The following is the full text of the address given by Secretary Richard W. Riley at the April 1997 National Forum on Attracting and Preparing Teachers for the 21st Century.

I want to welcome all of you to this national forum — those of you who are attending here in Washington — and all of you who are listening in at over 120 down links sites all across America. We have over fifty of the best teachers in America attending this forum as well as college and university Presidents and Deans from 24 states.

We also have over 1,000 teachers, college educators and students joining us from every part of the country. We are joined by teachers and students at Cal State — Sacramento, teachers at Mission View Elementary in Tucson, Arizona, and I am told that there is a very large gathering at Ohio State University.

We are down linked to Indiana University in Bloomington, we have listeners at the University of South Florida, and we are connected to educators attending the national mathematics conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

I’m please that all of you are joining us — for this really is a national dialogue of great importance to the future of our country. How we teach our children defines in many ways the future of America in this new Information Age.

This is also an exciting time of challenge because we are confronted by many new dynamics. Our nation’s classrooms have never been more crowded. From
Los Angeles to Atlanta to Miami, Florida — the portable classroom is a common sight in school yards.

The entire context of American education is changing. We need teachers skilled in using computers as a powerful teaching tool, and many more teachers well-versed in teaching English as a second language. Our teachers need to teach to a higher level of achievement, and be prepared to teach all of America’s children — the gifted and the talented, our many new immigrants, the college bound achiever, and the disabled child who is learning so much more because he or she is now included.

Yet, we struggle to put the old industrial model of education behind us. The jewel of American education is our system of higher education yet too often our colleges of education are treated like forgotten step-children. And for too long public education in America and higher education have gone their separate ways, each dedicated to its own vision of excellence and learning.

I believe that this 19th-century model is outdated. We need a new model appropriate for the 21st century, an ongoing dialogue at every level of education to raise expectations and achieve high standards. This is one of the chief purposes of this national forum — to break down the disconnections — to get good people at every level of education talking to one another.

We must also recognize that too often in the past when we have been confronted with the demand for many teachers we have traded quality for quantity and paid the price by accepting mediocrity in our schools. I also believe that we must make a concerted effort to attract Americans from all walks of life to this demanding profession.

To my way of thinking one of the best ways to make teaching attractive is to make it a real profession with high quality preparation programs that are rigorous and relevant to today’s classrooms. And we need to do a better job at promoting teaching as a way of life to young people who are now growing up. Let’s remember, young people are starting to make choices as early as 9th grade.

As Terry noted in her remarks now is the time to get it right — to step back and rethink how we attract, prepare, and support America’s teachers. We have little hope of raising standards and giving our young people the skills they need unless we have better prepared teachers in the classroom. Teachers who are well trained and prepared for the realities of today’s classroom.

This is why I want to share with you the results of a questionnaire we asked the teachers of the year who are with us tonight to fill out. The Council for Basic Education took charge of this project for us and the results are quite instructive.

We asked our state teachers of the year to answer eleven questions on teacher preparation with a special focus on the new teachers they have mentored or are mentoring now. Here is what they told us.

The first thing they told us is that the new teachers they are mentoring know the content of their subjects. They also told us that these first-year teachers have good mechanics — they know how to give tests, they are well prepared when it comes to planning daily lessons, to direct classroom activities and monitoring student progress. This is all very positive.

But the teachers also voiced some common concerns. They were overwhelming in their view that new teachers are unprepared to manage classroom discipline. The teachers also expressed very strong concerns that new teachers are not prepared to use technology and they have some difficulty engaging parents in the learning process.

The teachers also seem to suggest that new teachers are not being prepared enough to teach young people from many different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. The same view holds true when it comes to teaching young people with physical and learning disabilities.

The teachers also noted that new teachers really are not given adequate time for student teaching — and all too often new teachers are on their own during the first
two years of teaching. We haven’t created a process that gives future teachers a true sense of the American classroom here in 1997 — and then we leave them to fend for themselves.

A few more concluding thoughts. Our little poll told us that new teachers are not as sure as they should be when it comes to connecting their teaching practices to content standards or in using performance based assessment.

At the same time, the majority of the teachers tell us that university faculty value their assessment of the student teachers they are mentoring. Yet, they also suggest a disconnect as well — there is a real need for more practicing teachers to be teaching in university programs.

Now this is a very small poll but it is a poll of some very smart Americans. And I suspect that much of what these teachers are telling us rings true with many of you in the audience. These teachers have given us something to think about.

Teaching is a demanding profession, and it will be even more demanding in the future. This is why I want to encourage every teacher in America to think about following in the footsteps of Sharon Draper — our new national teacher of the year — who chose to become board certified.

President Clinton and I strongly support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and its goal of certifying over 100,000 master teachers in the next decade. I challenge every school in the nation to have at least one board-certified teacher on your faculty.

And I want to thank all of you who are doing the hard work of thinking through what we must do to prepare our teachers for the 21st century. My wife Tunky and I were visiting the zoo one day when we saw a teenager with a Dilbert T-shirt that read: “Change is good — you go first.”

Well, some of you are going first — you’re breaking new ground — and that’s hard work — a heavy load. But we need to get on with it — to be willing to rethink what we are doing when it is appropriate — to get into the classroom more — and let go of old habits and ways of thinking in light of changing circumstances.

This is my charge to all of you — use this dialogue not as an end, but as a beginning — become serious and committed advocates for change. Do the hard work of upgrading teacher preparation and certification in your state.

The American people are tuned into education. The sparks are all around us. And we have a President in the White House — in Bill Clinton — who cares deeply about education. If ever there was a time to come together to improve teaching, it is now.

America is on the move, and every school, college and university can be a bastion of hope, creativity and learning. For education is much more than getting a degree or learning a new skill. There is joy to learning, and the freedom of the intellect that brings with it new discovery and new thinking.

I end now with a quote from an old friend of mine from South Carolina, the writer Pat Conroy. This quote is from his novel the Prince of Tides.

And in this passage the main character of the book Tom, a teacher, is asked why he chose to “sell himself short” when he was so talented and could have done anything in his life.

Tom’s reply goes like this, “There’s no word in the language that I revere more than ‘teacher.’ None. My heart sings,” he says, “when a kid refers to me as his teacher and it always has. I’ve honored myself and the entire family of man by becoming a teacher.”

