It was very exciting to see 23 states and one Canadian province represented at the CASE Annual Membership and Board of Directors meeting at the CEC Convention, National Harbor, MD, on April 26, 2011. The CASE Executive Committee (EC) was very pleased to spend much of the allocated time sharing the progress made on the CASE Strategic Plan (SP) for 2010-2012.

The CASE SP is based on the Design for the Future Report, originally written in 2005. Although these recommendations have been followed and completed for the most part over the last several years, it was timely for the present EC to reflect on those accomplishments and develop a Strategic Action Plan to align with the current needs and goals of the organization.

Collaborative Team Process

The initial process steps were taken at the July meeting of the newly appointed Executive Committee to establish roles and working relationships. While each EC member has defined roles and responsibilities, we discussed the need for using a cross-collaborative approach for committee work since many of the goals overlap and such an approach would be more purposeful and efficient, especially when interacting with our members. Committee Chairs identified those areas and further discussed how several goals intersect. Much of the time was spent on relationship-building, the most essential feature of collaboration and teamwork.

Focused discussions on frequent follow-up conference calls with the CASE Leadership, the Presidents and Executive Director, and the EC resulted in establishing the framework for the Action Plan and planning for the November EC meeting. The real work began at our November EC meeting where we finalized the goals and defined the objectives, activities, persons responsible and timelines for completion. A very talented group of leaders very effectively shaped the work that would evolve into a working action plan to move the CASE organization forward by responding to the needs of members and the field. With this in mind, our ultimate goal is to lead the way for special education administrators internationally. After several hours of serious discussion and interaction, a written draft was produced for review and revision with EC members assigned to each goal.

Further reflection occurred between November and January and a subcommittee of the Executive Director, Luann Purcell, President, Mary Kealy, Past President, Emily Collins, Secretary, Laural Jackson, Professional Development Chair, Gary Myrah and Research Liaison, Gina Scala met in early February to finalize actions and
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SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS

Reauthorizing ESEA: Yes or No?

MYRNA R. MANDLAWITZ, ESQ

“I think I can. I think I can,” said the Little Train that Could. With all the optimism of that little train, the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP) Committee continues to announce a forthcoming bill to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The latest prediction is a committee markup by late May or early June. Even if the Senate prediction were to come true, the House is talking about a different scenario with introduction of several smaller bills instead of comprehensive legislation.

Senate Discussions

The “big four” Senators – Committee Chairman Harkin (D-IA), Ranking Member Enzi (R-WY), Ranking Member, Bingaman (D-NM) and Alexander (R-TN) – have been meeting regularly to reach agreement on as many core issues as possible. At this stage, staff members are drafting a “thin bill,” retaining a fair amount of current law and adding new provisions on which the four senators concur. The idea is to bring this base bill to a committee mark-up, at which time amendments would be introduced on any other provisions.

This is a rather unusual method of reauthorization. In the past, the committee’s draft has been a comprehensive bill that included the Chairman’s wish list of new provisions. Of course, amendments at the committee and floor have always been in order.

Students with Disabilities in the Senate Bill

In discussions with Senate staff, it appears likely the requirement for all students to participate in assessments will remain. The “1%” testing regulation regarding students with significant cognitive disabilities will be incorporated into the statute. However, the “2%” regulation, which has never been fully implemented, would be left to the amendment process.

The Chairman’s bill will also contain a definition of “multi-tier system of supports (MTSS).” A number of general and special education groups have advocated for moving “response to intervention” processes from the IDEA to ESEA, since these processes are targeted at general education students. MTSS is the answer to these advocacy efforts. It is unclear at this point exactly how this concept will be incorporated into the bill.

Proposed changes to the accountability requirements could be problematic for students with disabilities. The new bill will focus on accountability for the lowest 5% of schools identified by states and districts, including accountability for subgroups. The question, therefore, is whether subgroup accountability requirements will remain for the other 95% of schools. Staff says members have heard repeatedly that students with disabilities have kept districts and schools from making adequate yearly progress. If this trend continues, it does not bode well for maintaining strong accountability for progress of students with disabilities.

House Action

The House has not made as much progress as the Senate toward moving a bill, partially because staff has had to spend time educating the twelve new members of the Committee. Staff is working on several smaller bills, which will focus on flexibility, duplication, charter schools, and accountability. Chairman Kline (R-MN) has held several hearings in the Education and Workforce Committee that have highlighted these themes.

On the idea of flexibility, the Committee is looking at allowing much greater flexibility at the state and local level for how funds are used to meet statutory requirements. Regarding duplication, the Committee is examining regulations and reporting requirements they deem duplicative. As in the Senate, it is likely adequate yearly progress will not survive, and the House would give states more say in how to measure progress.

The Bottom Line

It would be great to have a specific timeline for completion of the reauthorization. However, that is highly unlikely. The Senate will be on recess from May 30 – June 5, July 4 – 10, and August 8 –September 5. The House will be out even more, since the work schedule for this Congress is three weeks in town and one week in districts every month. The bottom line is that time is waning for a completed bill in this calendar year.

CASE will continue to provide input on and monitor staff deliberations. Stay tuned!

Myrna Mandlawitz, president of MRM Associates, LLC, a legislative consulting firm in Washington, DC, represents a number of national associations as a consultant and lobbyist on a broad range of general and special education issues. She has written extensively and presented across the country on special education law and policy and previously served as the Director of Government Relations for the National Association of State Directors of Special Education.
further details. Of course, in the meantime, all committee chairs were avidly moving toward their goals on several activities and accomplishing a tremendous amount of work.

Through further Presidents’ and EC calls, we were able to establish agreements and make connections between and among the activities aligned to each goal. This ongoing communication and mutual respect for the work of others in building a cohesive organization with a common purpose has been greatly realized by this illustrious team of professionals!

Reflecting on Accomplishments—the Progress Update Report

The culminating event for reporting on the progress of the CASE Strategic Action Plan occurred on April 26, 2011, when the results were enthusiastically shared with CASE members representing several CASE units across the country at the Annual Membership Meeting. Each “EC team” reported on the goals and activities they were responsible for and discussed how they engaged members and partners in achieving positive outcomes and excellent results. We also designed the short version of the Plan as a brochure to communicate the goals and highlight some of the objectives we are collectively working on together. The results of the work accomplished in the last 6 months toward the 7 major goals have been tremendous! I applaud the Executive Committee for their spirit, commitment and diligence in achieving these results and extend my sincere appreciation for our members’ cooperation with all of us in these efforts. We invite you to visit the CASE website at www.casecec.org to review the Strategic Plan and brochure at your convenience.

Leadership Reflection

Through shared leadership and collaborative teamwork CASE has been able to move our ambitious agenda forward with a dedication and pride that exemplifies our commitment to our members. We realize that the integration of effective professional development, research-based practices, policies and legislation and will advance the work of special education administrators and result in improved outcomes for all students. We invite you to join us on this exciting journey and reflect on the Strategic Plan that guides our work through 2012.

Dr. Mary Kealy is Assistant Superintendent for Pupil Services, Loudoun County Public Schools, in the northern Virginia/DC metro area, and is the current president of CASE.

The CASE strategic plan can be found on the CASE website in the ABOUT CASE section. A more detailed SP is in the MEMBERS ONLY section.
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2nd in the Series on...

**Personnel Development in Special Education**

How getting and keeping great special educators links to the SPP/APR: Strategies that states and locals can use to increase local capacity for the development of a highly qualified and effective workforce in special education.

CASE presents this article as the 2nd in a six-part series on issues related to personnel and workforce development in special education. At the end of this series, the compilation of the articles will become one of the CASE Lucky 21 books. The series is a collaborative effort on the part of four technical assistance centers funded by the US Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP):

- Personnel Improvement Center (PIC) at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)
- National Center to Inform Policy and Practice in Special Education Professional Development (NCIPP) at the University of Florida
- Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC) at WestEd.
- National Center to Improve Recruitment and Retention of Qualified Personnel for Children with Disabilities (Personnel Improvement Center)

Each center will author an article(s) for the series. Topics will include personnel recruitment and retention, induction and mentoring, professional development, working conditions, and caseloads for special education and related services personnel…. all issues that are related to the development of a highly qualified and effective teacher workforce in special education and the foundation of improved programs, services and results for students with disabilities.

**Introduction to the Series: The State Performance Plan (SPP) as a vehicle for improved compliance and student results**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004 requires each state to develop a State Performance Plan (SPP) and to report progress on an annual basis through the Annual Performance Report (APR). The SPP helps the state evaluate its efforts in implementing the requirements and purposes of the IDEA and describes how it will improve its implementation over a period of six years. The SPP for Part B of the IDEA includes 20 indicators of state compliance and performance. Compliance indicators address requirements such as timely initial evaluations, disproportionality, due process and dispute resolution timelines and other indicators of compliance with the statute. Results indicators track state performance related to graduation and dropout rates, participation and performance on state assessments, Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for students with disabilities and other outcome measures. States report annually to OSEP. States are also required to publicly report results at the local level for each school district in the state.

