

January 18, 2018

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
New Directors' Academy webinar

*****DISCLAIMER*****

THE FOLLOWING IS AN UNEDITED ROUGH DRAFT TRANSLATION FROM THE CART CAPTIONER'S OUTPUT FILE. THIS TRANSCRIPT IS NOT VERBATIM AND HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD. TO DO SO IS AN EXTRA FEE. THIS FILE MAY CONTAIN ERRORS. PLEASE CHECK WITH THE SPEAKER(S) FOR ANY CLARIFICATION.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE COPIED OR DISSEMINATED TO ANYONE ELSE UNLESS YOU OBTAIN WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM THE OFFICE OR SERVICE DEPARTMENT THAT IS PROVIDING CART CAPTIONING TO YOU; FINALLY, THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE USED IN A COURT OF LAW.

*****DISCLAIMER*****

>>CART PROVIDER: Captions will appear here. Thank you.

>> Good afternoon and welcome to the winter new director academy Webinar, I'm Angie Nickell in special finance, co-presenting with me today is Mary Corey in data and Karen Allan in compliance. Please note that this Webinar is being recorded and will be posted in the next several days on the Department's Webinar page, so you can access it at that time. You can ask questions during this Webinar by typing in if the chat window. But note that all attendees may see your questions and comments and we'll try to leave time at the end of the presentation to answer your questions. I'm going to start out by talking about Special Education Finance and in particular, I'm going to be talking about receiving and coding Federal Funds. Okay LEAs that have an approved 16-17 early childhood final expenditure report may begin receiving Federal Funds in the coming monthly ECSE payments. I just noticed that these slides are not updated so the one that we um post on the Web will we will have to update, so apologize for that. Okay, we will make the most of it. Early childhood Special Ed federal revenue received for the 16/17 school year will be made up of both federal and state payments um through the 17-18 school year. So the federal portion of that funding is both from IDEA Part B Section 619 and federal IDEA Part B Section 611 funds. Thus far those Districts with on approved 16/17 Early

Childhood Special Education final expenditure report have only received state funds in school payments but they should be sure to review monthly, to see how much of Early Childhood Special Education payment is state and how much is federal. It is likely that in the March or April school payment we will begin to pay ECSE Federal Funds in addition to ECSE state funds. ECSE state funds have a revenue code of 5314 on the payment transmittal and ECSE Federal Funds have a revenue code of 5442 on the payment transmittal. It is important to make sure that if you have an Early Childhood Special Education final expenditure report for the prior year, and been receiving state payments that you check your monthly school payment transmittals to see whether or not you've received any Federal Funds. The Federal Funds that you received from Section 619 and 611 must be added together so that the district knows how much ECSE funds have been received for that month. So this is an example of a monthly payment transmittal for an LEA that received ECSE state funds as well as ECSE 611 and 619 funds. Shown at the bottom of this screen, the three ECSE federal amounts are added together to total 69,691 dollars, this is the amount that must be tied to a current year, Early Childhood Special Education expenditure to document the use of federal dollars for appropriate costs. So just to give a little bit of background about the reason that we have to code ECSE federal dollars in a certain way is because LEAs have to document in their general ledger how the Federal Funds are spent to number one, be in compliance with cash management improvement act and number two, to show the funds were used in allowable ways. So the total amount of early childhood Special Ed funds that LEAs receive the current year is for costs that occurred in the prior year. That's something you probably already know, but the funds received in the current year should be used to pay for current year costs, even though the amount was to reimburse the amount that was spent the year before. The amount of federal ECSE funds received in the current year should be used to pay for current year ECSE costs. So I'm going to talk through how you do that. This screen shot shows an example of an LEA general ledger showing the steps taken to tie ECSE Federal Funds to current year ECSE costs. The LEA has found current year ECSE expenditure been coded as payed with state funds, the expenditure, in this example, is an ECSE certificate salary. The first step in recoding the expenditure from being paid with state funds from being paid with Federal Funds is to enter a journal correction to remove the expenditure to be sure it is paid with state funds. This is the step outlined in red. The next step is to make sure that is paid by Federal Funds, this step is outlined in blue. Note in product code column extend tour outline in red has a code of 00, designating in this example as it is paid with state funds. In the following row the project code is changed to 42 to show how the expenditure has now been paid with ECSE Federal Funds. LEAs can determine what project codes to use for ECSE cost paid with local state and Federal Funds throughout 17/18 school year, but the coding will change in 18/19 and there will be specific codes that must be used from that point forward. Again in this example it shows a project code of 42, because federal code for Federal Funds is 5442, so the last two digits of revenue code has been used. It is not necessary to have a separate project code for ECSE 611 federal and ECSE 619 federal paid costs, the important thing to remember about this is that the entire amount of federal, both of those amounts added together, are tied to current year Early Childhood Special Education costs. Okay moving on to the Federal Funds, a little background about this special purpose fund, it was established to provide funding support for LEAs with high cost students or high need students. These students are Special Education students whose educational costs exceed