I believe that there are a great many Americans listening tonight who feel the same. I thank you for your commitment to the teaching profession.
**Administrators' Corner**

**Bob Marra**, state director of the DOE Division of Special Education, announced at the August 15 ICASE Executive Committee meeting that officials from the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) will be in Indianapolis from October 6-10, 1997. In a letter to state directors the first of August OSEP proposed that each state agency appoint a team or panel to develop an implementation plan for compliance with the IDEA revisions. OSEP has proposed the team would write the agreement, seek public comment, obtain OSEP approval and verify that the plan has been implemented.

OSEP wants each state panel to include: state agency officials, a local agency director and a teacher, a college representative, a parent who serves on the state’s advisory council, a representative from the state’s Parent Training and Information Center (IN*SOURCE), and from the state’s protection and advocacy agency (P&A), as well as other public agencies or organizations at the state’s discretion.

Bob will provide more details regarding Division plans at the ICASE Fall Conference on September 26 at Terre Haute. See the July 28, 1997 letter from Dr. Thomas Hehir in this issue.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

**Tom Doyle** has been appointed the Director of Special Education for MSD Pike Township effective August 1, 1997. He was the assistant director of the Hamilton-Boone-Madison Special Services Cooperative for 10 years and served as the director for 2 years for a total of 12 years with the co-op.

**Ann Smith** has been designated as the new director of the Hamilton-Boone-Madison Special Services Cooperative. She has been the assistant director for 3 years.

**Dr. Sandra Hollingshead** has been selected Director of Special Programs at Hamilton Southeastern Schools which is a member of the Hamilton-Boone-Madison Special Services Cooperative.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

The CASE web page is now active. Members may access the web page at <http://members.aol.com/caseec>. In the coming weeks a linkage will be established with the Council for Exceptional Children web page to permit even easier access to CASE information. Other future plans include making the web page interactive in order to expand communication with CASE members.

**Happy Birthday!**

- September 2  
  **Darcy Hopko**  
  Alexandria Community Schools

- September 2  
  **Valree Kinch**  
  Oak Hill Schools

- September 3  
  **John Helfen**  
  Gibson-Pike-Warrick Special Education Cooperative

- September 9  
  **Ann Schnepf**  
  Clark County Special Education Cooperative

- September 10  
  **Pat Daggy**  
  Speedway City Schools

- September 10  
  **Susan Miner**  
  Division of Special Education

- September 12  
  **Marilyn Faris**  
  Covered Bridge Special Education District

- September 19  
  **Kathy Rapp**  
  Division of Special Education

- September 21  
  **Bob Handlon**  
  Harrison County Special Education
Letter From the OSEP Director on Plans for Developing Implementation Agreements — [The following is the full text of a July 28, 1997, letter from Dr. Thomas Hehir, Director of the federal Office of Special Education Programs, to State Directors of Special Education.]

I’m excited to share the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP’s) plans for monitoring in the 1997-98 school year. In an effort to assist all fifty-eight States and entities to implement the new requirements of IDEA 97 in an expeditious and systematic fashion, OSEP will refocus its 1997-98 monitoring efforts. Specifically, OSEP will conduct on-site visits to each State to facilitate the formulation of State-specific “IDEA 97” Implementation Agreements that: (1) address the revisions to IDEA; (2) incorporate all outstanding corrective action plan requirements; and (3) include significant parent, advocacy and local education agency (LEA) involvement in the development of the Agreement.

The major benefit of this approach is that it allows States to focus their resources on planning for the expeditious, substantive implementation of the requirements of IDEA 97. The Implementation Agreement, since it would be developed with significant involvement from parent and advocacy groups and LEA representatives, would set up a structure to assist States in taking a comprehensive approach to implementation of, and compliance with, IDEA 97, that focuses on State systems rather than fragmented procedural requirements. Any outstanding corrective actions from previous OSEP monitoring would be incorporated into the agreement.

The Implementation Agreement would be developed by an Implementation Team made up of State education agency (SEA) administrative members (including appropriate SEA staff during relevant portions of development of the agreement), and a parent representative from the State advisory panel, a representative from the Parent Training and Information Center, and a representative from the Protection and Advocacy agency. In addition, an LEA director, a teacher, and a representative from institutions of higher education will also be included. Representatives from the Part H program, Independent Living Centers, and other public agencies and organizations will be included, at the SEA’s discretion, in all or relevant discussions during the development of the agreement. Guidelines for selecting members of the Implementation Team will be provided by OSEP.

The Implementation Agreement will include: Identification of requirements for which the State is not in full compliance with IDEA 97; corrective actions and the specific action steps the State will take to come into compliance; timelines for completion; required resources; designation of responsible staff; method of verification; and incorporation of all outstanding corrective action plan requirements.

The process to develop the Implementation Agreement would include: (1) completion of a SEA inventory that will assist the SEA in determining their compliance status with regard to the new IDEA 97 requirements, the results of which will be used to focus the Implementation Agreement development process on discrepancies between current State practice and requirements of IDEA 97; (2) development of the Implementation Agreement by a State team with OSEP staff participation; (3) public input into the Implementation Agreement; (4) formal approval by OSEP; (5) execution of the Implementation Agreement; and (6) verification of implementation.

All initial monitoring visits on IDEA 97 will be completed by January 1998, and OSEP’s planned 1997-98 follow-up monitoring schedule will be undertaken between January and May. In addition, OSEP will conduct focused Part H monitoring visits to selected States.

You will soon receive a follow-up phone call from your OSEP State contact to further discuss IDEA 97 monitoring for this year and to begin to work with you to schedule OSEP’s visit to your State. In addition, Ruth Ryder, Director of the Division of Monitoring and State Improve-
ment Planning, will be sending out more detailed information on this process soon.

**SOURCE:** GTE INS Federal newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 7/30/97.

**OSEP Dissemination Activities: IDEA Amendments of 1997** — The federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is taking various steps to disseminate information about the IDEA Amendments of 1997 (Public Law 105-17). A wide range of advocacy groups and other organizations have participated in a series of outreach meetings in order to have the opportunity for broad input into the IDEA implementation process. OSEP also points to the June 17 Federal Register notice requesting advice and recommendations on regulatory issues, with comments due by July 28.

The U.S. Department of Education is expected to publish proposed rules in September, to be followed by a 90-day comment period.

The Regional Resource Centers and Federal Resource Center have been hosting training sessions for State Education Agency staff members in their regions. Suzanne Sheridan, Office of the General Counsel/U.S. Department of Education and Joleta Reynolds, OSEP policy analyst, have been providing the training.