There are no specific indicators in the SPP that measure personnel issues, e.g., the availability of highly qualified and effective teachers. We know, however, that the degree to which students with disabilities are able to meet state content and performance standards, make AYP, stay in school and graduate with a regular diploma is dependent upon teacher quality in general and special education. Improved results for students with disabilities and increased compliance with the procedural requirements of the IDEA are both dependent upon the availability of a well qualified work force.

Because CASE knows how important good teachers are to improved performance and compliance, we are sponsoring this series on Personnel Development in Special Education. We hope that you will share this information with others with whom you work at the local level and use it as a springboard for reviewing and updating your local policies, procedures and practices. Topics that will be addressed in future articles include:

1. Personnel Data Management at the State and Local Level
2. Recruitment of Special Education Teachers
3. Induction and Mentoring including Alternative Route Teachers
4. Working Conditions
5. Professional Development
6. Caseloads for Related Service Personnel
7. SPP/APR: Making the connection to developing and retaining a well qualified and effective workforce and to improved compliance and results for students with disabilities.

**HOW LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES CAN USE PERSONNEL DATA TO INFORM POLICY AND PRACTICE THAT ADDRESSES SPECIAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL NEEDS**

**DR. PHOEBE GILLESPIE**

**Tips for Increasing Your School District’s Capacity to Hire Special Education Personnel Who Meet the Needs of Your Local Community**

Finding just the right match for your school district’s open positions is an important element in building a special education workforce that meets the needs of your students and community. This article shares three “tips” that can be helpful in attaining that match - developing personnel preparation program partnerships, utilizing online recruitment systems and providing financial incentives. These three strategies have proven effective in matching the most qualified candidate to the available position.

Examples cited in this article are drawn from throughout the literature on special education-related personnel preparation program partnerships, as well as from work conducted by the Personnel Improvement Center (PIC) at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE).

**Tip #5: Develop personnel preparation program partnerships between your school district or local**
PART C PROGRAM AND INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (IHEs).

Successful partnerships are characterized by:

- collaboration among partners;
- tailoring of programs to meet the unique personnel needs of specific localities;
- offering of alternatives to traditional methods of course delivery (e.g., distance and evening classes); and
- reaching out to nontraditional teacher candidates, including paraprofessionals already working in special education settings, culturally and linguistically diverse individuals and/or career changers.

One important goal of personnel preparation program partnerships is increased accessibility of coursework for local community members.

QUALITY PROGRAM PARTNERSHIP FEATURES INCLUDE:

- Cohorts. A common feature of personnel preparation partnership programs is use of a cohort model where programs build in opportunities for groups of candidates attending the program at the same time to move through the training program in concert with one another. This enables them to interact frequently and provide one another with support.

  - As part of the University of San Francisco (USF) Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential Internship Program, candidates continue through the program with the same group of peers and the same collaborative group of instructors, field supervisors and LEA support providers.

  - As part of the University of Utah District Teacher Education Program, a cohort model enabled candidates who were physically isolated from one another to communicate via online chat rooms.

- Mentoring and Supervision. Many personnel preparation program partnerships offer candidate support in the form of mentoring and/or supervision. Well-planned partnerships give consideration to selection and training of mentors, matching of mentors and mentees, size of mentoring caseload and mentoring activities. For example, as part of the Wyoming Collaborative Mentorship Academy (WCMA), mentors are inservice educators who have volunteered to work with candidates seeking certification. Mentors and mentees reflect on shared readings, analyze case scenarios, prepare individualized education programs (IEPs) and co-teach. Mentors receive a certificate recognizing their skills as master mentors from IHEs as well as graduate hours to add towards a master’s degree.

- Course Delivery Accommodations. Some personnel preparation partnership programs take the form of professional development schools (PDS). PDS are intensely collaborative partnerships between practicing teachers and IHE faculty customized to meet the personnel needs of individual LEAs/schools. For example, George Washington University offers a one-year, full-time program to prepare teachers of elementary-aged students with emotional and behavioral disabilities using a PDS model. Graduate interns complete a two-semester clinical internship during the school day and attend course work at night. The model is centered on the daily team teaching experience at one of two PDS partnered with the university. Interns are guided by master teachers, thoroughly immersed in school environments and become active in the daily operation of all aspects of the school.

MODIFICATIONS TO TRADITIONAL COURSE DELIVERY. Many personnel preparation program partnerships can be characterized by the modifications they make to traditional course delivery. For example, partnerships may include alternatives to week-day morning/afternoon coursework such as evening classes, condensed coursework, intensive seminars, summer institutes and/or accelerated programs. Some preparation programs offer coursework in locations other than the main IHE campus. For example, San Diego’s Internship Credential Program made coursework locally available during the school year and provided instructional experiences on the main campus during the summer months.

  - Partnerships serving rural and/or remote areas may offer virtual programming, including online courses. For example, as part of a special education partnership program involving California State University at Chico, courses simultaneously combine a live studio audience with real-time video-streaming in order to include geographically remote students.

- Tailoring Supports for Local Needs. Personnel preparation program partnerships are designed to accommodate the unique personnel preparation needs of participating LEAs or local Part C programs, such as offering supports that help to ensure participants succeed academically and in their practicum placements. For example, the Texas Education Aide Exemption Program was tailored to meet the needs of participating paraprofessionals by offering an IHE-level course designed to assist them in developing skills necessary for success in college.

- Coordination of Field-Based Experiences. Another common feature of personnel preparation program partnerships is the coordination of coursework with candidates’ field-based experiences. Some of the ways partnership programs attempt to bridge the gap between theory and practice is by ensuring that the same faculty member both supervises field experiences and leads related seminars or using instructional teams combining IHE and local school district or local Part C program staff. For example, as part of the University of San Francisco’s Mild/Moderate Education Specialist Credential Internship Program uses methods such as roundtable discussions and a case method approach to connect its field-based experiences with coursework.

TIP #6: USE TECHNOLOGY TO SECURE THE ‘RIGHT MATCH’ FOR YOUR LOCALE WHEN HIRING NEW PERSONNEL.

In order to find the right match for your local school district and recruit a larger number of fully qualified education personnel —including special education personnel - it will be necessary to streamline your recruitment and hiring process so that you are reaching those candidates that are best suited for the type of jobs you have to offer and the communities where your schools are located. In order to accomplish this, increasing numbers of states and localities are developing online recruitment systems. Using examples drawn from Nevada, South Carolina and Virginia, here are some suggestions for developing online systems and how these systems can be used to recruit qualified special educators that are the right match for your school district.
Online systems designed to improve recruitment of qualified personnel to specific jobs often include the following features:

**Job Listings.** Most systems allow applicants to browse job listings. For example, South Carolinas’s online system at [www.CERRA.org](http://www.CERRA.org) and VA’s [www.TeachVirginia.org](http://www.TeachVirginia.org) site enables users to search their job banks, with TeachVirginia using Teachers-Teachers.com as its database of job openings.

**On-line Job Applications.** Online job applications can play a significant role in reducing the time it takes from application to hiring. For example, CERRA and TeachVirginia allow job applicants to apply for multiple positions throughout the state but require job applicants to complete only one application:

- For applicants using CERRA, this means they need only request one set of letters of reference, PRAXIS scores, documentation of certification and college transcripts.
- For TeachVirginia applicants, it depends on whether the school district chooses to require only the Teachers-Teachers.com application available via TeachVirginia’s website, or whether the district also requires job seekers to complete its own application.

**Tracking and Targeted Follow-up.** Another benefit of an online system is the built-in capacity to track applicants’ progress throughout the application process and customize follow-up communication. For example:

- Clark County School District (NV) color codes all of its applicants according to their stage in the application progress. When a potential applicant has completed an online interest form, staff screens the form to ensure that the potential applicant has completed necessary education/certification requirements. If these requirements are met, applicants are coded “blue” and sent a password admitting them to the application system. Automated reminders to submit missing documentation can be sent to “orange” applicants (i.e., those who have not yet completed the application process). Once applications are submitted, and approved applicants are identified for hiring by the district, they are coded “red” and passed along to building-level administrators.
- TeachVirginia enables district staff to track applicants according to status (e.g., application incomplete, interview set up, application fully screened) and upload internal documents such as interview scores.

**Hiring.** Online systems help building-level administrators quickly identify eligible candidates (i.e., those who have completed applications and/or been approved for hiring) without any need for outside advertising. For example:

- CERRA and TeachVirginia enable building-level administrators to view all candidates who have submitted applications for their district and/or school. Both screening and hiring are handled at the local level.
- Clark County School District screens all candidates prior to releasing applications to building-level administrators for hiring.