three times the LEAs current expenditure per average daily attendance or ADA. Reimbursement to LEAs under High Need Fund for qualifying students is made without regard to disability or placement. LEAs that submitted an FY18 High Need Fund application to claim 1617 high need costs may receive both state and federal reimbursement in the January school payment. LEAs can check the FY18 high need payment spreadsheet that's posted at the website, to see how much state and federal reimbursement will be received in the January payment. High need funds, state funds have a revenue code of 5381 and high need Federal Funds have a revenue code of 5437 on the monthly payment transmittal. Not all LEAs with approved FY18 will receive federal funding, so make sure to watch for that. For those LEAs that do receive a portion of High Need Fund payment from Federal Funds, just like ECSE federal you have to code those funds to a current year, Special Education expenditure by the date the funds are received. This is an example of a monthly payment transmittal for an LEA that received high need funds state and Federal Funds, down at the bottom of the screen the High Need Fund federal amount received is 21,661.13, this is the amount that must be tied to a current year Special Education cost to document the use of Federal Funds for appropriate costs. So just like the ECSE Federal Funds, any time um High Need Fund federal dollars are received, even though they, the amount is to reimburse costs that incur the prior year, the funds should be used to pay for costs of the current year. So this is an example of an LEA general ledger and it again shows the steps to take to tie the High Need Fund federal fund to a current year Special Education cost. The High Need Fund federal dollars do not need to be tied to a um current year High Need Fund cost, because you are not sure what that's going to be at this point. So as long as the funds are tied to a Special Education expenditure that's an allowable use of those funds because they are IDEA funds. Similar to recoding the ECSE costs, this LEA has found a current year Special Education expenditure, which is function code 1221, that has been paid with state funds. The first step in recoding the expenditure from being paid with state to being paid with federal High Need Fund funds is to enter a journal correction to remove expenditure as payed with state funds. Again this is the step outlined in red, the next step is to enter that expenditure as payed with High Need Fund federal dollars. This step is outlined in blue. Notice in the project code column expenditure in red has a code of 03 to designated as payed with state funds. Then in the following row the code is changed to 37 to show the expenditure has now been paid with federal dollars. Again just like the ECSE project codes, the LEA can determine through 17/18 what codes to use, but those will be specified codes in 18/19 and beyond that must be used. So the important thing to remember is that the entire amount, but not more than the High Need Fund, Federal Funds received are tied to current year Special Education costs. Okay so now we'll spend some time discussing releasing proportionate share carryover funds. So what proportionate share funds are designated for is for any parentally placed private, parochial, home school children with disabilities ages 5 to 21 that attend a private, parochial or home school located within the boundaries, this is a portion of the current year um Part B IDEA funding that must be reserved and spent to provide services to those parentally placed, private, parochial or home schooled children. The initial current year budget application is where those funds must first be budgeted under function codes 1224 or 1227 then once the prior year FER has been approved the district needs to complete a budget, current year budget application revision to amend the current year amount or um include any proportionate share carryover amount. I recently provided a Webinar just on proportionate

