraprofessionals in Education and Related Services, Center for Advanced Study in Education, The Graduate School & University Center, City University of New York.

Pickett, A.L. Paraeducators in inclusive education programs; The need for performance, professional development and management standards. *IMPACT ON INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT* - 25(1) Winter, 1996.

Pickett, A.L. (1989). *RESTRUCTURING THE SCHOOLS: THE ROLE OF PARAPROFESSIONALS*. Washington, D.C. National Governors Association.

Pickett, A.L. (1994). *PARAPROFESSIONALS IN THE EDUCATION WORKFORCE*. Washington DC: National Education Association

Pickett, A.L., Vasa, S.F & Steckelberg, A.L. (1993). *USING PARAEducATORS EFFECTIVELY*. Fastback #358, Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Foundation.

Putnam, J.W (1993). *COOPERATIVE LEARNING & STRATEGIES FOR INCLUSION: CELEBRATING DIVERSITY IN THE CLASSROOM*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes, Publisher.

Rubin, P & Long, R.M. Who is teaching our children? Implica-

tions of the use of aides in Chapter I. *ERS SPECTRUM*. Education Research Service. Spring, 28-34, 1994.

Snodgrass, A.S. (1991). *ACTUAL AND PREFERRED PRACTICES OF EMPLOYMENT PLACEMENT, SUPERVISION AND EVALUATION OF TEACHER AIDES IN IDAHO SCHOOL DISTRICTS*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Idaho, Moscow.

CITATION: Pickett, A. L. (1996, September). Factors that influence the performance, development, and supervision of paraeducators in inclusive classrooms. *TASH NEWSLETTER*, 22(9), 7-8.

SOURCE: GTE INS Severe newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 11/5/96.

**People with Disabilities: Federal Programs Could Work Together More Efficiently to Promote Employment** — Released in September 1996, this report is the response of the United States General Accounting Office (GAO) to a request for a study from the Honorable Harris W. Fawell (Chairman, Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, U.S.

House of Representatives). The following excerpts present text from the cover letter to the Chairman; background information on the issues identified; and the results of the study in brief.

The term “we” in the following refers to personnel at the GAO who performed the study.

Over the past decade in the United States, attitudes about people with disabilities have changed significantly. A growth in public awareness of the capabilities of people with disabilities, a new emphasis on their inclusion in society, and a movement toward strategies promoting their economic self-sufficiency reflect this changed view. These changes in attitudes have influenced several recent major legislative initiatives: the Supported Employment program in 1986, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in 1990, and the amendments to the Rehabilitation Act. Although these initiatives are designed to help promote the employment of people with disabilities, they have not represented a substantial overhaul of U.S. disability policy. Instead, as experts have noted, they have added to or expanded an already existing program structure, parts of which have been in place for many decades.

Because these legislative

*continued on page 21*



## *FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 20*

initiatives have raised concerns about the ability of federal programs that target people with disabilities to work together, you asked us to examine and describe these programs, emphasizing those that relate to employment. Specifically, we focused on the following questions:

1. Which federal programs target people with disabilities, and how many of these programs provide employment related services?

2. To what extent are information, eligibility, and services coordinated under these programs?

3. What does available evidence suggest about the effectiveness of federal programs in promoting employment among people with disabilities? (p. 1)

To accomplish these objectives, we integrated evidence from the literature, from analyses of the most current available databases, and from interviews with consumers and public and private organizations. We identified the range of federal programs, their funding levels, and the services they provide through a review of federal statutes and regulations, consultations with agency officials, and information from a variety of sources — agency reports, budget documents, the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, the most current expenditure data (fiscal year 1994)

available from the Consolidated Federal Funds Report, and our previous reports. Using the economics and social science literature, combined with evidence from available databases, including the 1990 census and the 1993 National Health Interview Survey, for example, we identified characteristics of the population of people with disabilities and gathered information on employment barriers posed by their special needs. However, we did not independently verify data that we received from public or private databases. We also interviewed disability experts, consumers, service providers, and public officials at the federal, state, and local levels to help determine how federal programs address these barriers to employment. Our work was completed between April 1995 and July 1996 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards (pp. 1-2).

### BACKGROUND

In the last ten years, the Congress has expanded federal efforts to promote employment for people with more severe disabilities by creating new programs, expanding existing programs, and providing employment protections. In the past, social attitudes toward people with mental retardation or psychiatric conditions often labeled them as unemployable outside of institutions or sheltered workshops and thus unable to benefit from job training or vocational rehabilitation.

However, recent advances in assistive technology, particularly in computers, have made many personal limitations less prohibitive barriers to work. Voice recognition software, for example, allows those who do not have use of their hands to produce documents on a computer. In addition, the development of supported employment, in which ongoing on-the-job support is provided to people with disabilities through a job coach, has demonstrated that many people previously considered unemployable could work alongside people without disabilities. In response to these developments, the Congress has created new programs to promote the increased use of assistive technology and to provide states with funding specifically designated for supported employment. In addition, the Congress has amended the Rehabilitation Act to strengthen the requirement that states serve individuals with severe disabilities (p. 4).