**Tip # 7: Use financial incentives as a means of recruiting special education personnel to specific jobs.**

Finding special education and related services personnel with the appropriate state credentials and experience is often a daunting task, especially in fields of high demand and/or rural areas. The following examples illustrate ways in which state and local school districts can harness their resources to get powerful results:

- North Dakota offers a loan forgiveness program for as much as $5,000 for both general and special education personnel teaching in the state’s public schools. A second grant, the Teacher Shortage Loan Forgiveness Program offers up to $3,000 per teacher serving in shortage areas such as special education.
- The South Carolina (SC) Teacher Loan program provides loan forgiveness of up to $3,000 per year for up to three years in exchange for a commitment to teach in critical subject areas and in critical geographical school districts.
- Another SC program, Project Speech-Language Pathologist—Recruitment and Retention in Schools (SLP-RRS) is designed to address the state’s shortage of school-based SLPs. The program provides tuition reimbursement, reimbursement for the PRAXIS, sign-on bonuses, reimbursement for state and national conferences, licensure reimbursement and graduate courses for educator certification renewal.
- Louisiana sponsors a program called Local Teacher Quality, a state grant program that provides funds to districts and eligible nonpublic schools/systems to support teachers in becoming certified and highly qualified.

The document was produced by the Personnel Improvement Center (PIC). The PIC is a U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)-funded project (cooperative agreement #H325C080001) housed at the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE).

1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 320, Alexandria, VA, 22314 * 1-866-BECOME1 * [www.personnelcenter.org](http://www.personnelcenter.org)

Dr. Phoebe Gillespie is Director of the OSEP-funded Personnel Improvement Center at NASDSE, where she manages all technical assistance services to states and directs and coordinates national dissemination activities and collaborative work with other centers and professional organizations. She has 38 years of experience in the field of special education professions. Her expertise is in working with SEAs, LEAs, and IHEs to craft contextually relevant solutions to on-going statewide personnel needs. She received a B.S. in Education from Baylor University, a M.Ed. in Special Education from Sam Houston State University and an Ed. S. and Ph.D. in Education Policy, Planning and Leadership from the College of William and Mary.

### Highlighting PIC Work

The PIC delivers on-site technical assistance services to selected states to assist them in developing and implementing a structured process for personnel data management. Services include working with states to identify the kinds of data to be collected and the types of reports to be generated on a regular basis. The goal of this service is to better inform the decision making processes related to policy and practice for recruitment, preparation and retention using reliable personnel data. For more information, go to [http://www.personnelcenter.org/personneldata.cfm](http://www.personnelcenter.org/personneldata.cfm).
Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.

Margaret Mead

This July you have the opportunity to join a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens in an effort to improve the quality of life for children with disabilities. We need you to stand up and be counted for those who are unable to advocate for themselves.

CASE will be hosting the 9th Annual Special Education Leadership Seminar in Washington, D.C. July 17-20, 2011. The seminar will provide information of the latest developments at the federal level as it relates to education and special education. National leaders will present information of what is developing regarding the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA – aka No Child Left Behind) as well as the latest developments regarding the re-authorization of IDEA. Our congressional representatives have little knowledge of the critical components needed for a successful educational plan. We as professionals need to share our expertise.

You will not only learn of the latest developments, you will be guided on how to set up an appointment with your senators and congressman. We will provide you with talking points as well as techniques for having influence on your representatives. You will also be provided with guides and maps on how to locate the offices of your congressman as well as the influential educational experts within their office.

We have seen the greatest influence when several from one state come together to do the visits at the capital, so we encourage teams. Yet we have also had experience of one or two individuals having the opportunity to provide key information that helped in making a decision on educational issues.

At the conclusion of the experience you will have had a great opportunity to see our nation’s capital in action, tour an incredible city, and have a feeling of fulfillment that you may have had some influence in changing history. You will also have developed a network of contacts from throughout the nation that can be a resource to you throughout the school year. Additional details on registration and hotel information are available on the CASE website, www.casecec.org.
LEGAL UPDATE

Practical Tips for Educators: Child-Find/Identification

JULIE J. WEATHERLY, ESQ  Resolutions in Special Education, Inc.

On April 25, 2011, I had the distinct pleasure of conducting CASE’s “Spotlight Session” at the National CEC Convention with my friend and colleague, Kathleen Mehfoud, Esq. from Richmond, Virginia. During the Session, we presented “90 Tips in 120 Minutes”—a fast-paced practical topic that spanned a number of special education legal issues. I thought it would be useful to summarize some of those tips, particularly some related to child-find and identification, as a follow up to my last Article regarding the growing tension between (and apparent confusion about) the obligation to comply with child-find/evaluation mandates and the obligation to conduct RtI activities. The following are some of the child-find/identification tips for educators that were provided during our “Spotlight Session”:

1. TRAIN all school personnel to take the “Child Study Team” process seriously and to understand the role of such Teams.

Whether it is called “Child Study Team,” “Student Support Team,” or “Problem Solving Team” at the local school level, members of these teams must be trained to understand that the process is to be taken and implemented seriously and designed to reduce the need to refer students for special education consideration based upon documented positive response to appropriate interventions provided in the regular education environment. In addition, these mechanisms are in place in order to prevent disproportionality and/or over-representation based upon race or ethnicity and to prevent over-identification of students in special education generally.

2. STRESS to all school personnel that the “Child Study Team” process is not just “the way” to special education.

Too often, members of “Child Study Teams” are under the mistaken impression that the Team serves as the mechanism or “way” to special education for students. Clearly, the mindset of team members must be that the process is for the purpose of decreasing the need to make referrals for special education consideration in the first place. This must be stressed to all school personnel involved.

3. ENSURE that if/when developing and implementing an RtI approach to child-find/referral, the process is implemented with fidelity and that a student is referred without delay when progress monitoring data indicate insufficient response to interventions.

As discussed in my last Article, school personnel have an obligation to ensure that evaluations of children suspected of having a disability are not delayed or denied because of implementation of an RtI strategy. When there is a “reason to suspect” or “reason to believe” that the student might be a child with a disability, a referral for evaluation must be made, regardless of whether the RtI process is still in progress.

4. REMEMBER that the concept of “continuous progress monitoring” is applicable—regardless of whether an overall RtI approach for identification is used—in order to ensure that a student’s difficulties are not due to an overall lack of “appropriate” (scientific/research/evidence-based) instruction.

The concept of “continuous progress monitoring,” or the requirement for eligibility committees to consider data-based documentation of repeated assessments of achievement at reasonable intervals, is applicable regardless of whether an overall RtI approach is used by a school district in making referral/eligibility decisions. Under the IDEA, this approach is necessary to ensure that a student’s underachievement is not due to lack of appropriate instruction, as required by the IDEA’s eligibility regulations.

5. WATCH OUT for “referral red flags.”

As I indicated in the last Article, school personnel (particularly regular education service providers) should look out for “referral red flags” that likely would trigger the child-find duty and referral for an evaluation. Some of these “red flags” would include 1) worsening grades or academic performance; 2) increasing disciplinary referrals; 3) knowledge that the student is on medication; 4) knowledge that the student is seeing outside professionals, such as counselors, psychologists, psychiatrists; 5) knowledge that the student has been diagnosed with a medical condition, such as ADHD, ODD, OCD, etc.; 6) knowledge that the student has been hospitalized; or 7) outside service providers, school personnel or the parents have suggested that special education services or an evaluation be considered. While not one of these “referral red flags” would, by itself, necessarily trigger the duty to conduct an evaluation, several
of them together certainly could. When there’s debate, evaluate!

**6. SEEK** input from the parents regarding a referral, even if they cannot or do not attend meetings.

With respect to all educational decision-making, it is imperative that school personnel take action to solicit information from parents whenever a referral is being considered. Often, parents have important evaluative information in their possession that they might not have thought to share with school personnel.

**7. LOOK** for specifics regarding the reason(s) for a referral and gather all relevant information prior to a referral meeting (e.g., Child Study Team information, medical information, report cards, cumulative record, work samples, recent evaluations, Response to Intervention (RtI) data, student referral forms).

As part of any referral for an evaluation, it is incumbent upon school personnel to ensure that all relevant information is gathered and considered by the appropriate referral team. All such information considered should also be documented and, if a referral is made, considered in any subsequent eligibility determination process.

**8. REMEMBER** to refer the student back to the “Child Study Team” process if a determination is made that the student will not be referred for an evaluation and send prior written notice of the refusal to refer.

On occasion, a *unilateral* determination is made (by a teacher, principal, the psychologist, etc.) that a student will not be referred for an evaluation, but parents are not provided sufficient written notice of this “refusal.” As a consequence, a procedural violation has occurred that could, in and of itself, amount to a denial of FAPE. Thus, it is imperative that referrals be addressed via a team process, so that proper procedure may be followed by the team and appropriate written notice of any decision about referral is provided to the parents.

*Julie Weatherly is the owner of Resolutions in Special Education, Inc. in Mobile, AL, which is a consulting business designed to assist educational agencies in the avoidance of special education legal disputes. She is a member of the State Bars in Georgia and Alabama. Julie is a long time friend of CASE and is the author of Lucky 21 #1 and 2.*
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**CASE Website Has Members Only Section Now!**

In order to use the CASE MEMBERS ONLY section, you will need to go to the CEC website and sign up for THEIR Members’ Only site. Once you have the sign in and password for CEC, you will be able to use that log in and password to access the CASE MEMBERS ONLY. To sign up today, go to [www.cec.sped.org](http://www.cec.sped.org) and sign up for the MEMBERS ONLY site now! At this time, you can download previous copies of the CASE Newsletter, and the PDFs of the CASE Journal of Special Education Leadership. The 2006-08 and the 2008-10 Biennial reports are also available for download. Let us know what other items you would like to see in this area of the website.