share that goes into much more detail and I'll be on going through today, so please take a chance, look at that Webinar, to learn more about proportionate share budgeting and tracking of funds. So any staff providing services to those parentally placed private school students with disabilities, should have their salaries and benefits pro-rated and coded separately in the general ledger under 12-24 to account for the cost. So as long as the method is reasonable and justifiable, it will be fine. We also have a worksheet on our proportionate share Web page under Special Education Finance that is a useful tool for districts trying to determine the correct amount to pro-rate of salary and benefit for staff providing services. As far as reporting the services served for proportionate share students, make sure that any private and home school student who was determined eligible and served as of DESE 1st, has to be reported in DESE student core, 11 count and the educational environment of 2100-parentally Placed Private is educational environment that must be used in order to identify this student in MOSIS, this student. For carryover students this is the time of year districts have to be aware of carryover students they have, regular Part B and proportionate share carryover. Because districts have a full two years to spend any federal dollars, any IDEA federal dollars the second year is considered the carryover year and districts must be aware of any carryover funds they have, so they can budget and spend them in the second year. If those are not spent and budgeted in the second year, on proportionate share services, then the LEA should request a release of those unspent proportionate share carryover funds. The release process allows districts to then use those unspent proportionate share carryover funds on public school students with disabilities. There are five allowable reasons for unexpended proportionate share funds, the district should be using all of their funds, those set aside proportionate share funds on services for those privately placed for students with disabilities, on the rare occasion that is not the case, districts may be able to release those funds using one of these reasons. So the student, either no longer attends the private school or has graduated from the private school, maybe the private school has refused services, the parents have refused services, and as I mentioned there might be a rare occasion where there are too much proportionate share carryover funds, the amount has exceeded the amount needed for services provided to those students. So the process of releasing unexpected, unexpended, that should be expended proportionate carryover funds is if the estimated expenditures for proportionate share are less than the carryover amount than the LEA has some additional carryover funds that can be released. However, if the amount of proportionate share carryover funds are equal to or greater than the carryover amount, then there is nothing to release, because the LEA has spent all of the carryover funds. So these next two examples just give you a visual of, of that. So in this example the LEA does have an amount to release, carryover amount from the previous year is 50 thousand dollars, the estimated expenditures for the current year is 40 thousand dollars, so that leaves 10 thousand dollar of the carryover amount that is available for release. In this example the LEA does not have the opportunity to release carryover funds because there are no carryover funds to release. The carryover amount is 50 thousand dollars again, the estimated cost for the year for proportionate share however is 60 thousand dollars, so because carryover funds must be spent first all of the carryover funds have been spent, there are no carryover funds available for release. Okay so if your LEA does have proportionate share carryover funds that will not be used and you need to release them, make sure that you are looking in [Name?] for the carryover release request, this request has opened in ePeGs January 1st, the form is due on

March 1st. The proportionate share Webinar I did maybe a month ago goes through that process in detail. So on the current year budget application once the proportionate share carryover release request has been approved, you must revise the current year budget application to take the amount of the release carryover funds out of the proportionate share function codes of 1224 or 2557 and then budget those funds in a Special Education function code for use on public school students with disabilities. And on the current year final expenditure report, you must remember to include the amount of release proportionate share carryover funds on the FER Supporting Data page. We do have a lot of information, some useful tools and guides, FAQs on a proportionate share Web page at that address. We also have ePeGs guides that go through budget revisions, final expenditure reports and completing the proportionate share carryover release requests. Okay now I'll turn the Webinar over to Mary Corey.

>>Mary: Good afternoon, this is Mary Corey, I'm going to spend just a few minutes talking about two main topics that are data related. One is the Special Education child count and the other is a follow-up on the students with disabilities who exited High School last year. So first, on the Special Education child count um, this was the count of students as of DESE 1 and it was due DESE 15th, all districts have submitted and certified their data through MOSIS, I want to thank you all for your efforts on that. We do know some districts are still in the process of verifying data, that is perfectly fine. It's, we want you to do that so if you, if you need to add kids; correct some coding on kids, you are very welcome to do that to continue doing that in the DESE student file. And just a reminder that when the data are complete you need to send us your verification of the child count and that's a report that is available to you under the Missouri comprehensive data system portal. If you need help finding that report, you can just let us know, we can help you with that. At this point I believe we have all but 50 district that is have submitted verification reports. We do have vast majority of those in. But again, even if you have submitted the report, if you have corrections to be made please go ahead and do those. The Special Education child count is used for a wide variety of things, the slide lists out several of those, but it is certainly not a comprehensive list, we use them for several of the state performance plan indicators, indicators 5 and 6 look at least restrictive environment, indicator 5 looks at the school age environments and it looks at three separate sets of those, one are the number and percent of children inside the regular class more than 79%, the second one is inside regular class, less than 40% and then the third category is, is a grouping of separate placements. So for each of those three areas we have state targets and your district data is compared to those state targets and included in the Special Education district profiles. Indicators nine and ten look at disproportionate representation, I'll talk a little more about that in a few minutes, but it is basically looking at racial, ethnic representation of students with disabilities. Another area, that we use this data for is for the self-assessment requirements. So as districts go through the self-assessment process if you are meeting the targets, the state targets for least restrictive environment on the school age side you, you, there are certain compliance indicators that you don't have to review. If you are meeting targets you don't have to address some of those compliance indicators. Significant disproportion is another area that we use this data for. We are required to publicly report on the educational environments and we include incident rates as well in the district profiles. We have federal reporting requirements that use this data and just lots of miscellaneous and ad hoc reports that happen that are requested