On July 11, 1997, OSEP Director Tom Hehir sent a letter to State Directors of Special Education regarding OSEP’s implementation activities. On July 2, OSEP Research to Practices Division Director Lou Danielson forwarded a letter to OSEP grantees outlining the ways that Public Law 105-17 will affect their work. The new law combines the previous fourteen authorities into seven authorities under Part D (National Activities to Improve Education of Children with Disabilities). Other changes in the discretionary grant process include:

- Creating standing panels to evaluate discretionary applications (by January 1, 1988);
- Developing a way for grantees and other stakeholders to have input in the fiscal 1998 proposed priority process; and
- Establishing a comprehensive planning process for the discretionary activities beyond 1998.

Meanwhile, various advocates and organizations are asking OSEP to clarify the discipline provisions in the new law, particularly the services that schools are required to provide to students with disabilities while they are suspended for disciplinary reasons.

A new IDEA ’97 home page is available online. It contains an overview of IDEA; a series of questions and answers; remarks by Secretary Riley and Assistant Secretary Heumann at the signing ceremony; a press release issued by the White House when the bill was signed into law; and a copy of the enrolled bill. <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP/>

The next update on OSEP implementation activities will be distributed in mid-August.

**Questions & Answers from OSEP** — 1. How will the new law help children with disabilities reach higher levels of achievement?

The 1997 Individuals With Disabilities Education Act which has been signed into law by President Clinton aims to strengthen academic expectations and accountability for the nation’s 5.4 million children with disabilities, and bridge the gap that has too often existed between what those children learn and the regular curriculum.

From now on, the Individualized Education Program (IEP) — the plan that spells out the educational goals for each child and the services he will receive for his education — must relate more clearly to the general curriculum that children in regular classrooms receive.

The law will also require regular progress reports to parents, include children with disabilities in state and district assessments and in setting and
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reporting on performance goals as they do for non-disabled children.

Teachers will benefit from advancements in research through professional development initiatives.

2. What about parents? How are parents involved in decisions about their child’s education?

Parental involvement will increase under the new law. In all states, parents will now be included in groups making eligibility and placement decisions about children with disabilities. Previously, in some states, parents only had a right to be included in IEP meetings. Parents also have a right to consent to periodic re-evaluations of their children’s program, in addition to initial evaluations.

Currently, parents of children with disabilities rarely get regular reports from schools on their child’s progress in achieving academic goals set forth in the IEP. The new law aims to increase parental involvement by requiring regular progress reports, that are commonly made for other children.

3. Will more children with disabilities be placed in regular classroom settings under the law?

The new law is designed to remove financial incentives for placing children in more separate settings when they could be served in a regular classroom, and it will include regular classroom teachers in the meetings at which the academic goals of children with disabilities are set.

The new law also eases some of the restrictions on how IDEA funding can be used for children served in regular classrooms. Specifically, such funds can be used for providing services to children with disabilities in regular classroom settings even if non-disabled children benefit as well.

4. How does the new law change the roles and responsibilities of regular classroom teachers?

A critically important feature of the new law specifies that regular teachers will be part of the team that develops each child’s IEP. That is especially important since the law removes barriers to placing disabled children in regular classroom settings and ties the education of children with disabilities more closely to the regular education curriculum.

The law requires that IEP’s include the program modifications and supports for the child and teacher to enable the child to succeed in the classroom.

The law also provides continued federal support to improve teacher training nationwide, and adds support of teacher training programs in geographic areas with acute teacher shortages.

5. How will IDEA 97 prevent inappropriate placements for minority children?

Whether the child is a minority student or not, IDEA 97 emphasizes that for most children with disabilities, special education is not a place. Rather, special education is a set of services to support the needs of children with disabilities to succeed in general education classrooms.

For the first time, states will be required to gather data to ensure that school districts are not disproportionately identifying and placing children with disabilities from minority or limited English proficiency backgrounds in separate educational settings, and that such children are not being disproportionately suspended or expelled. In addition, in determining their education services, schools will be required to address the language needs of students who have limited English proficiency. Teachers will be provided training and research based knowledge to meet the special needs of these children.

6. How will this law help school districts meet the costs of special education?

The new law directs more federal dollars to school districts and allows them greater flexibility to meet the needs of children with disabilities in their schools. States and other public agencies will continue their level of support to school districts. Unnecessary assessments will be eliminated, saving school districts an estimated $765 million per year.
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7. How does IDEA promote safe, well-disciplined schools?

All children deserve safe and well-disciplined schools. For the first time, the new law sets out and clarifies how school disciplinary rules and the obligation to provide a Free Appropriate Public Education to disabled children fit together.

The law explicitly requires that children who need it receive instruction and services to help them follow the rules and get along in school.

However, the law also recognizes that if students bring a weapon or illegal drugs to school, schools have the right to remove children with disabilities to an alternative educational setting for up to 45 days. The new law permits schools to go to a hearing officer for an injunction to remove a child for up to 45 days if the child is considered substantially likely to injure himself or others. Previously, only a court had that authority. And the law also recognizes the right of schools to report crimes to law enforcement or judicial authorities.

At the same time, the law guarantees that children under suspension or expulsion would still receive special education services elsewhere.

8. How does the law affect infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities?

The law allows federal funding to rise to $400 million for infants and toddlers programs from current appropriations of $315 million. For preschoolers allowable funding is up to $500 million up from current spending of $360 million. It clarifies that infants and toddlers should receive services in the home or in other natural settings where possible. It also improves the coordination and transition for children from infant and toddler programs to pre-school programs.

9. Will these changes and new requirements affect the number of lawsuits and due process hearings by parents and legal bills for school districts?

When parents and schools districts collaborate on childrens’ education, conflict is minimized. IDEA 97 recognizes and encourages these positive relationships and non-adversarial methods of resolving disputes. The new law includes parents in placement decisions and requires schools to report regularly to parents on their child’s progress.

Under IDEA 97 states will make effective voluntary mediation available to parents and school districts as a far less costly alternative to lawsuits. In the rare instances when it is necessary parents can still choose due process procedures.


U.S. Department of Education Integrated Review
— On April 3, during OSEP’s 1977 Leadership Conference, a panel provided an overview of the U.S. Department of Education’s integrated review process. Panelists were staff from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education and Office of Special Education Programs, as well as personnel from the North Dakota Department of Public Instruction.