---

**CASE Calendar of Events**

**July 17-20, 2011**

9TH Annual CASE Educational Leadership Seminar, Hyatt, Crystal City, VA  
Contact: Luann Purcell, Executive Director, 478-333-6892,  
email lpurcell@casecec.org or website: [www.casecec.org](http://www.casecec.org)

**November 8-9, 2011**

CASE Board of Directors Fall Meeting, at The Lodge, Williamsburg, VA  
Contact: Luann Purcell, Executive Director, 478-333-6892,  
email lpurcell@casecec.org or website: [www.casecec.org](http://www.casecec.org)

**November 9-11, 2011**

22nd Annual CASE Fall Conference at The Lodge, Williamsburg, VA  
Contact: Luann Purcell, Executive Director, 478-333-6892,  
email lpurcell@casecec.org or website: [www.casecec.org](http://www.casecec.org)
NEWS FROM THE CEC CONVENTION
APRIL 25-28, 2011 NATIONAL HARBOR, MD

SPECIAL CASE MEMBERS HONORED AT THE ANNUAL CASE MEMBER/BOARD OF DIRECTORS’ MEETING

One of the highlights of the Annual combined Membership/Board of Directors meeting is the recognition of the CASE Awards. Recognition is given to individuals and to units for outstanding performance. The following articles are a recap of these recognitions. The individual awards are the result of the nominations received from our annual call for nominations. Please consider nominating the outstanding administrators in your “community of practice” for this next year. Nominations are solicited through the web September-December each year. The Harrie M. Selznick CASE Distinguished Service Award was instituted for recognition of individuals who have been career-long leaders in the administration of special education programs. The intended recipients of the award are individuals who have made significant contributions to the field over extended professional careers.

The Selznick Award is the highest CASE honor and it is accompanied by a cash award. Harrie M. Selznick served as the first Executive Director of the Council of Administrators of Special Education, a post he held from 1973-1983. He served CASE in many roles throughout his long, distinguished career. Under Dr. Selznick’s leadership, CASE became incorporated as a professional education association and grew from 223 members to 3600, while its subdivisions grew from none to 28. It was under Dr. Selznick’s leadership that CASE was first consulted at the federal level for input on national public policy in the U.S. The number of persons touched by Dr. Selznick’s personal attention regarding professional assistance is beyond estimation. His influence is still felt today through a vibrant CASE organization, which would have made him so proud. We are proud to honor him through CASE’s most prestigious award.

The CASE Outstanding Administrator of Special Education Award was instituted for recognition of individuals making significant professional contributions to leadership behavior and field practice in the administration of programs for students with disabilities and/or who are gifted. Nominees for the award must have had ten years experience in the field of special education.

Dr. Diane Golden Receives the Harrie M. Selznick Award

Diane took the federal grant designed to support system development and parlayed the time-limited grant into a state-funded council and system that has developed appropriate assistive technology for Missouri citizens. Her assistive technology colleagues in other states have also recognized her commitment and passion.

In her current role as Policy Coordinator for Missouri CASE, Diane has succeeded in developing a special education advocacy network across the state of Missouri consisting of 20 local affiliates. Diane coordinates the efforts of MO-CASE, Missouri School Boards Association and the School Administrator’s Coalition by providing guidance on state and federal legislative issues related to the IDEA.

Diane’s honesty, intelligence, innovativeness, passion, vision and deep understanding of issues, has resulted in universal respect from both educational and advocacy organizations. Diane’s career has been stellar!

Kim Johnson Selected CASE Outstanding Administrator of Special Education for 2010

Kim Johnson provides exemplary leadership on behalf of children with disabilities well beyond her duties as a special education coordinator for the Owensboro Public Schools. Kim models excellence in collaborative leadership and has an extraordinary compassion and concern for people. She has developed a warm and caring environment not only for students, but for parents. Kim’s organizational and communication skills are an inspiration to all those who interact with her. She is a great example of what many people are striving to be.

Kim started her career as a special education teacher and then moved into administration. As a special education administrator Kim has designed and implemented an array of innovative programs emphasizing research-based instructional programs and practices, interagency collaboration, compliance with regulations and training of teachers. Kim implemented a project designed to increase the ability of teachers to effectively plan and deliver reading instruction and engage in curriculum based progress monitoring. Kim organized an annual Transition Fair to provide students and families with postsecondary options. The fair has expanded to 13 other school districts. She also provides after school professional development sessions for general and special education teachers, coordinates ongoing work groups on important issues affecting special education programs and provides study groups to help teachers acquire knowledge and skills.

Kim serves on the Kentucky Wesleyan College and Brescia University Teacher Advisory Committees, reviewing and approving student candidates for the teacher education programs and recommends changes to the redesign of the masters degree program. Kim has also taught classes for two Kentucky universities over the past 10 years. She is active with Kentucky Council for Exceptional Children and is a KY CASE Executive Board Member. Currently Kim is pursuing a doctoral degree in educational leadership. Her unique ability to inspire others, along with her devotion to students with disabilities magnifies her impact and contribution to the schools and the community.

Continued on page 11
UNIT AWARDS

Dr. Christy Chambers (IAASE), Marylou Wall (VCASE), CASE President Mary Kealy, Roxie Lanier (MOCASE), Jill Griffiths (KYCASE), Chris Horton (GCASE)

The annual membership/board of directors meeting was recently held at the Gaylord National Harbor, MD Convention Center in conjunction with the CEC 2011 Convention and Expo. During this meeting, units demonstrating exceptional performance throughout the past year were presented with Outstanding Achievement Awards and one unit received the Exemplary Unit Award.

The Outstanding Achievement Awards recognize units for outstanding performance and accomplishments in the specific areas of professional development, membership, communication, legislative action, and awards. The Exemplary Unit Award is given to the unit of CASE that has shown overall excellence in ALL of the categories.

Nominations were rated separately by each member of the Unit Development Committee and judged according to a rubric developed and refined by various unit development committees. Members of that committee have often stated the benefit the member receives from reading about the great and varied activities the other units are doing! It is clear that our state and provincial units are working to make a difference in the profession! Greta Stanfield (KY), CASE Representative of the Units and chair of the Unit Development Committee presented the awards to the well deserving units. The recipients of these awards are as follows:

- Professional Development - Illinois Association of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)
- Membership - Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education (GCASE)
- Communication - Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MO-CASE)
- Legislative Action - Virginia Council of Administrators of Special Education (VCASE)
- Awards - Kentucky Council of Administrators of Special Education (KY CASE)
- Exemplary Unit Award - Illinois Association of Administrators of Special Education (IAASE)

MEMBERSHIP AWARDS

Membership is clearly a very important part of the health of the CASE organization! While the Outstanding Achievement Awards include a membership award, that award is given based on strategies and projects the unit has done over the year to demonstrate the unit's commitment to the area of membership. At the annual meeting there is also recognition given to the very objective membership data of the units. An award is given yearly to the unit that has had the highest number increase in membership for the year ending December 31. There is also an Award for the highest percent of increase. Each unit that has grown by even one member is given a certificate noting this accomplishment! This year an additional award was given to a unit that had a 25% increase but still did not qualify for the highest number or highest percent! Emilie Anderson (MT), Membership Chair, presented these membership awards.

- Highest Growth in Membership: Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education (GCASE)
- Highest Percent of Growth: Idaho Association of Special Education Administrators (IASEA)
- Honorable Mention: Virginia Council of Administrators of Special Education (VCASE)
- Certificates of Appreciation were given to the following units for increasing their membership from Dec 31, 2009-Dec 31, 2010

Connecticut Council of Administrators of Special Education (ConnCASE)
Georgia Council of Administrators of Special Education (GCASE)
Idaho Association of Special Education Administrators (IASEA)
Iowa Council of Administrators of Special Education (I-CASE)
Kansas Council of Administrators of Special Education (KACASE)
Massachusetts Administrators of Special Education (ASE)
Montana Council of Administrators of Special Education (MT CASE)
South Dakota Council of Administrators of Special Education (SDCASE)
North Carolina Council of Administrators of Special Education (NCCASE)
Council of New York Special Education Administrators (CNYSSEA)
Virginia Council of Administrators of Special Education (VCASE)

West Virginia is NEWEST CASE Unit!

One of the absolute highlights of the Annual Membership/Board of Directors’ meeting was the giving of the Charter to the newly formed West Virginia affiliate of CASE! The core group worked hard throughout this year starting with sending Vic Fisher to the Fall Conference in October to learn more from both Unit Representative Greta Stanfield and Membership Chair Emilie Anderson during the Unit Training session of the Board of Directors meeting. Don Bucher worked extra hard to have a membership campaign during the CASE annual membership drive in November and WV doubled their membership! The WV CEC federation sanctioned the new affiliate and Greta Stanfield traveled to the Spring meeting where the first WV official meeting was held. Officers have been elected and the group was in force at CEC! Congratulations to all the members of our newest affiliate, WV CASE!!