In 1990, the Congress provided educational and employment protections to people with disabilities. For example, ADA prohibited employment discrimination on the basis of disability by state and local governments and many private sector employers, as long as the person was qualified and able to perform the essential job functions “with or without

*continued on page 22*



## *FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 21*

reasonable accommodation.” Similarly, in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Congress mandated that all children with disabilities be provided a “free, appropriate public education,” and courts interpreting the law have required that this education be provided in the “least restrictive environment.” This provision emphasized a clear presumption that children with disabilities should be mainstreamed — that is, taught in regular classrooms when possible (p. 4).

### RESULTS IN BRIEF

The federal government funds a broad range of services to assist the millions of people with disabilities. This effort is diffuse, however, with federal assistance provided through 130 programs in 19 federal agencies. For many of these programs, service delivery filters down to numerous public and private agencies at the state and local level. In fiscal year 1994, the federal government spent over \$60 billion on 60 programs targeted exclusively to people with disabilities. In addition, people with disabilities benefited from between \$81 billion and \$184 billion in spending through 61 partially targeted programs. These partially targeted programs gave special consideration to people with disabilities, even though they serve a much broader clientele (p. 2).

The majority of federal

expenditures were associated with income maintenance and health care programs. In 1994, programs that focused specifically on employment assistance constituted a relatively small proportion of all disability programs (26 of 130) and received a relatively small proportion of total federal funding for such programs (from 2.5 to 4 percent). A larger number of programs and a greater share of federal dollars, however, were devoted to programs that provide employment-related services such as transportation, accessible housing, and independent living services (pp. 2-3)

Our review suggests that programs helping people with disabilities do not work together as efficiently as they could to share information about their programs and overcome obstacles posed by differing eligibility criteria and numerous service providers. Because people with disabilities often face multiple barriers to employment, including insufficient job training, lack of transportation, and employer discrimination, they may require services from more than one program to make employment feasible. However, each program has its own eligibility requirements and applicants must often establish eligibility separately because no effective mechanism exists to promote or ensure coordination. Similarly, because services are often not coordinated among programs, people with disabilities may receive duplicate

services or face service gaps (p. 3).

Although the general lack of coordination suggests that program efficiency could be improved, scant evidence exists for evaluating the effectiveness of these programs, either individually or collectively. Despite the size of the federal commitment, few programs are required to gather the outcome data necessary for reliable program evaluation. Many of the 26 employment-focused programs that we identified have had little or not formal evaluation in recent years. The difficulties associated with comparing data from different programs also hinder evaluation efforts. In many instances, service providers track different consumer information, use different eligibility criteria, and have different rules on confidentiality. Therefore, without improving coordination, imposing requirements on data collection may not necessarily facilitate evaluation (p. 3).

Past federal efforts to reorganize and restructure service delivery have succeeded only marginally, compared with more modest, local initiatives. Federal agencies have an opportunity to learn from some recent state and local efforts to improve the coordination of programs helping

*continued on page 23*



***FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 22***

people with disabilities. Some state and local programs reported improved service delivery, along with reduced program costs, thus providing resources that could be redirected toward improving services or evaluating program performance (p. 3).

**CONTACT:** United States General Accounting Office. Washington D.C. 20548.

**CITATION:** Joyner, C. (1996, September). **PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES: FEDERAL WORK TOGETHER**

**MORE EFFICIENTLY TO PROMOTE EMPLOYMENT.** Washington, DC: United States General Accounting Office.

**SOURCE:** GTE INS Ed. Personnel newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 10/29/96. □

***ANNOUNCEMENTS***

**Memorandum** — To: Individuals, Groups, State Agencies, and Organizations Interested in the Development of the Strategic Plan and the State Plan for the Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program and Supported Employment Services

From: Bobby L. Conner, Director, Division of Disability, Aging, and Rehabilitative Services and Rita Martin, Deputy Director, Vocational Rehabilitation Services

Re: State Plan Development Public Hearings

Date: March 7, 1997

The Division of Disability, Aging, and Rehabilitative Services, Vocational Rehabilitation Services invites you to provide comments and suggestions prior to the development of the Strategic Plan and the State Plan for the Vocational Rehabilitation Services program and Supported Employment Services. We are asking you to share your thoughts with us as we shape the Vocational Rehabili-

tation program activities for federal fiscal year 1998. Topics which may be discussed include, in part, community based employment for people with disabilities, consumer choice, transition services, rehabilitation technology, and outreach procedures for identifying and serving individuals with the most severe disabilities who are minorities.

Five public hearings will be held throughout the state to provide an opportunity for comments. All hearing sites are accessible and include the availability of an interpreter for individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing. Attached is information about the dates, times, and locations of the public hearings.