In the spring of 1996, the Department of Education began piloting a process of consolidated reviews for federally funded K-12 programs. The six objectives of the Department-wide integrated reviews are:

1. To help States determine how federal programs work together as they are implemented within the state and local context;

2. To consider results of federal programs in improving academic achievement for all students who are beneficiaries of federal programs;

3. To identify federal support and technical assistance capabilities that can aid states;

4. To monitor for compliance essential program integrity requirements;

5. To support the engagement of parents, families, and communities in dialogue about school improvement and student achievement;

6. To identify federal barriers and make recommendations for overcoming them.

Buy-in across the Department of Education includes participants from the Offices of: Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs, Elementary and Secondary Education, Educational Research and Improvement, Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and Vocational and Adult Education, as well as the Department’s Chief Financial Officer, Inspector General, and General Counsel.

In addition to reviewing the actual process of the North Dakota integrated review, the panel highlighted the benefits to of the procedure to the Department of Education and to state and local education agency staff.

Special Education Communications Network (“SECN”) — In an August 7 memo Bob Marra, state director, notified directors and school personnel of the following change to take effect in one year.

As many of you know, the Division has been without a network administrator for the SECN for almost a year. As technology has advanced and communication methods have improved more and more school personnel are accessing electronic mail through the Internet and/or local area Post Offices. Administrative personnel have begun looking at the most cost-effective means for communicating among staff members and between school buildings. So too has the Division.

Beginning August 1, 1998, the Division will no longer provide a dial-in access to the SECN. We are providing you with a one-year notice so that you may explore other means for electronic communication within our field. With Internet access relatively inexpensive and the majority of our schools connected to IDEANet, a dial-in method of communication is outdated and inefficient.

There are several options available and our office is willing to assist you in your explorations if you so desire. Please feel free to contact Sharon Knoth if you wish to discuss these options at 317/232-0570.

Kindergarten Entrance Law — As in years past, many parents are calling with questions regarding the Kindergarten entrance law in Indiana. This May 2, 1997 memorandum issued by the DOE Prime Time Consultant will assist you as you answer similar questions at the local level.

I.C. 20-8.1-3-17 establishes a statewide entrance eligibility date for public school Kindergarten. A student residing in Indiana must be five on or before June 1 in order to enroll in public school Kindergarten. This law further requires that each school corporation have an appeal process for parents requesting early entrance. The Department of Education issued guidelines for the local appeal process in August 1991.

I continue to receive many calls about the appeal process, specifically regarding equity issues inherent in the administration and cost of testing. The
Department of Education legal staff has reviewed the issue regarding parents being charged for testing that a school corporation requires as part of its appeal process. The opinion of the Department of Education is that school corporations cannot require a parent to assume a cost as part of the school corporation’s early admission appeal process. Such a cost would be inconsistent with the General Assembly’s creation of a right intended for access by all parents similarly situated. A parent can voluntarily assume such costs by having the child evaluated by an independent evaluator. If a parent has done so, the school corporation is to consider these results in making its determination. However, as stated in the guidelines, early entrance should never be based on a single test score.

School corporations are dealing with entrance issues in different ways. For example, some communities have targeted specifically their at-risk population for early entrance. Others have interviewed parents and children and come to a joint decision as to the child’s best placement. Still others have accepted children whose birthdays fall closest to the eligibility date, space permitting. It is important to consider that age is the only culturally and economically unbiased determinant for school entrance. When issues other than age are considered, what is in the best educational interest of the individual child should drive the decision.

In addition to providing guidelines for a local parent appeal process, the 1991 legislation required the Department of Education to develop criteria for school corporations to use in adopting assessment procedures for Kindergarten or first grade placement of children coming to school for the first time under compulsory attendance laws (during the school year of their seventh birthday).

This law does not require a child to be six years of age on or before June 1 to be eligible for first grade; it does not establish a statewide entrance eligibility date for first grade. Kindergarten attendance is not required by law. School corporations have the authority and responsibility to enroll a student in the appropriated grade based on educational factors. The Department discourages denying entrance to the first grade based solely on the Kindergarten eligibility law.

We urge teachers and administrators to refer to the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) for recommendations regarding programming for the primary years. Two particularly helpful NAEYC books, Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs (1997 Revised Edition) and Reaching Potentials Volumes 1 and 2, are available from NAEYC, 1509 16th Street N.W., Washington, DC 20036-1426 (800/424-2460).

Another good resource is Getting Schools Ready for Children (1994) from the Southern Regional Education Board (404/875-9211). In addition, it may be helpful for administrators and Kindergarten teachers to review the following from the State Board policy regarding curriculum:

Curriculum Rules Regarding Kindergarten Indiana State Board of Education

511 IAC 6.1-5-1 Kindergarten Curriculum
Authority: IC 20-1-1-6; IC 20-1-1.2-18
Affected: IC 20-1-1.2-1; IC 20-5-2-1; IC 20-10.1-16-6

Sec. 1. (a) The Kindergarten curriculum shall include developmentally appropriate activities in the following areas:

1. Language experiences, including oral, listening, and visual activities.
2. Creative experiences, including music, dramatics, movement, arts, and crafts.
3. Personal growth experiences, including motor skills development, health, safety, nutrition, and self-concept development.
4. Social living experiences.
5. Environmental and science experiences.

continued on page 11
The Indiana Kindergarten Guide provides a theoretical and practical framework for the implementation of developmentally appropriate practices in the areas listed above. Since it was first distributed in 1990, many schools have revisited the Guide and find it a valuable resource in planning quality Kindergarten programs. We are currently in the process of revising the Guide to be more inclusive of all early childhood classrooms, Pre-K through Grade 3. This Guide and a companion video will be available fall 1997.

Thank you for the important role you play in ensuring that a child’s first school experience is a positive and rewarding one. Please contact Mary Beth Morgan at 317/232-9149 should you have any questions regarding this information.

Tobacco Products —
[Editor’s Note: During the week of May 5, 1997 the Indiana Attorney General and State Superintendent of Public Instruction issued the following letter to all Educators.]

Use of tobacco products by middle school students is a deadly problem in Indiana. We need your help to spare them from suffering life-long addictions and premature death.

Every day in this country, 3000 children become regular smokers. Many of these children begin smoking when they are only 11, 12, or 13 years old. More than one-third of these children will die prematurely of smoking-related diseases. Sadly, Indiana’s share of this tragedy is above the national average, with 42.6 percent of eighth graders saying they have smoked cigarettes in the last year. Smoking is on the rise among almost all categories of Indiana’s children.

That’s not surprising when you consider that the tobacco industry spends nearly $6 billion a year (over half a million dollars an hour) on advertising — much of it directed to kids right here in Indiana. In fact, the industry has quadrupled spending on promotional items that appeal to kids such as hats and T-shirts — to almost $800 million in just the last two years.