CASE ELECTION RESULTS

At the Annual Membership/Board of Directors meeting held Tuesday, April 26 at the Gaylord National Harbor Convention Center, Dr. Emily Collins (GA), past president, announced the results of the recent election for secretary. Current secretary, Laural Jackson (AK)
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was re-elected as CASE secretary. This election was the third year for electronic voting. The return rate for the election and those in the past are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Electronic Return Rate</th>
<th>Mailed Return Rate</th>
<th>Combined Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>21.49%</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9.03%</td>
<td>9.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was decided in the CASE Executive Committee meeting held on April 25, 2011 that in the future those members who have not provided their email address to CEC or have requested CEC not use their email will have to request a ballot be mailed to them. In this most recent election, 573 ballots were mailed out yet only 31 were received back. The printing and mailing cost of these ballots has become quite expensive and so it was decided to allow members to request a written ballot if they are unable to receive the electronic ballot. So remember you will need to request a ballot be mailed to you in the future if you have opted out of CEC/CASE emails or have not provided us with your email!

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact the CASE office or Past President, Dr. Emily Collins at emilycollinsga@hotmail.com

ADDITIONAL PICTURES FROM THE CEC CONVENTION ARE ON THE CEC WEBSITE IN THE MEMBERS ONLY SECTION—TO ACCESS THE MEMBERS ONLY SECTION, USE THE SAME LOG IN AND PASSWORD YOU USE FOR THE CEC MEMBERS ONLY SECTION. IF YOU HAVE NOT SET ONE UP, GO TO WWW.CEC.SPED.ORG.

SPECIAL THANKS TO SPONSORS AT THE
CEC CONVENTION 2011- NATIONAL HARBOR, MD

CASE Showcase Session: Standing Room Only! 90 Tips in 120 Minutes

What an amazing 90 minutes the standing room only crowd of over 300 spent with two top special education attorneys! The quick rundown by Julie Weatherly, Esq. and Kathleen Mehfoud, Esq on all the various hot topics provided a great Showcase during the Annual CEC Convention. Special thanks to the KY CASE group for their sponsorship as a charter GOLD Patron!

Julie Weatherly, Esq. Dr. Mary Kealy, and Kathleen Mehfoud, Esq.
The power of effective leadership is often underestimated. Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) suggest that leaders in our schools are important catalysts for addressing the most challenging situations noting that only classroom instruction itself has greater influence on student learning than school leaders. As leaders in education are asked to support an increasingly varied student body, their needs for specific skills increase. Revised national standards for administrators of special education programs, based upon an extensive literature review and validation process, provide an integrated perspective of what individual leaders need to master to meet the expectations of such complex educational environments (Boscardin, McCarthy, & Delgado, 2009). This version emphasizes advanced skills needed by leaders of programs supporting learners with special needs in the following domains: (a) Leadership and Policy, (b) Program Development and Organization, (c) Research and Inquiry, (d) Evaluation, (e) Professional Development and Ethical Practice, and (f) Collaboration (CEC, 2009).

Having a comprehensive, integrated set of standards provides a framework for training. Of course, the purpose of training is to produce leaders who can actually apply the knowledge and skills deemed important. Bandura (2006) suggests that how people perceive their own efficacy influences their behavior. Self-efficacy perceptions can impact one’s ability to set goals, plan strategically, persevere in difficult situations, and recognize accomplishments. Bandura suggests that measures of efficacy focus on how confident a person is of his/her capability for executing specific activities. Measures of principal efficacy are available based upon the School Administrator Efficacy Scale (SAES) and the Principal Self-Efficacy Survey (PAES), but Bandura suggests that efficacy scales should be specific to the domains being measured.

Crockett, Becker, and Quinn (2009) closely examined the existing body of research regarding special education leadership over the past 40 years. Approximately 24% of the articles reviewed specifically examined Leadership Roles and Responsibilities (n=68) or Leadership Preparation and Development (n=48). Boscardin, Weir, and Kusek (2010) completed a study of state requirements for the credentialing of special education administrators. They examined state credentials relative to both training and experience, noting that while some states have rigorous expectations others require little to no training in special education before taking on leadership roles in special education administration. Although universities may naturally utilize the CEC standards for accreditation, Boscardin et al. report a reduction in special education administration programs. Professional development initiatives could also benefit by making a direct connection with the professional standards. Therefore, a new scale specific to special education leadership was developed for this study based upon the 2009 advanced standards provided by CEC in the context of state requirements and experience.

Who participated?

CASE members who provided their e-mail address to the organization received an email requesting their participation in this research committee survey; also, visitors to the CASE website could access the survey through a link under the “News” menu. Finally, the executive director forwarded a message to each CASE State President asking him or her to forward the survey link to state members of CASE. Subsequently, three hundred and sixty-three (n = 363) respondents in positions of leadership in special education responded to the survey.

Two primary areas of demographics were targeted in this survey. The first was years of experience in administration of programs supporting students with disabilities in some capacity. Respondents represented diverse special education leadership perspectives from early childhood leaders to executive directors. Respondents were predominately current administrators with years of experience ranging from first year to 45 years. Over 24% of participants reported being in a leadership role for 5 years or less (n=87). Another 25% reported being an administrator for 6 to 10 years (n=89). Subsequent groups relative to administrative experience were as follows: (a) 11-15 years (n=71), (b) 16-20 years (n=42), (c) 21-25 years (n=43), and (d) 26-30 years (n=20). Only 11 people reported having over 30 years in administration (see Table 1). Table 1 shows years of experience in special education administration in five-year intervals. Almost half of the respondents (48.5%) reported having 10 or less years of experience in special education administration.

Table 1: Years of Experience in Special Education Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Administrative Experience</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31+</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on page 14
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The second area of demographic information targeted centered upon state location relative to licensing requirements. When asked about their current state location, respondents represented 46 of the United States. States with the largest representation were Georgia (n=44), Illinois (n=22), and Pennsylvania (n=20), and five states had only 1 respondent. The remaining 38 states had responses ranging from 2-18 people. Overall, states identified by Boscardin et al. (2010) as having licensure, certification, or endorsement requirements had 217 respondents as opposed to states without such requirements having 143 respondents. Three participants did not provide state-based information.

What were the participants asked?

Participants were asked basic demographic items including job title, state affiliation, and years of experience in special education administration. The Special Education Leadership Appraisal Scale (SELAS) used to measure the participant’s confidence included 54 forced-choice items, with 9 items developed from each of the 6 standards (CEC, 2009). Participants were asked to self-report capability relative to specific skills on a 10-point scale ranging from I cannot do at all (1) to I am certain I can do (10). Responses were collected via an online survey tool created by CASE. The reliability of the scores from this instrument reflects very high internal consistency with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .97. Prior to dissemination of this survey through CASE, it was piloted with two groups of volunteers for content validity.

What did the participants share?

Efficacy. Participants generally reported high levels of confidence in successfully completing the activities and responsibilities measured by the items on the SELAS. Table 2 shows items in descending order from those respondents felt most certain they could do successfully to those they felt less certain they could do. The table reports the percent of respondents who rated each item as either a 9 or 10 on the 10-point scale. Participants were most confident in successfully engaging the right stakeholders in goal-oriented collaboration followed by reporting confidence in maintaining professional dignity throughout all interactions with parents, students, and staff. There were only 3 items that over 90% of the participants rated as a 9 or 10. There were five items that only half or less participants rated as certain they could do successfully (9 or 10). Participants were least confident in evaluating educational instruction that is related to special education program delivery.

Table 2: Items by Percent of Confidence Ratings at 9 & 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>Engage the “right” stakeholders in goal-oriented collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>Maintain professional dignity throughout all interactions with parents, students, and staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Influencers of Confidence Ratings.** In trying to better understand what leadership activities and responsibilities special education leaders feel most prepared to do, we wanted to determine the influence of specific state credential requirements in special education administration on special education leaders’ efficacy while controlling for years of administrative experience. According to Boscardin, Weir, and Kusek (2010), twenty-seven states require licensure/certification/endorsements for special education leaders. We coded each participant as either being in a state requiring a credential or not requiring a credential according to the Boscardin, Weir, and Kusek article. Special education leaders’ scores on the SELAS were regressed on their credential and years of administrative experience. The overall multiple regression was statistically significant ($R^2 = .048$, $F(2, 357) = 9.043$, $p < .001$), and the two variables (credential and years of administrative experience) accounted for ~ 5% of the variance in efficacy as measured by the SELAS. Both independent variables did have a statistically significant effect on the special education leaders’ efficacy. The unstandardized regression coefficient ($b$) for years of administrative experience was 1.005 ($t (357) = 3.517$, $p < .001$), meaning that for each year of administrative experience, special education leaders’ efficacy increased by 1.01 points, controlling for credential. Of more interest was the $b$ associated with credential on the special education leaders’ efficacy ($b = 12.107$, $t(357) = 2.342$, $p = .02$), meaning that for those holding a credential, their efficacy was on average 12.11 points higher than those without a credential, controlling for years of administrative experience.