um, examples are we recently received a request for the numbers of Deaf or hard of hearing students in each district. So we just, we get a variety of requests for that data, so it does get used and disseminated pretty wildly. We look at the incidence rates and look at trends over the years, the total Special Education incident rate which just looks at the number of students with disabilities, compared to the number of students enrolled that had been on a slow decline for many years, but the last couple of years that has started to creep back up. So disproportionate, in general when we which we look at racial ethnic disproportionate and Special Education we're looking at whether students, whether the data shows over-identity in rates or placements by race ethnicity. So an example here is just looking at whether Hispanic students are over-identified as having specific learning disabilities compared to other races and ethnicities. So the way we do that is to use a risk ratio and risk ratio just compares the risk for identifying Hispanic students as having specific learning disabilities due to the risk of all other students. The way we do that in that example calculation down there is to, is for this particular district, there are ten Hispanic LSD students divided by 150 Hispanic students enrolled in the district. So that gives a risk of 0.067 so basically it is saying that 6.7% of Hispanic students were identified as having an LSD. Is for the comparison group it would be all other non-hispanic students, so 100 non-hispanic students identified as LSD divided by 4000 non-hispanic students enrolled in the district, which gives a risk of 0.025 again basically that means that two and a half percent of non-hispanic students were identified as having a specific learning disability. So the risk ratio just compares those two risks. So it compares the 0.067 to the 0.025 to give it 2.68 ratio, which basically means that Hispanic students are 2.68 times more likely to be identified as having a specific learning disability than all other students. So we use this basic risk ratio calculation for SPP indicator 9 and 10 which look at disproportionate and for significant disproportionate, this basic calculation can be used to compare any number of groups, you can do it within your district just to compare and see if, to see if there is equity between two groups and it doesn't have to be race, ethnicity, it could be gender, it could be socio-economic status, it could be just any, anything that you are interested in comparing, you could use this basic concept to do that. So the second data area I'm going to talk about is the graduate and drop-out follow-up. So Special Education students who graduated or dropped out from grades 9 through 12 in the prior year, prior year would be the 16/17 school year need to have follow-up reported in this February MOSIS cycle. So that is due on February 15th and the, there are two main fields that you need to pay attention to when you are reporting on the follow-up status. One is called follow-up status and the other is called SpedMetDefinition, the data that you report for this are used for state performance plan indicator number 14 and it's also used for MSIP purposes. So the two data fields, one is the, is the follow-up category and that just tells us what the student is doing. Are they attending some sort of um college, post-secondary um continuing education, are they in the military, are they employed or you just couldn't find them, you don't know what they're doing. Or you know what they're doing but they are not doing any, not enrolled in post-secondary education, not employed, not in the military. So r so those are basic categories, those are used for all students, including students with disabilities, but for students with disabilities to meet the reporting requirements for SPP indicator 14, we need additional information, we need more than just the follow-up category. The SpedMetDefinition is a yes or no field. And if a student is enrolled in post-secondary education, so either a two year or a four year college, or some kind of non-college post-secondary training program, the