All comments made at the public hearings will be tape recorded. Preparation of comments in writing is not required, but would be helpful. If you are unable to attend any of the public

hearings, we invite you to forward your comments and suggestions in writing directly to the Central Office.

Written comments affecting the development of the State Plan and Strategic Plan must be submitted no later than Monday, April 21, 1997.

The mailing address is: Division of Disability, Aging, and Rehabilitative Services, Vocational Rehabilitation Services, 402 W. Washington Street, Room W453, P.O. Box 7083, Indianapolis, IN 46207-7083

REGION I VALPARAISO

Date: April 9, 1997 (Wednesday)  
Time: 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.  
Location: Valparaiso Public Library, 107 E. Jefferson Street, Meeting Room A



*continued on page 24*

*Announcements • continued from page 23*

**REGION II MARION**

Date: April 9, 1997 (Wednesday)  
 Time: 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.  
 Location: Marion Public Library, 600 South Washington Street, Room B

**REGION III INDIANAPOLIS**

Date: April 11, 1997 (Friday)  
 Time: 2:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.  
 Location: Indiana Government Center South Training Center, Room 5, 402 West Washington Street

**REGION IV TERRE HAUTE**

Date: April 10, 1997 (Thursday)

Time: 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.  
 Location: Vigo County Public Library, 1 Library Square, Lower Level (between Poplar and Walnut on 7th St.)

**REGION V COLUMBUS**

Date: April 11, 1997 (Friday)  
 Time: 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.  
 Location: Bartholomew County Public Library, 536 5th Street, Meeting Room 1 - Lower Level

All hearing sites are wheelchair accessible. Interpreters for people who are deaf or hard of hearing will be provided.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is seeking input on new standards for teachers of:

- \* Exceptional needs
- \* Vocational education
- \* English as a second language

Comments received will be used to develop final standards, which are used to devise the assessments given to teachers who apply for board certification.

For more information, call Glowena Harrison: 202/463-3980.

□

**Input Sought on National Teaching Standards** — The



**Closing the Gap** has long been a state-of-the-art center for technology for people with special needs.

Closing The Gap, Microcomputer Technology for People With Special Needs is now on-line. <http://www.closingthegap.com>

The website includes samples from Closing the Gap's Resource Directory, articles from the newsletter, an online Resource Library with searchable text including an early childhood section, and information about the 15th Annual Conference.

**Teacher Evaluation: A Comprehensive Guide to New Directions and Practices** —

This book by Kenneth Peterson presents research-based recommendations for changes in teacher evaluation, both formative and summative, which are predicated on the belief that a direct correlation exist between teacher evaluation and school reform. The author and his contributing colleagues believe that good evaluation requires the participation and control of teachers.

By focusing on the expertise of master teachers in the process, by recognizing the varying needs of teachers at multiple stages, and by acknowledging that educational practice is not confined to the classroom, the author re-focuses the evaluation process to include professional growth and activities within and external to

the school district.

The book also examines issues involved in hiring, tenure decisions, and the impact that reforming teacher evaluation may have on the district's entire personnel evaluation system. It also covers teacher testing, the use of portfolios in evaluation, the identification of appropriate observers, tools for improved evaluation, and the creation of meaningful reports to administrators and parents.

Published in 1995; 304 pages with index; \$35 softcover.

Contact: Corwin Press, 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320. □



## What Do We Know About...Students With Disabilities And State Assessments?

- \* 49 states have in place, or are developing, state assessment systems
- \* Approximately 85% of students with disabilities are capable of participating in the general education assessment, but less than 50% typically do
- \* Most states have written guidelines about the participation of students with disabilities in assessments, and about the use of accommodations, but local IEP teams may not know about these guidelines or what they say
- \* Accommodations are often controversial – one state may recommend the use of an accommodation that other states prohibit
- \* 18 states now require students to pass exams to receive diplomas; in all but 5 of these states students with disabilities must pass the same exam
- \* Even when students with disabilities participate in state assessments, their scores may be excluded from reports of student performance
- \* Alternative assessments for those students unable to participate in the general assessment are needed. Currently, Kentucky and Maryland have alternative assessments in place. Texas is developing one.
- \* Twelve federally funded research efforts are now underway to investigate how state accountability systems can include students with special needs. New projects will be funded next year.
- \* Accurate participation rates for students with disabilities in statewide assessments are difficult to obtain due to lack of information on which students participate, and how states determine which students are eligible for participation. At least 30 states indicate they cannot find or identify students with disabilities in their states' assessment databases.
- \* New federal requirements under LASA and IDEA (pending) promote higher rates of participation in assessments by students with disabilities.

**The National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO) has been studying these and other characteristics of state assessments since 1990.** It has developed a set of criteria that identify how to maximize the participation of students with disabilities in state and district accountability systems (Synthesis Report 25) and a policy brief on alternative assessments for students with disabilities. A complete list of publications is available from NCEO, 350 Elliot Hall, 75 East River Road, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Source: CASE Newsletter. Vol. 38, No. 4. January - March 1997.