**What does this mean for CASE members?**

CASE members can utilize this information in a variety of ways. Within local school districts support of administrators of special education programs can become more individualized based upon this type of measure of efficacy perceptions. For instance, participants in this sample were very confident in the areas of (a) engaging the “right” stakeholders in goal-oriented collaboration; (b) maintaining professional dignity throughout all interactions with parents, students, and staff; and (c) making decisions within the boundaries of ethical and legal practices. However, they were least confident in (a) leading change using knowledge of organizational change theory; (b) employing adult learning theories in the creation of professional development programs, and (c) evaluating educational research that is related to special education program delivery. Therefore, targeted

### Table: Leadership Activities and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>Lead change using my knowledge of organizational change theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>Employ adult learning theories in the creation of professional development programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>Evaluate educational research that is related to special education program delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>Influence the development and implementation of district policies that are responsive to the needs of students with disabilities and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>Lead the use of data for making decisions regarding students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>Use research literature to determine professional practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>Provide effective professional development opportunities to increase regular and special education staffs’ skills for working with students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>Provide instructional staff with ongoing supervision that leads to improvement in their instructional practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>Apply models of effective leadership that provide a foundation for the administration of programs and services for students with disabilities and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>Engage the “right” stakeholders in goal-oriented collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>Lead the development of the local special education budget using available funding streams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>Utilize dispute resolution systems that support students with disabilities and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>Stay current with the new research practices in the field of special education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>Lead the implementation of processes to reduce unnecessary referrals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>Evaluate teaching staff effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>Apply principles of distributed leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>Develop comprehensive professional development plans aligned with district wide and special education strategic plans. AND Facilitate intra and interagency agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>Analyze subgroup data from state standardized assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>Implement research-based practices related to support of special education teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>Facilitate effective prereferral intervention processes. AND Use the current research on assessment of students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>Implement evidence-based programs that account for the diversity of the students with disabilities in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>Conduct a district-wide needs assessment of services and supports for students with disabilities and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>Examine student performance data to extract information needed for program improvement efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>Conduct educational program evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>Ensure effective mentoring occurs for new special education teachers and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>Explain to staff formative assessment procedures to monitor instructional practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>Secure and implement the effective use of assistive technologies for students with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development opportunities in areas of concern could enhance performance and resiliency.

Bandura (2006) suggests that people cannot be efficacious in all areas. Information from this scale could also be used to create mentorship partnerships or even leadership teams so that people with differing strengths and areas of concern could work together. Such opportunities for balancing teams of co-leaders could facilitate greater effectiveness in shorter timeframes. For instance, if I perceive utilizing change theory as a concern, but my partner perceives that skill as a strength, as a team we could still facilitate change actively while I develop both the skill and my confidence through my partner’s modeling. Of course, perceptions can be flawed. With mentorship and partnership opportunities, observations of these skills may indicate that a person’s perceived deficits may not be a problematic as thought. Partners can assist in highlighting behaviors that help to build confidence in areas of concern and may also expose misperceptions of efficacy in areas of existing confidence. For instance, if I consistently have made an error in the budgeting process of which I am unaware, I may be falsely confident in my skills in that area. A partner can facilitate discovery and correction to ultimately bolster genuine confidence and enhance effectiveness.

As an organization, CASE can support representative areas of concern via InCASE, webinars, website information, and conference strands. For example, CASE currently is trying to support frontline administrators of special education address the need to evaluate research relative to program delivery. The Product and Publications Review committee examines products upon request and employs an extensive process to vet a variety of materials before rendering an endorsement (or not). National CASE can also provide additional resources regarding evidence-based practices by offering guidance not only about which products are viable, but also by offering a decision tool that administrators can apply within their own settings. State CASE units can utilize this tool to examine efficacy of their own mentoring efforts relative to induction programs by identifying areas of low efficacy to target for resources dissemination and additional support. For CASE members operating in the higher education arena, expansion of pre-service training opportunities that emphasize preparation for administering programs in special education is suggested. In part, self-assessment can be a powerful tool for monitoring program effectiveness. Utilizing a tool such as this in a pretest-posttest format can help to document student growth.

In addition to training related supports, CASE can advocate for policy changes that would support requirements for licensure, certification, or endorsement in the area of special education leadership in states where such requirements are not yet present. CASE can also view this as an indicator that people more tangential to special education supervision may also need at least some training in these areas as well. For instance, school principals who have a variety of responsibilities to all learners may indeed benefit from direct instruction or support in the domains currently noted as necessary for special education administrators. To better understand the construct of special education leadership efficacy, a factor analysis to refine this scale is recommended.
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A New IDEA in LEADERSHIP!

How Can You Detect Informal Leadership?

by Dennis Hooper, copyright © 2011, published in the Apr/May/Jun, 2011 issue of the “In CASE” Newsletter

When I work with a new client company, I’m very sensitive to the informal leadership that exists in the organization. I recently complimented an individual, saying that I could tell he was an informal leader within the organization.

His response was genuine astonishment. He looked at me quizzically and said “I’m not a leader. Why do you say I’m a leader?” He paused for a moment, waiting for my answer. Still confused, he asked again. “What do you mean when you say that I’m an informal leader?”

I realized that not only should I compliment natural leadership when I see it, I need to be able to help informal leaders understand how valuable they are to their organizations! Let’s think for a moment about what “leadership” is all about. What really determines “a leader”?

Think about when you were very young, and you played with the other kids in the neighborhood. How vivid is the image of that one kid who tended to influence what everybody else wanted to do? Did some adult appoint that person as the leader of the other kids? Of course not!

Yet many people think of “leadership” as an appointed position. Why is that? Why has that myth become entrenched in our society? I’m sure it’s associated with the impression that people in leadership positions have authority. And someone with greater authority made that appointment.

We humans think in terms of cause-and-effect, but we sometimes get confused about which is the cause and which is the effect. Does the person influence people better because he or she is in a position called “leader”? Or is the person in the position of “leader” because he or she influences people well? Which is the cause, and which is the effect?

Leadership is not necessarily a position. Leadership is the ability to influence others in productive and beneficial ways.

It is with that thought in mind that I am consciously looking for informal leaders in organizations. They influence others in productive and beneficial ways.

Why do I call them “informal” leaders? Because no one has appointed them as having authority over anyone else in the organization. Yet the individual clearly has influence with others. And it typically is a very natural, welcomed influence.

The obvious question then becomes: “Why does this person have influence? How am I able to detect an informal leader when I see one?” Let’s call this individual Carol.

People respect Carol. They watch what she does and they find consistency between what she says and what she does. Carol doesn’t take advantage of people. She does the “right” thing even if she could take shortcuts and even if doing that right thing is not particularly easy.

Carol is interested in doing the job well. She may look for ways to make the organization look good, but she rarely cares about making herself look good. She respects other people. When a decision is needed, she offers her opinion. She encourages others to offer their thoughts, too. If the group is stuck, she suggests a way to get unstuck.

Carol often helps other people. She seems to genuinely care about others. She cooperates. Somehow, she manages to come up with the necessary resources. She knows what the desired outcome of the group is, and she is tenacious about moving in that direction.

Some people just have those abilities. And those characteristics cause others to behave in ways that tend to benefit the organization and that are consistent with the values of the organization.

Individuals like Carol usually respond well to the developmental polish that mentors and others in positions of authority can provide. Like any other process in an organization, intentional thought and energy is required to transform this natural capability into something that can be refined and applied for the benefit of the individuals and the organization.

Should an individual like Carol be promoted into a position of authority? Only if that’s something Carol wants; don’t make assumptions! Ask for an opportunity to talk with Carol at a time when you won’t be interrupted. Tell her what you’ve observed in her behavior and express your appreciation.

Then ask Carol what she loves doing. Ask if there are new challenges she’d like to experience in your organization. Invite her to consider your question over the next couple of weeks. Then write yourself a reminder to check back with her in ten days.

Let Carol know that you’d love to have a lot more of what she brings to the organization. Let her describe what aspirations she might have. If she’s satisfied where she is, thank her for her honesty.

If she identifies some additional opportunity she’d like to pursue, develop a plan for her to gain some experience in that area. Generate some criteria by which she’ll be able to tell if that is an area of interest, something she might consider for her
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This spring, the CASE Publication and Product Review (PPR) Committee reviewed four products:

1) e-IEP Pro from Media Net Solutions www.medianetsol.com
2) Transmath from Cambium Learning Group http://www.soprislearning.com/transmath/TransMath_home.aspx
3) My Reading Coach from Mindplay www.Mindplay.com
4) Academy of READING® from School Specialty® eps.schoolspecialty.com

Because these products met the CASE Executive Committee’s high standards for endorsement, the Committee voted to endorse each one. Vendors have told us going through the endorsement process helped them to produce a better product and strengthened their relationship with CASE members. It is with these ultimate long-term goals that we introduce you to our newest endorsees.