SpedMetDefinition will tell us if they, if the student is enrolled for at least one complete term. So did they complete a term, whatever the institutions definition of term is. If they have completed a term then SpedMetDefinition would be yes, if they haven't completed a term then SpedMetDefinition would be no. For students that are employed, either competitively or non-competitively, a yes in SpedMetDefinition would tell us that they had been employed for at least 20 hours per week for at least 90 days and no would indicate that they had not been employed for that amount of time. And the definition between or the difference between competitive and non-competitive employment is basically whether or not they are making minimum wage. If they are making minimum wage or higher, it would be considered competitive, otherwise it would be non-competitive. I have a few examples here just to walk through those two fields. So the first example is a student who is attending a four year college and has completed one semester. So in this case the follow-up status code, category will be four year college and the SpedMetDefinition field would be yes because that student has completed one full term in that college. The second example is a student attending a four year college, but has not yet completed one semester. So in that case follow-up status would still be four year college, but SpedMetDefinition would be no since the student has not completed one, one full term. Third example is a student working at Wal-Mart full time for the last five months. Follow-up status here would be competitive employment and SpedMetDefinition would be yes because that student had been working for at least 20 hours a week for at least 90 days. Then the 4th example is a student working at Wal-Mart full time for just two weeks, but was unemployed prior to that. The follow-up status would be competitive employment again, but the SpedMetDefinition would be no, since that student had not been working for at least 90 days. On the MCDS Portal we have a report out there called the LEA follow-up report that summarizes the follow-up information. The um, the screen shot shows two different reports, one is called public, the other one is, doesn't say public. So the public report is available to anyone, it is available to the public. But it has cell supression on it. So due to the large number of follow-up categories and different desegregation of students, often very small numbers to report. The public report is going to have a lot of asterisks in it depending on the size of the district and so would be potentially a little less informative. But if you have the security access to the secured report then you can use that, it is going to show all the numbers, no matter how small, it just shows, it shows two different categories of students and one of them is all students, so it is going to display number and percents of all students in the various follow-up categories and it shows it by subgroup and IEP students are one of the subgroups that are displayed. So you can see the data that was reported, broken out by student type and by follow-up status. Then there is another report option in there that it is called IEP students and that just displays the IEP students and it uses the SpedMetDefinition to adjust the categories, the follow-up status cat does that the students are displayed in. Because for indicator 14 purposes, any student reported with a SpedMetDefinition of no is, it is not considered a positive outcome and so for, for the IEP student um report, sub-report within this, those any student with SpedMetDefinition of no would be actually moved into the other category rather than left in the continuing education or employment categories. So I would encourage you to take a look at those reports and if you have questions on finding them or interpreting them you can always just give us a call. With that, I'm going to turn it over to Karen Allan in compliance.

>>Karen: Good afternoon. Today we're really glad to have you all with us by the way and I just want to take a little bit of time to talk about some topics that have to do with compliance. I'm going to, just three main areas, the processes, discipline procedures and a couple of important things about eligibility and writing the report. Okay. So first of all, let's talk a little bit about the difference between child complaint and due process. There are several parts or points of dispute resolution and so as a new director you should make yourselves familiar with what those are so that if these should happen to arise in your district you'll know what you need to be doing. So mediation is one, child complaint is another and then due process. And each of these is described in procedural safeguards that are within the State Plan and of course you provide parents with procedural safeguards periodically. So let's take a look bill of time to compare the two systems and who can file, what kind of issues can be addressed between the two systems and how the information is gathered and who makes a decision and who can provide legal representation and how long does the process take. So for child complaints, any person can file a child complaint whereas in due process, only the parents of the student or the LEA in limited situations can actually file a due process. And then in child complaint the types of issues that can be addressed are any violation of IDEA whereas in due process any proposed action of the agency to initiate or refuse to initiate or change the identification, evaluation or educational placement of the student or the provision of FAPE are those issues that can be raised. How is the information gathered? Well in child complaint there is an investigation process, so the Office of Special Education requests documentation from both the parent and the LEA and there is a thorough review of that documentation and we also conduct interviews with the parties involved. In the case of due process there are witnesses who testify under oath. Who makes the decision in the case of child complaints the Assistant Commissioner of Special Education is the one who renders the decision and in due process there is an administrative hearing commission, commissioner within the Missouri administrative hearing commission. In the case of child complaints there is not an appeal process. I apologize, there is a typo on, it says can a decision, it should be, be appealed. So under Child Complaint Process, no, there is not an appeal process. Whereas in due process there is an appeal process that can be filed in state or Federal Court. For child complaints there is not a requirement nor a prohibition against having legal representation. And in due process it is not required to have legal representation, but most parties are represented by attorneys. For child complaints the process time line is 60 days from the date of the complaint to the decision and for due process it can be completed in 45 days, but it can take approximately six months in some cases. So I just want to make sure you know where to find the information about due process in child complaint. If you go to the Office of Special Education website and go over to the right side of the page you'll see compliance and then if you click on compliance and go down to due process you can get to it there. Due process and child complaint. You can also see the procedures to follow and we also are required to post the due process decisions. Then if you also want to look at the comparison or use any of the forms, the quick links in the middle of the page, we'll provide that as well over on the right-hand side of the page. Here is another screen print and the, the arrow is pointing to the facilitated individualized educational program or better known as FAPE. The facilitated IEP process is not one of the formal processes that we use in dispute resolution so it is addressed separately on our page. This is an opportunity for the local district and the parent to agree that they want to have a facilitator and we provide state trained facilitators