The three most heavily advertised brands (Marlboro, Camel, and Newport) have captured over 85% of the teenage market. Not surprisingly, the fastest rising cigarette being smoked by children is Camel. Its share of the illegal underage market skyrocketed from less than .5% to 33% after the “Joe Camel” campaign began.

Earlier this year, we, along with the Commissioner of the Indiana Department of Health and other state agencies, joined forces to combat underage smoking by establishing the Attorney General’s Tobacco-Free Youth Coalition. The coalition is pursuing a two-pronged strategy to reduce sales of tobacco products to minors by increasing enforcement efforts of existing laws and by working cooperatively with retailers to stamp out sales of tobacco products to youngsters.

Attorney General Jeffrey A. Modisett filed suit on February 19, 1997, against the tobacco industry to halt unequivocally the marketing of tobacco products to minors. In March, one of the Big Five Tobacco Companies — Liggett Group — finally told the truth. Liggett now admits that cigarettes cause lung cancer, heart disease, and emphysema. Liggett admits smoking is addictive. Perhaps most important, Liggett admits the tobacco industry actively and deliberately markets its products to children.

In the remaining weeks of this school year, we want you to remind students that cigarette smoking is the most deadly — and preventable — cause of disease and premature death in America, and that tobacco companies deliberately entice youngsters to smoke. Beginning this fall, we also want you to consider the Attorney General’s Tobacco-Free Youth Coalition as a resource to assist you and your school in anti-smoking projects. For additional information telephone 317/232-6201.
**Federal Update . . .**

**State Special Education Finance Systems, 1994-1995** — This report was released in June 1997 by the Center for Special Education Finance (CSEF), which conducted a national survey of state special education administrators to obtain information on the mechanisms used by states to fund special education services for school-aged children with disabilities and the costs to provide these services. All 50 states and the District of Columbia responded. To obtain additional data, CSEF conducted a follow-up survey in spring 1996, of the 24 states that had been able to provide data on special education costs for the 1994-95 school year.

This document summarizes results from the CSEF survey, describing state systems for financing special education services. Part I contains three sections that provide descriptive information on the special education finance systems in the states and the policies that guide them; special education revenues and expenditures; and a conclusion that addresses the implications of the data presented. Part II contains an abstract of each state’s special education funding mechanism for the 1994-95 school year.

The data in this report suggest several avenues for change, including the following:

* Reduce unnecessary identification of students eligible for special education services, including reducing fiscal incentives for identification.

  * Increase integration across categorical programs. The continued separation of categorical programs is costly and can lead to a fragmented and inefficient set of schooling programs.

  * Meet increased demands for school-based accountability. This includes increased emphasis on including students with disabilities in state and local assessments.

  * Continue searching for a needs-based funding system. Such a system would vary with differences in true measures of student NEED, rather than the number of students identified or the quantity of services being provided.

**Contact:** CSEF, American Institutes for Research, 1791 Arastradero Road, P.O. Box 1113, Palo Alto, CA 94302-1113; 415-493-3550, Ext. 240; fax 415-858-0958; email: CSEF@air-ca.org

The entire document, along with selected tables, may be down loaded from CSEF’s web site: <http://www.air-dc.org/csef_hom>

**Welfare Reform, Medicaid, and SSI: Implications for Special Education** — Roy Trudel, of the Health Care Financing Administration, Thomas Gloss of the Social Security Administration’s Office of Disability, and Connie Garner, of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services presented a general session on the above topics on April 3 at OSEP’s Annual Leadership Conference. Their discussion began with an overview of major concerns, as follows:

* Decoupling of eligibility requirements for TANF and Medicaid, resulting in the need for a seamless system;

* Loss of health coverage and other support programs for children of legal immigrants, both in general and special education; and

* The relationship between SSI benefits and automatic Medicaid eligibility.

Thomas Gloss (SSA) reviewed recent changes in programs affecting people with disabilities. His graphs on changes in SSI benefits paid to children from 1988 to 1996 showed:

* The number of children served has grown from 250,000 to 1,000,000;

* Spending grew from $8 billion to $25 billion;

* The effect that Individual
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Functional Assessments (IFA) have had on the increases.

Gloss also reviewed changes made to SSI as a result of the 1996 Welfare Reform Act, the most significant of which are:

* Changes in the definition of a disability;

* Repeal of the IFA;

* Changes in the “behavioral” criteria;

* Required completion of Continuing Disability Reviews (CDRs) every three years and by the first birthday for children who have low birthweight;

* Evidence of treatment must be shown or payment is suspended or made directly to the child;

* At age 18, recipients are medically reviewed, using adult standards.

Garner suggested that the implications for schools are twofold: schools need to be prepared to contribute to the “medical evidence” that is needed to prove eligibility, and inform students that they may be eligible for Medicaid under other programs when they no longer qualify under SSI.

Roy Trudel (HCFA) discussed the kinds of children who would be affected. These are children from families who previously received Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), children with disabilities receiving SSI, and non-citizen children. He stated that, according to their estimates, 80 percent of the 130,000 children losing SSI will still receive Medicaid under other programs. Again, the need to keep children from “falling through the cracks” upon being notified of losing SSI benefits is a crucial role for schools.

SOURCE: GTE INS Federal newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 4/7/97.

Reauthorization of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act: A Review — During the OSEP Annual Leadership Conference the first week in April 1997, highlights of Vocational Rehabilitation Act reauthorization issues and processes were shared by: Howard Moses, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS); David Riskind, Director of Program Administration, Rehabilitative Services Administration (OSERS); June Harris, Education Coordinator for Congressman Clay, House Committee on Education and the Workforce; Beverlee Stafford, Rehabilitative Services Administration; and Robert Rabe, Administrator, Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission.

The principles that form the basis for the administration’s draft reauthorization proposal include:

* Strengthen the focus on individuals with the most severe disabilities;

* Reinforce active consumer involvement and choice;

* Promote high quality outcomes with an emphasis on competitive employment;

* Increase the role of employers in the rehabilitation process;

* Streamline the rehabilitation process;

* Emphasize systemic reform;

* Commit to independent living programs; and

* Recognize the role of research.

The overall view of Congress is that the data show a high degree of success and satisfaction with this program; the Congress believes that the program works well for clients. The President’s budget includes a proposed 3.3 percent increase in funding.

Public comment has highlighted the following major issues:

* ORDER OF THE SELECTION PROCESS: It is seen as unfair and should be abolished, while keeping a focus on individuals with the most severe disabilities.
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* INFORMED CHOICE: There is a need for more ways or new ways of strengthening this requirement.

* TARGETED SERVICES: Certain populations are asking for maintaining or even expanding targeted services, while the National Independent Living Council is opposed.