To do this, we include selections from the Product Review Rubrics compiled for each vendor. These sections were chosen to highlight the data collection aspects of the rubric as well as of the product, thus, not all sections of the rubric are provided for each product. (For more information on either of the products, please contact the vendor or email me at davidgrapka@gmail.com). We encourage you to find ways use this data to make wise choices for your staff and students.

E-IEP PRO: Reviewer(s): Dion Betts, Ed.D., Nancy Patrick, Ph.D.

The e-IEP PRO, developed by MediaNet Solutions, Inc., is a customizable, web-based software that simplifies management of the special education process. The e-IEP PRO is a full-featured special education management system that tightly integrates all federal and state required documents into one comprehensive system.

Marketability: The product follows the federal guidelines as prescribed by IDEA’04 and is currently used in three states and the District of Columbia. Thus, it would meet the needs of users in all states and Canada.

Feasibility: Vendor conducted a feasibility study to demonstrate the product’s viability. They have a 99.5% retention rate and consistent trend of implementation and deployment.

Research Base: The theoretical piece of what they do conforms to the body of research on case law for computerized IEP’s.

Company Satisfaction and Reputation: Data exists that demonstrates how the product meets or surpasses customer expectation. Publisher has a good track record of reputable products.

Enhances Professional Practice advocated by CASE/CEC policy and/or standards: E-IEP PRO aligns with the current State and Federal guidelines for Special Education. The company monitors these guidelines to assure that the e-IEP PRO is up-to-date so District Directors feel confident in their ongoing compliance and accurate state reporting.

TransMath: Reviewer(s): Kathy Wilhoit, Pam Howard, Ph.D.

TransMath is a comprehensive, skill-based mathematics intervention program developed specifically for students in grades 5–10 who are two or more years behind in math on standardized grade level tests and lack the necessary skills for successful entry into algebra. The program is ideal to be used as an intensive support for remediation and acceleration of middle and high school students, including students in special education, who are experiencing academic difficulties in the area of math.

Marketability: TransMath has been implemented in 48 states at the elementary, middle school and high school settings, both special education and general education classrooms. Has not been implemented in Canada. They would love to be in Canada.

Research Base: A report by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under the contract of the What Works Clearinghouse included these studies (Woodward, 2006; Woodward & Brown, 2006) in a group that received a rating of Moderate (Rti Math, pp74, 78, 83). This rating “refers either to evidence from studies that allow strong causal conclusions, but cannot be generalized with assurance to the population on which a recommendation is focused…. (perhaps because the findings have not been widely replicated)—or to evidence from studies that are generalizable but have more causal ambiguity than offered by experimental designs” (Rti Math, p. 1).

Field Testing: Contacts provided qualitative comments to support positive results in school systems.

Professional Practice: They offer professional development activities that are founded in research-based best practice. The professional development plan is designed to ensure all staff members are highly-trained in assessment, data utilization, and the TransMath curriculum.

Addresses Identified Member Needs: TransMath is intended to replace the grade-level basal math program for those students needing substantial intervention. (Tier III)

My Reading Coach: Reviewer: Sarah Richarz

MindPlay® is a comprehensive, direct instruction, and direct intervention literacy program that is effective for students from 2nd grade through adulthood.

Marketability: My Reading Coach™ is currently in use in more than 3,000 schools across the United States, Canada, and, most
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recently, the United Kingdom. It is accessible to adults, correctional facilities, home-based instruction, and speech-language pathologists.

Feasibility: Four case studies show how the vendor determined the feasibility of using My Reading Coach in a regular school setting by establishing 1) the time interval it would take a struggling reader to show progress and 2) the time it took a struggling reader to complete the entire program.

Research Base: The research base was that of the Orton-Gillingham instructional approach that states reading instruction should be: Language-based, Multi-sensory, Structured-Sequential-Cumulative, Cognitive and Flexible.

Field Tested: Field test results include multi-state scientifically designed evaluation studies, randomized control studies, and longitudinal studies.

Enhances Professional Practice advocated by CASE/CEC policy and/or standards: MindPlay’s® Department of Educational Services provides certification training for personnel who train in schools. Each trainer is required to receive initial training from a certified trainer and must pass a rigorous test, both oral and written, in order to be eligible to train school personnel.

Academy of Reading Reviewer: Pam Baker, Ed.D.

This product is a reading intervention software tool designed to complement an existing reading curriculum. The target user is the struggling reader, (e.g., learners with disabilities, English Language Learners, at-risk readers). The program can be used with learners individually or in groups (e.g., computer lab). Users are encouraged to access the program 3-5 times each week for approximately 20-30 minutes per session as the goal is to improve automaticity. Content is based on the 5 essential reading skills recognized by the National Reading Panel.

Marketability: Users take a pretest before participating in training, responsive tutorials, and additional practice. Teacher engagement for direct instruction and progress monitoring is part of the program. Fidelity monitoring is possible.

Feasibility: The validation study offered by School Specialty addresses: 1) studies on the need for a balanced approach to reading instruction, 2) links with educational principles (e.g., motivation, mastery learning, assessment), and 3) the science behind the Academy of Reading approach. They typically do Beta trials with 10 schools and 30 teachers.

Research Base: Research base includes two independent reviews of the product, both of which are favorable. The website offers a “research” tab with links to a variety of studies, some of which are disaggregated for special education students.

Addresses Professional Practice: The professional development package is not only required, but is customized to meet the needs of each site. Trainers meet with building-level and central office leaders to identify needs, set goals, and plan the product implementation. The trainers then deploy, mentor, and evaluate according to the plan.

Addresses Identified Member Needs: Included in this summary is a study completed by Fiedorowicz and Trites (1990) that links well with the mission of CASE to support its members in practices that can impact the quality of education. This study showed that one year after completion of the program posttest, students with dyslexia maintained general reading skills and continued to improve phonetic knowledge to a greater extent than did members of the control group. While the short-term gains are important, the lasting gains noted in the 1990 study are a plus.

Evidence of Documentation of Customer Satisfaction: Nine hundred respondents participated in the 2006 eSchoolNews Readers’ Choice Award survey regarding the best reading software. The Academy of Reading took first place in all categories for both PK-3 and grades 4+. Qualitative comments were also very positive. While not scientific, it is a satisfaction indicator beyond that produced by the company.

To learn more about all CASE - endorsed products, paste http://www.casecec.org/resources/endorsed.asp into your browser, then click on the company logo to go directly to their site. We invite you to share your comments, questions, and reactions to this column by writing: davidgrapka@gmail.com.

David Grapka is Staff Development Coordinator for Capital Region BOCES, emphasizing Assistive Technology, Alternate Assessment, RTI, and Suicide Prevention. A NYCASE officer for 16 years, he also serves on the New York Board of Regents Technology Policy/Practices Council. David’s work is based on: “People 1st, Systems Change 2nd, and Technology 3rd”, because they present us with infinite possibilities for balance and inspiration.
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future contribution.

Many times, allowing informal leaders to do their thing right where they are is most satisfying for them and extremely valuable for the organization.

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

Dennis Hooper is a leadership enhancement coach. His website is www.buildingfutureleaders.com. Dennis welcomes your comments, suggestions, and questions at dhooper2@juno.com or 478-988-0237

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

Editor’s Note: Dennis Hooper has been writing weekly articles on the topic of leadership for the past nine years. He sends copies of those articles out to interested readers. If his articles in our newsletter have been of value to you, consider contacting him and asking to be added to his distribution list.
The 9th Annual Leadership Seminar

The Leadership Seminar has been scheduled for July 17-20, 2011 in Washington, DC. The event will take place at the Hyatt Regency in Crystal City (at Reagan National Airport). Web site for hotel is http://www.crystalcity.hyatt.com/hyatt/hotels/index.jsp. There is a free shuttle from the airport.

We are preparing for the usual activities to take place which include:

• Providing participants with a guide on how to schedule a visit with your congressman (The day of planned visits will be Tuesday, July 19th).
• Scheduling presentations that will provide the best methods to influence your congressional representatives and how to have an impact in the reauthorization process.
• There will be guided practice on maneuvering through the federal maze.
• Participants will receive great resources including maps and directions on how to find your way around the congressional office buildings.
• We plan to have a debriefing and discussion on Wednesday, July 20th, with a goal of determining what actions will be needed.

We will even build in time for some fun after our busy day on Tuesday. Options may include:

• a twilight trolley tour of Washington, DC and historic monuments
• a play at the Lincoln Center
• or simply free time on your own

We are hoping for a great experience that will result in a great network of colleagues from throughout the nation.