through the Office of Special Education to provide facilitation for IEP meetings and it is particularly effective so that districts don't, and parents can hopefully reach consensus and have someone provide opportunities and that IEP meeting for all parties to be able to provide input and they can also reach consensus without as much stress and likewise there is usually someone there to describe the process and it is a neutral situation for the facilitator, they aren't there to take sides, they act as a neutral person so that everyone has input. There are forms on, at the page that you will see, so when you go to that page and click on facilitated IEP you'll be able to pull up a form for the district to submit once the parent of the district decide that yes facilitation is the way to go. Okay now I would like to spend a little bit of time talking about discipline procedures because we did get a number of calls about these procedures or situations in which students have been in cases where students have been given a disciplinary action. So I want to start out by talking about services when a student has had less than ten-days of suspension either consecutively or cumulatively. This is probably the most common scenario, in this case services are not required and so there are no special procedures required for these short-term suspensions. The IDEA allows for up to ten-days consecutively or ten-days cumulatively before any of these special procedures must be followed. And in these cases generally services are not required unless your local district provides services to students without disabilities in the same circumstances. So remember you cannot discriminate based on a student's disability. And the next scenario on this slide shows the scenario of greater than 10 days cumulatively where there is not a pattern to either the suspensions or the behavior that resulted in the suspensions. In order to determine if services are required there are several key decision points. First is the decision of the existence of a pattern. This decision is based on the length of the removal, the total amount of time the child has been removed and the proximity of the removals to one another. In addition behavior resulting in this suspension must be analyzed to see if they are substantially similar to the behavior that resulted in the previous suspensions. It is very important to remember that decision of whether or not a pattern exists is made by school personnel in conjunction with at least one of the child's teachers. Note that parents are not involved with this decision and for this reason it is very important to document the rationale for making the decision as parents do have the right to file due process if they disagree about the existence of a pattern. It is also very important to remember that a manifestation determination meeting is not required and should not be held for scenario. Once the decision is made that a pattern does not exist, the next decision is regarding if services are required beginning on the day 11 of the suspension. Again, the school personnel in consultation, excuse me, at least one of the child's teachers makes this determination. They must consider the length of the current removal, the length of the previous removals and the students needs and IEP goals for making this decision. If services are needed then the school personnel and at least one of the child's teachers determines the type of service to be provided and the location of those services. If no services are needed then the student would be treated the same as any other peer in the same circumstance. Okay so this is the case where there is a pattern and it is important to remember that when dealing with a suspension of greater than ten-days consecutively or cumulatively with a pattern, the LEA is required to conduct a manifestation determination meeting within ten school days of the decision to long-term suspend the student. At that manifestation determination meeting the LEA, parent and relevant members of the child's IEP team must determine if the behavior that resulted in the disciplinary action was or

was not a manifestation of the child's disability. This slide shows the third scenario of discipline of greater than 10 days cumulatively with a pattern and the behavior that in the disciplinary action was not seen as a manifestation of the child's disability. In this scenario the student with a disability can be disciplined the same as any other student. In this case the services are required beginning on day 11 of this type of long-term suspension that will allow the student to continue to participate in the general education curriculum and to progress toward meeting their IEP goals. As well as will reduce the likelihood of a repeat in the behavior which resulted in the suspension. The type and location of these services is determined by the IEP team. It is important to note that in a case of a 45 day alternative educational replacement the IEP still, the IEP team still determines the services. However, the LEA determines the setting where these services will be provided. In the next slide, it shows the 4th scenario of discipline, which is greater than 10 days cumulatively with a pattern and the behavior that resulted in the disciplinary action was a manifestation of the child's disability. In this scenario the student with a disability cannot be disciplined the same as any other student. Again, services are required beginning on day 11. The LEA has the option of returning the child to the current placement and services or proposing to change the placement and services with a notice of action or continuing a 45 day interim alternative educational placement with services. In this last situation the IEP team still determines the services, however the LEA determines the setting for the, where the services will be provided. Okay so we have talked about discipline and I would like to finish the presentation today by talking about evaluation report and eligibility and the determination of that eligibility decision or that decision for eligibility for services. Because I want to make sure that people understand that there needs to be certain components to this evaluation report and quite frankly number 2 is the one of greatest concern right now, is the synthesis of information from the evaluation that is considering all areas of functioning. And it is so important to be able to get that synthesis of information, putting together all of the pieces in order to be able to establish that basis in number three for making a determination that a child indeed is eligible because they have a disability and because they need services. So when you are talking about synthesis, it is easier for me at this point to explain to you what we are not seeing first and then talk about what we should see. So we often see scores in the eval report and then a basis for determination that says the student is eligible. But what we don't see is the pulling together of an explanation to explain why this student should be eligible for services. And that should be very clear, very clearly stated by pulling together all of those areas that team really feels like point to the fact that the student has a disability and has a need for services. So there should be a thorough explanation and usually this will come right before the statement that is the statement saying that the student is eligible. I would go ahead and say that if you have any questions about how to write a synthesis or what is really meant by the synthesis, I would contact your compliance consultant at the regional professional development center, they can help you with that process, but we really do need to improve the evaluation reports that are being written for students with disabilities. The other piece of the evaluation report actually is the decision making for the eligibility more than the report, but it should be stated well in the report as well is when a district, when the LEA uses professional judgment to find a student eligible. I think there has been some drift over time and um, so there needs to be some emphasis based on this area. The professional judgment still needs to be based on a significant deficit that exists and that significant deficit may not meet quite the criteria that is