* PERSONAL ASSISTANTS: There is a need to continue this emphasis and assure that special aids and services are available to all who need them.

* TRANSITION REQUIREMENTS: There is a need to strengthen the interagency agreements by specifying who will pay for which services.

* HEALTH INSURANCE: There is a need to recognize that lack of health insurance is a primary deterrent to putting people with disabilities to work.

Facilitating the acquisition of jobs, balancing reality with choice, encouraging partnerships, finding ways to cut red tape, and finding ways to provide services to all who qualify are some of the primary concerns from a state perspective.

Howard Moses said that OSERS is interested in receiving any input regarding changes that can be made in the legislation to better grasp the issues and intent of transition. He said that suggestions should go beyond funding to address ways to improve the transition process within the reality of restrained funding.

SOURCE: GTE INS Federal newsgroup posting on Indiana SECN 4/7/97.

Head Start Expansion

— On March 26 HHS Secretary Donna E. Shalala announced a new Head Start initiative that will expand Head Start services for children while also helping parents on welfare move to work.

Under the announced initiative, Head Start expansion funds will be used for the first time to build partnerships with child care providers to deliver full-day and full-year Head Start services. Full-day and full-year services, in turn, can help parents attain full-time work.

Through the Head Start-child care partnerships, Head Start and child care agencies combine staff and funds to provide high quality services. Children stay in one place all day, rather than attending Head Start for half a day and then moving to child care for the remainder of the day. In addition, the expansion funds will provide for increased Head Start slots for children. By the end of FY 1997, some 800,000 children are expected to be enrolled in Head Start, an increase of 50,000 from the beginning of the fiscal year.

Head Start programs provide early education and development, as well as health services, for children in low-income families.

“Head Start has historically had the goal of involving the family as a whole. It has sought not only to help the children in low-income families, but also to help the parents achieve self-sufficiency,” said Secretary Shalala.

“Today, when welfare reform has made the move to work a national commitment, Head Start’s twin goals are more important than ever,” she added. “We need to give our children the start in life they deserve — and we need to support parents who are moving to work. Our expansion grants can build new partnerships that will make these twin goals a reality for more families.”

Congress approved President Clinton’s full request to increase the Head Start budget by over $411 million for FY 1997. In addition to expanding total Head Start enrollment, the enhanced funding will also increase the number of infants and toddlers in the new Early Head Start program.

HHS designed the announced initiative today to build on the successes of dozens of local Head Start-child care partnerships, including the Full Start project of
KCMC Child Development Corporation in Kansas City; the Settlement House Initiative in New York City; and the family child care network efforts of Puget Sound Educational Service District in Seattle.

“No longer will families have to choose between Head Start and a job,” said Olivia Golden, principal deputy assistant secretary for children and families. “This is an extraordinary opportunity to use Head Start expansion funds in a timely, innovative and practical way to support healthy development and learning for young children and help families attain or maintain work.”

The HHS Head Start Bureau will manage a national competition among local Head Start programs for the additional funds. Two additional open competitions will be held for new Early Head Start programs and to establish Head Start programs in previously unserved areas of the country. Other portions of the expanded Head Start funds will be used for statutorily mandated cost of living increases, quality improvement funds and expanded training and technical assistance.

Under the Clinton administration, funding for Head Start has grown $1.8 billion over the past five years, from $2.2 in FY 1992 to nearly $4 billion in FY 1997, an increase of more than 80 percent. These additional funds have enabled Head Start to serve 180,000 more children and their families, enhance the quality of Head Start services, launch a new initiative to serve infants and toddlers, and improve program research. President Clinton proposes continued investments to allow Head Start to grow to serve over one million children by the year 2002. Additional details about the Head Start expansion initiative are available on the internet at: www.acf.dhhs.gov/news/press/hsexpand.htm.


Regional Education Laboratories — Where can you find the best available knowledge from education research & practice?

The Department supports a network of 10 Regional Educational Laboratories to make such knowledge widely available. This network, which is administered by our Office of Educational Research & Improvement (OERI), is featured in two new publications: “Profiles of the Regional Educational Laboratories” describes each lab’s mission & major activities and tells how to contact the Lab (or the Department program officer for that Lab) and “From Promise to Practice: Stories from the Regional Educational Laboratories” describes how the Labs have assisted educators in school reform efforts.

Both publications, plus a *map* showing the region each Lab serves (with a link from that region to the Lab’s web site), are available in our Online Library at: http://www.ed.gov/prog_info/Labs/

A limited number of paper copies of one publication, “Profiles of the Regional Educational Laboratories,” is available from the National Library of Education by calling 1-800-424-1616 or by emailing your request to library@inet.ed.gov

Following are EXCERPTS from “From Promise to Practice: Stories from the Regional Educational Laboratories” (September 1996) describing what the Labs do, where they are located and more.

What do the Labs do?

Each Regional Lab is guided by a governing board that represents the constituents in its region — including teachers, researchers and high-level policy makers. Under the guidance of their Boards, Laboratories:

* work with states and localities to implement comprehensive school improvement strategies by providing information, training and technical assistance, and developing or implementing
FEDERAL UPDATE . . . continued from page 15

* research-based programs;
* conduct development and applied research resulting in well-tested models for implementing systemic reform and for “scaling up” or expanding exemplary isolated reform efforts on a broader scale;
* promote widespread access to information regarding research and best practice;
* create communities of learners to engage collaboratively with the Laboratory in development and dissemination;
* cooperate with other ED-funded technical assistance providers to create a nationwide education information and assistance system that can support educators’ and policymakers’ efforts to improve education; and
* forge strong links to the research community to promote the creation of new knowledge to improve education.

Where are the Labs, & what is the *specialty area* of each?

(* Note: Each Lab is developing expertise in one “specialty area” which will enable it to serve as a special resource not only within its region but to the entire lab network.)

Northeast and Islands Laboratory at Brown University (LAB) Internet: http://www.lab.brown.edu Specialty Area: Language and Cultural Diversity

Mid-Atlantic Laboratory for Student Success (LSS) Internet: http://www.temple.edu/departments/Iss Specialty Area: Urban Education

Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) Internet: http://www.ael.org Specialty Area: Rural Education

Southeastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE) Internet: http://www.serve.org Specialty Area: Early Childhood Education

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) Internet: http://www.ncrel.org Specialty Area: Educational Technology

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) Internet: http://www.sedl.org Specialty Area: Language and Cultural Diversity

Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL) Internet: http://www.mcrel.org Specialty Area: Curriculum, Learning and Instruction

WestEd Internet: http://www.wested.org Specialty Area: Assessment and Accountability

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) Internet: http://www.nwrel.org Specialty Area: School Change Processes

Pacific Region Educational Laboratory (PREL) Internet: http://prel-ohau-1.prel.hawaii.edu Specialty Area: Language and Cultural Diversity

What are some “defining features” of the Labs?