**Dates:** Sunday, July 17-Wednesday, July 20, 2011

**Hotel:** Hyatt Regency Crystal City

(CASE GROUP RATE: $129 available thru June 24)
Telephone: 1-888-421-1442 2799
Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202 USA

**Seminar Cost:** Member- $350  Non Member- $425
(Special TEAM Rate will be available)

**Sign up at**
www.casecec.org
A recent large-scale study conducted in Ontario, Canada, examined the roles and responsibilities of educational assistants (paraeducators) in the public school system. The research was conducted through the perspective of the educational assistants and the results were analyzed using an ecological framework that allowed for the examination of the many layers of relationships involved in their work.

One of the relationships that became a focus of the analysis was that of the educational assistant and the school administration. We tend not to spend a great deal of time focussing on this relationship. The work that the educational assistant engages in with the student and the teacher tends to be where most of our attention is paid. However, during the analysis of the data it became clear that frequently the relationship of the educational assistant with the school principal or vice principal was the ‘make or break’ relationship in terms of how effectively they could carry out their role.

It is important to understand in the context of this research that school administrators were seldom involved in the initial hiring of the educational assistants. The hiring was most often carried out centrally and the principal may or may not have been given the opportunity to conduct a second interview at their school. The allocation of educational assistants to a school was usually a central office function and the school administration could only select staff from the central pool. The skill set of the educational assistants were seldom matched to the needs of the students in a particular school – this often created a knowledge gap that needed to be addressed.

Mismatch of training and job assignment

In Ontario, as in many of the States, there are no legislated minimum requirements for the hiring or training of educational assistants prior to assuming the role of supporting students with exceptionalities. The participants in the study, the majority of whom had the minimum of a college diploma, talked about the frequent mismatch of their skills and the job requirements. For example, a former nurse hired as an educational assistant had supported students with physical disabilities the first year she was hired and subsequently was assigned to support students with a learning disability in rotary French (she was not French speaking). Similarly many of the educational assistants talked of the extensive training they had to work with children with autism and yet had not been assigned to support these students. The reverse was also cited with an alarming frequency.

In examples given where the school principal was involved in the assessment of the skills brought to the job by the educational assistants, skill inventories and training requirements were developed early in the school year. In the best case scenario joint inventories were completed by both teachers and educational assistant so that the supports required by the students were fully understood and the training requirements of all staff were seen as a continuum.

In the research analysis, the school administrator was often seen as the gate keeper to accessing training. Some educational assistants applauded the efforts that their principal went to in order that they could be included in training sessions while others had the opposite experience and felt excluded from much needed training. The school administrator clearly has a key role to play in the preparation of staff for the work they are required to do.

Recognition as part of the educational team:

One of the recurring themes expressed by the educational assistants, in this study, was one of lack of value and esteem within the school context. This feeling (which has been echoed in many of the U.S. studies on paraeducators) often stemmed from the way in which the educational assistant was introduced or more accurately not introduced to the staff at the school as a member of the team. All too often the placement of the educational assistant happened late in the school year or one or two days after the Fall term had begun. Their introduction to the school was often hurried and they expressed their entry to the school as ‘hitting the ground running’. The omission of orientation to the school and clear introductions to the staff as a whole left many of the educational assistants feeling as though they were not regarded as ‘real’ staff and reported their dismay in being seen as a ‘teacher helper’.

In the best case scenarios, educational assistants were included in the beginning of the year staff meetings, were introduced as staff members, and had a similar orientation to the school along with other new staff regardless of job title. Their names were listed on the staff list and they had a dedicated mail box. These small gestures were also cited as recognition that they truly were a staff member and had the dignity and respect afforded to all staff.

Continued on page 22
Recognition by the school administrators is vital to a positive beginning for educational assistants. It is critical that they identify how the assistants will be included as a staff member and what their role will be on the team. The attitude of the administration towards the educational assistant will provide a model for the rest of the staff.

Under the direction of a teacher:

One of the tenets of the work assigned to educational assistants is the tacit understanding that they work under the direction of a teacher. In recognition of this reality it is essential that school administrators clearly establish with their teaching staff how and when this joint planning will take place. In the research it was clear that many of the educational assistants were working in isolation with little or no direction from the teacher. When asked to identify the top three functions they performed in their current position they named instruction, behaviour support and personal care. They provided many illustrations of times when they were left to ‘make it up’ as they went along. Unless there are explicit times for conversations and planning of the support that the students require the benefit of having an educational assistant in the classroom can quickly be eroded.

It is incumbent upon the school administrator to ensure that the teachers on their staff are familiar with the appropriate ways in which to work with the educational assistants under their direction. This task may be delegated to special education staff in the school, however, the school administrator is ultimately responsible for the way in which educational assistants are directed and supervised.

This large-scale research was the first of its kind in Ontario, and, as with all research, it created more questions than it gave answers. The use of an ecological framework to assist in the analysis provided a unique lens through which to view the multifaceted roles that educational assistants assume. Their interaction with students, teachers, parents, specialists and other educational assistants were very much influenced by the tone set by the school administration.

I encourage the administrators who read this to take a few minutes to reflect on your understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the educational assistants (paraeducators) on your staff. How much do you know about the skills that the assistants have brought to the job and what is your understanding of their training needs? Do you know when and how joint planning takes place and how frequently do you evaluate the work being carried out by the assistants?

Educational assistants are a much valued resource in our schools. It is our responsibility as school administrators to ensure that they have the support and respect that allows them to do their best work possible.

Joyce Mounsteven currently teaches in the Teacher Education Programme at York University in Toronto. She previously worked with the Toronto District School Board as Supervising Principal for Special Education. One of her responsibilities was the allocation of educational assistants to the schools. She recently completed her doctoral work at York University. A copy of the executive summary of her dissertation may be obtained by contacting her at: joyce@jmconsulting.ca.

Joyce Mounsteven recently completed her doctoral work at York University in Ontario, Canada. Her dissertation was on the roles and responsibilities of educational assistants (paraprofessionals). Joyce has held numerous leadership positions in special education in the Toronto District School Board, one of the largest school boards in Canada. Dr. Mounsteven is a long time member of CASE and CCBD. She has held the position of President of OCASE and Canadian Member at Large for CCBD.
22ND ANNUAL CASE FALL CONFERENCE (WILLIAMSBURG, VA)

We have sent out a notice for a Call for Proposals with application available through the CASE website. This year we will be at The Lodge (one of the Colonial Williamsburg Hotels) located in historic Williamsburg (website: http://www.history.org/visit/hotels/williamsburgLodge/index.cfm)

We have had initial contact with the Ad Hoc planning committee from Virginia CASE (VCASE) and have established an initial planning grid for determining how many keynote speakers and breakout sessions we will have.

It is important to note that the conference will begin at noon on Wednesday, November 9, 2011 to noon on Friday, November 11, 2011 (so the conference does not end on Saturday). The Lodge extends to our group the option to purchase a special Historic Area ticket that is good for the duration of the event and includes access to Colonial Williamsburg’s Historic Area sites and museums.

Dates: Wednesday, November 9 - Friday, November 11, 2011

Hotel: Williamsburg Lodge
CASE GROUP RATE: $149 Suites: $229
(Block deadline October 5, 2011)
Telephone: (757) 220-7976
310 South England Street, Williamsburg, VA 23185

WINTER VIRTUAL CONFERENCE – RENEWED AND IMPROVED (ORLANDO, FL)

We are in the initial stages of planning for a Winter Conference that will be a partnership with the University of Central Florida (Orlando). We will have our program within the Toni Jennings’s Institute within the College of Education where we will have full access to the advanced technology being developed at the University of Central Florida.

We are hoping the Winter Conference will evolve to be provided both face to face and virtually online. This would occur at the same time with attendees in the conference center auditorium/conference room and the others attending from their office via technology. We are anticipating that there will be a continuation of restricting opportunities for educators to travel to national conferences. So this will be an opportunity for someone to still receive professional development through a virtual experience.

Yet we are also looking forward to having a growing participation in our Winter Conference from directors throughout Florida. Jonathan MacIntire and I are also looking into a fun “add on” such as a behind the scenes tour of Walt Disney World or Universal Studios. This is where we will be “wowed” by the advances in technology that will have impact on education in the future.

NOTE: Since we are planning to take advantage of the facilities on the campus of the University of Central Florida, the date of the Conference will be much earlier. The dates we are planning on is Wednesday, January 11 - Friday, January 13 (no worry this will be a lucky day).

Dates: Wednesday, January 11 - Friday, January 13, 2012
Hotel: To Be Determined – Orlando Area
Conference Cost: To Be Determined

WEBINARS

Our last webinar focused on the new 4th Edition of the popular CASE publication, Section 504 and the ADA: Promoting Student Access-A Resource for Educators, which was updated to include on the latest developments with the ADA amendments and the effects on 504 regulations. These changes have far reaching impact on educational decisions and we believe our members will appreciate the most current information on the regulatory interpretations of how to serve children in our schools. If you missed the live webinar, you can still purchase the DVD for use with staff and parents whenever and wherever you want! Go to the CASE website to order.

Our CASE Leadership and Professional Development Committee are looking to expand opportunities for reaching out with quality programs to our members. An option available is to receive a CD/DVD that can be used for training purposes with others at the local level.
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