required, but there is still a deficit that can be established that's great enough to say we think this kid actually has a disability and so I would encourage you to be careful not to make broad statements that, well the student didn't meet the criterion but we feel like the student is eligible. You need to be able to continue to explain it and to show that there is indeed a significant deficit. We're at the end of our presentation and I just want to thank you all for participating and to give you an opportunity to see how you can contact the compliance Section if you need to be, if you want to get more information or have questions. Okay. The slides will be posted within the next week and so then you should be able to print those slides from the posting. That's one question that came to us. And at the end of this presentation you will be given the opportunity to complete a survey and if you again need any help with Special Education Compliance you can feel free to give us a call. We'll take a few minutes in case there is some question that needs to be answered and we appreciate your attendance and I'm going to be here for a little while as well as Mary Corey and Angie Nickell.

>> Hi we don't really see any questions coming in, we will post this information and we'll send out an e-mail to everybody who is on this when information is posted. If you do have any questions, you can contact us in any way any of us are available to you. So at this point, I know some people are dropping off. We're going to go ahead and end this and there is a survey that we're going to ask you, okay, at the end there is a survey, so if you could hang on just a little bit, but we do have one question for compliance about the synthesis for evaluation. So I'm going to turn it back over to Karen.

>>Karen: Okay so the question is, can you guys provide an example of a synthesis for the evaluation. Again, what I would suggest is that you contact your RPDC and they can perhaps help you with that and they may have an example of synthesis in the work that they've done. There is another question, what about homebound services, I'm not quite sure I understand the question. Are you speaking of homebound services as a service during a disciplinary action? I'm not certain about that. So I'm not sure how to answer your question. Okay. A student who cannot attend school because of their disability. Well as always, if the IEP team determines that a student would best be served through homebound services then this, then the LEA is responsible for making sure the instruction is provided by a person who is properly certified to provide those services. We do not have the same threshold for those services as we used to have many years ago. There is a question asking if there is a limit to how many students can be on a caseload. I think the consideration is also taken into account for the level of need of the students and I would refer you to the State Plan where it talks about caseloads in the State Plan and if you are talking about early childhood Special Ed I refer you to the manual that is on, the State Plan, okay. Angie just said to me yes also the State Plan. I think this concludes our presentation and we thank you for joining us. So I'm going to end the meeting and you will have the opportunity for a survey. Thank you.

*****DISCLAIMER*****

THE FOLLOWING IS AN UNEDITED ROUGH DRAFT TRANSLATION FROM THE CART CAPTIONER'S OUTPUT FILE. THIS TRANSCRIPT IS NOT VERBATIM AND HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD. TO DO SO IS AN EXTRA FEE. THIS FILE MAY CONTAIN ERRORS. PLEASE CHECK WITH THE SPEAKER(S) FOR ANY CLARIFICATION.

THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE COPIED OR DISSEMINATED TO ANYONE ELSE UNLESS YOU OBTAIN WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM THE OFFICE OR SERVICE DEPARTMENT THAT IS PROVIDING CART CAPTIONING TO YOU; FINALLY, THIS TRANSCRIPT MAY NOT BE USED IN A COURT OF LAW.

*****DISCLAIMER*****