One defining feature of the Laboratories is their strong regional focus. Each Laboratory has its own agenda of work that reflects the most compelling problems of educators and policymakers across its region. The agenda is determined by a governing board that represents a cross-section of Regional Educational interests and includes members from every state in its geographic area. Laboratories use multiple techniques, such as focus groups, surveys, and advisory committees to assess regional needs.

A second distinctive feature of the Regional Educational Laboratories is their close relationship with practicing educators. Decisions about research and development activities draw heavily from recommendations of teachers, administrators, parents, policymakers, and others on the front lines of education. These key people also have input into all other aspects of Laboratory work, from the initial design of projects to the final publication of materials and products. Teachers, for
example, help develop, test, and refine Laboratory-developed models in their classrooms. Administrators identify urgent problems in their districts and work with Laboratories to carry out reforms.

This two-way relationship with practitioners contributes to a third unique feature of the Regional Laboratories: their practical orientation. The Laboratories work with educators to develop strategies for solving the sometimes messy problems that educators face in actual classrooms and schools. Unlike university-based research centers that tend to tackle long-term, complex research problems, the Regional Educational Laboratories are capable of moving fast to respond to time-sensitive situations and policy issues.

This is not to suggest that the Laboratories are a local “911 number.” Because they do not have resources to address every state and local need, Laboratories work with their Boards, choose their projects systematically and carefully, taking into account their regional significance and the willingness of school partners to assume the responsibilities of field-based research and development. If a school’s unique concerns do not fit into the Laboratory’s priorities, then the Laboratory can make referrals to other appropriate technical assistance services.

SEARCH: edinfo@inet.ed.gov

SOURCE: Division News & Notes bulletin board posting on Indiana SECN 11/18/96.

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 25, Issue 7
April 17, 1997

Judicial Decisions. . .
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OSERS/OSEP . . .


The Special Educator
Volume 12, Issue 17
April 11, 1997

OSERS/OSEP . . .
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Individuals With Disabilities Education Law Report
Volume 25, Issue 12
June 26, 1997

Judicial Decisions. . .


Editor’s Note: It is important to note that the above interpretation from OSERS came before the adoption of the recent IDEA amendments which have had a heavy hand in further defining the rights of private school students.


Although Not Specifically Required, Providing Advance Copies of IEPs To Teachers Furthers IDEA’s Mandate. Letter to Ellis, 25 IDELR 1210 (OSEP 1997).
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Judicial Decisions.


Board of Appeals Upholds Determination That High School Student Was Not Eligible For Special Education—Indiana. The determination of a hearing officer that a high school student was not “disabled” as defined by the IDEA and Rehabilitation Act was upheld by a state board of special education appeals in Eagle Union Sch. Corp., 26 IDELR 106 (SEA IN ’97).
get individual and family counseling on an outpatient basis.

Center for Behavioral Health is a community mental health center dedicated to providing the Deaf and hard of hearing community of Indiana with the highest quality mental health services available.

Services for the Deaf have been provided for many years by our Center and as we expand with Hope House and additional outpatient services we will continue to move towards completion of our mission: to serve the underserved population of Indiana. Should you have a Deaf or hard of hearing child or family in your school system that you feel may benefit from counseling services Center for Behavioral Health employs a wide variety of highly trained staff to meet the varying needs of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing community.

Currently, our staff consists of hearing professionals fluent in American Sign Language, Deaf professionals fluent in American Sign Language, and Hard of Hearing professionals who are oral.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you would like an assessment or consultation. 317/924-9475 (voice), 317/924-9456 (TTY), 812/339-1691 (voice) or 1/800/944-9411 (TTY)

---

**RESOURCES**

**Public Law 105-17 The IDEA Improvement Act of 1997** — Copies of the newly enacted law are available from the following:

1. Document Room of the House - call the Legislative Resource Center at 202-226-5200 and ask for the Document Room. Ask for a copy of P.L. 105-17. They will take your address and mail it to you when it is printed. To obtain copies of the Report Language, H.R. 105-95, you must download it from the Internet or obtain it through a federal depository library, as hard copies are out and will not be reprinted, according to the source contacted at the House Document Room.

OR

2. Senate Document Room - FAX your request for P.L. 105-17 to 202-228-2815. (They will respond ONLY to a written or faxed request.) NOTE: Copies of the law in its Senate bill version, S.717, and Report Language, Report 17, may still be available from the Senate Document Room. To check on availability before you FAX your request, call 202-224-2815.

OR


**New Career Flyers Available** — The National Clearinghouse for Professions in Special (NCPSE) has published some additional career flyers that explore career options for people who are interested in working with children who have disabilities. The new titles are:

- Special Education Technology Specialist
- Physical Therapist
- Occupational Therapist
- Speech-Language Pathologist
- Adapted Physical Education Teacher

To request copies of flyers on the above topics, contact: National Clearinghouse on Professions in Special Education, The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 20191-2589.

**Public Opinion Poll on Professions of Most Benefit to Society** — Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. (RNT) and the Advertising Council conducted a poll of 1004 adults to ask about their perceptions of the teaching
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profession, in comparison with other professions. Results showed that:

* 57 percent chose teaching as the top profession in providing “the most benefit to society”

* Only 1 in 4 respondents cited physicians as providing the most benefit to society, 1 percent named lawyers, 3 percent named business persons, 3 percent named politicians, and 2 percent named journalists.

* Medicine ranked first (29 percent) as the career respondents would most likely recommend to a family member, but teaching (23 percent) ranked a close second.

* The youngest respondents (aged 18 to 25) were the only age group to say that they would recommend a teaching career (32 percent) over a career as a physician (29 percent).

According to RNT President David Haselkorn, “The American public intuitively understands the relationship between a caring, competent, and qualified teacher and high student achievement. Yet more than three-fourths of our nation’s largest urban school districts are currently struggling with teacher shortages in critical areas, such as mathematics, science, special education, bilingual education, and elementary education, and demand will intensify over the next decade.”

RTN is a national nonprofit organization that has worked for ten years to create a more diverse, capable, and culturally responsive teacher work force for America’s schools.

CONTACT: Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., 385 Concord Avenue, Belmont, MA 02178; 617/489-6000; fax 617/489-6005.

AdvoKids Alliance — The AdvoKids Alliance is a collaboration between Child Advocates, Inc. (the Guardian ad Litem/CASA program for Marion County), and the Indiana Juvenile Justice Task Force, which is actively involved in juvenile delinquency issues throughout the state. Its mission is to provide multi-disciplinary training to all those professionals who are responsible for seeing that the best interests of children are being met in adjudicative and administrative settings.

The primary focus of AdvoKids is to instruct professionals on what role each plays in the juvenile justice system. It is their intent to tailor the training to address local conditions. If, in allocating CSPD funds, your district identifies special education and the juvenile justice system as a targeted priority, contact Scott Newton in Indianapolis at 317/543-2450.

Resources • continued from page 21

Communities In Schools — During the past year, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and Communities In Schools (the nation’s largest stay-in-school network) announced a national collaboration to help kids stay in school and get a good education.

Communities In Schools believes that helping kids and giving them a first-rate education are challenges for the entire community. When the community joins hands with its schools, the chances of offering an excellent education improve dramatically. The program also aims at helping kids to help themselves. Through training, Communities In Schools helps form a coordinated school and community team to bring resources, volunteers and services into the public schools.

AASA urges administrators and teachers to learn more about Communities In Schools and explore the possibility of starting

Booklet on Model School Health Centers — The National Health and Education Consortium has published a 16-page booklet that describes models of successful school-based health centers. The booklet also discusses a compelling rationale for how and why students can benefit from in-school health clinics. The cost is $15.

CONTACT: National Health and Education Consortium, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 310, Washington, DC 20036
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a stay-in-school program in their districts.

CONTACT: Bill Milliken, Communities in Schools, Inc., 1199 North Fairfax Street, Suite 300, Alexandria, VA 22314; 703-519-8999; fax 703-519-7213; email: cis@cisnet.org/

Blast-Off to an Odyssey of Extended Day Adventures —
TARGET POPULATION: All school-aged students who would benefit (developed at an intermediate school); particularly designed for students in special education.

DESCRIPTION: This extended-day program features:

* Supervision and instruction for children beyond normal school hours;

* A high degree of interaction between general education students and special education students;

* A professional development partnership with a nearby teacher training program;

* Strong support and involvement from the administration;

* Opportunities for students to develop strong social skills by working and playing in multi-age groups;

* Multicultural activities to help students appreciate diversity;

* Optimum utilization of community resources; and

* A high degree of parent involvement.

EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS: This program has been recognized for statewide dissemination by the Alabama State Department of Education/Division of Special Education Services as a practice supporting successful teaching.

CONTACT: Otis Stephenson, Special Education Coordinator, Opelika City Board of Education, P.O. Box 2469, Opelika, AL 36803-2469; 334/745-9709.


Project RIDE (Responding to Individual Differences in Education) —
TARGET POPULATION: At-risk learners in the general education classroom setting, elementary and secondary. (A preschool version is also available.)

DESCRIPTION: Project RIDE provides classroom teachers with resources to deal with students’ academic and social problems within the confines of the classroom. It is a building-based support system that operates on the premise that teachers, when coupled with proven classroom practices and modern technology, can become their own best resources. RIDE supports the belief that every student, typical or atypical, belongs to the educational family and should be considered the responsibility of the entire building staff. As a collaborative effort, RIDE provides:

* A resource for solving regular classroom problems, both behavioral and academic;

* A process for accommodating those students who neither qualify for pull-out programs nor can function successfully in the regular classroom;

* A pre-referral procedure to special education services.

The RIDE components are:

* EFFECTIVE CLASSROOM PRACTICES. The program includes twelve proven general classroom practices taken from the effective schools research. They are presented in practitioner language in order to make them readily usable by the classroom teachers. Teachers are asked to compare what should be versus what is occurring in their classrooms.

* THE SCHOOLWIDE ASSISTANCE TEAM (SWAT). Based on the premise that teachers are often their own best resources, the SWAT process uses a building-level team of teachers to address problems encountered by their peers.
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* COMPUTER TACTICS BANK and VIDEO LIBRARY. The Computer Tactics Bank makes over 500 proven practices retrievable (IBM, Macintosh, and Apple versions). The tactics address 40 classroom problems identified by teachers as causing the most disruptions within their classrooms. An average of five tactics of 300 words or less are offered for each identified behavioral and academic problem. Each of the tactics includes an introductory statement, instructions for implementation, special considerations, guidelines for monitoring, and the original reference(s).

The Video Library is a logical extension of the Computer Tactics Bank. Academic and social tactics are presented through a professionally developed series of 61 one-half inch videos, eight to ten minutes in length. The videos demonstrate how to carry out the proven classroom tactics.

Materials are available from the below distributor and can be independently implemented. However, RIDE facilitators can train either the entire staff of a school building or teams from a number of buildings who, in turn, can instill the program in their respective schools. For a typical adoption of eight school buildings, RIDE can be implemented and maintained for less than $750 per building, inclusive of training.

EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS: RIDE has been evaluated extensively. Stringently controlled studies have demonstrated that RIDE has resulted in:

(a) significant improvements in academic and social behavior;
(b) significant decreases (up to 56 percent) in referrals to special education;
(c) improvement in the ability of general classroom teachers to deal with everyday social and academic problems;
(d) selection as a project disseminated by the National Diffusion Network and by other national centers.

CONTACT: Sopris West, 1140 Boston Avenue, P.O. Box 1809, Longmont, Colorado 80502-1809; 1-800-547-6747; fax: 303/776-5934.

* American Disability Prevention and Wellness Association (ADPWA) — ADPWA advocates wellness programs and health education as a means of preventing and reducing disabling conditions. This is a nonprofit educational organization, funded by membership fees. Among its activities are the following:

- Supporting programs and legislation that improve the lives of persons with disabilities;
- Educating the public about the importance of preventing disabling conditions;
- Cooperating with other organizations dedicated to improving the lives of people with disabilities;
- Publishing information on disability prevention; and
- Sponsoring national conferences on topics related to the prevention of disabilities.

ADPWA has also been working with Congress to pass the Disabilities Prevention Act, which would provide federal support for local and state prevention programs that use a grass-roots community-based model to encourage prevention. The House has unanimously passed this legislation three times since 1990, but Senate committees have prevented the bill from reaching the Senate floor for a vote.

ADPWA is seeking new members interested in improving the health of people with disabilities.

CONTACT: ADPWA, 111 Clarmar Road, Fayetteville, NY 13066; 315/446-3660.