

STATE ADVISORY PANEL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

April 19, 2012

@ Worthington Schools Education Service Center

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
Call to Order, Welcome and Introduction	Reviewed agenda and introduced members and guests		
Panel Business	Approval of Agenda Approval of Minutes from Jan. 19, 2011 Meeting	Debbie Zielinski proposed moving the Membership and Elections Business before the Office for Exceptional Children Update. Tom Ash motioned for agenda approval with revisions; Alice Roehrs seconded. Motion carried. Susan Scarponi moved to accept the Jan. 19, 2012 minutes, Handout #1, and Jennifer Brickman seconded. Motion carried, the SAPEC Jan. 19, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved.	
Committee Reports	Membership Committee Report	Discussed the process used to narrow down the 99 applicants. Narrowed down the list using weights and then interviewed the candidates. Membership Committee then discussed all of the interviews to determine who the best candidates.	
	Proposal for Bylaws Revision	Set forth a resolution to modify the Bylaws to change the Member at Large term from one year to two years. Terri McIntee motioned to adjust the Bylaws to reflect the MAL 2 year term. Kate Kandel seconded. Motion carried.	Bylaws will be revised to reflect a two year term for members-at-large.
	Elections Committee Report	Candidates for elected positions had several minutes to share why they are interested in the positions and gave background information about themselves.	
	Slate Amendment-Addition of Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities (ODDD) representative	Handout #2 – Slate Jed Morrison moved to amend slate to include Katrina Bush-Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities. Cynthia MacIntosh seconded. Motion carried.	Katrina Bush-ODDD added to the slate.
	Elections	Election ballots were distributed by the election	

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
<p>Update from the Office for Exceptional Children</p>	<p>Updates from the Office for Exceptional Children</p>	<p>committee to the voting members.</p>	
	<p>SPP/APR Update</p>	<p>SPP and APR annual report was submitted to OSEP before the deadline. OSEP requested some clarification and it was resubmitted on Monday.</p> <p>The State will receive a determination from the US Department of Education in June. LEAs will receive their determination a few weeks after that.</p>	
	<p>Seclusion and Restraint</p>	<p>Seclusion and Restraint</p> <p>Public testimony took place at the state board of education meeting and ODE was urged to move forward with policy, rules and guidance related to seclusion and restraint of students. As a result, ODE has formed a Seclusion and Restraint Statewide Workgroup. The first meeting of this group is scheduled for April 27th. SAPEC has representation on that Workgroup.</p> <p>State committee will bring recommendations to SAPEC.</p> <p>This policy and rule will be for all children not just children with disabilities.</p>	<p>When the recommendations are ready, the state committee will bring them to SAPEC for feedback.</p>
	<p>Dyslexia Pilot Project</p>	<p>Handout #3</p> <p>A results of HB 96 signed by the Governor in January 2012.</p> <p>Required the ODE establish a pilot project involving school districts to provide early screening and intervention services, using multisensory language structured programs, for children with risk factors for dyslexia. Pilot</p>	

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
	<p>Rules Update and Whose IDEA Is This?</p>	<p>project must operate for three full school years beginning in 2012-2013. Goal is to evaluate the effectiveness of early screening and reading assistance programs for children with risk factors for dyslexia and to evaluate whether those programs can reduce future sp ed costs.</p> <p>There will be six schools in the pilot project. All kindergardeners in those schools will be screened.</p> <p>ODE-OEC is funding this project with IDEA discretionary funds.</p> <p>Members asked questions regarding parent involvement, district typography, control groups within the study.</p> <p>Rules Update and Whose IDEA Is This?</p> <p>Summary of technical changes made on April 2, 2012 was posted to the ODE website for Whose IDEA Is This?</p> <p>Member stated that they have received feedback from families that the document is too technical and suggested including diagrams and charts.</p> <p>The rules, <i>Operating Standards for Ohio Educational Agencies Serving Children with Disabilities</i>, are up for review and ODE will seek input from the State Advisory Panel on the revision. Revision must be finished by June 30, 2013. Once the rules have been revised, Whose IDEA Is This? will be revised and ODE will be seeking input from this Panel.</p>	<p>ODE will seek input from the panel on the revisions to the Operating Standards in 2012-2013.</p>
<p>Parent Request for Initial Evaluation Draft Letter</p>	<p>Parents Request for Initial Evaluation draft letter reviewed and feedback provided by the panel.</p>	<p>Handout #4</p> <p>This is a sample draft letter parents can use to document and formally request an initial evaluation of their child.</p>	<p>ODE will review and consider the feedback provided by the panel.</p>

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
		<p>Broke into table discussion. Tables report out their suggestions and questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More identification of the purpose of the letter in the header. • Directions on what to do with this request for school personnel. • Examples of data. • Do parents understand that the intervention process is considered a response? • How to distribute it? How will parents know that it exists?—schools, doctors offices, Ohio Coalition, children’s services, HMG, OFCF, • Regular Education staff should be aware of the document. • Add superintendent • A suspected disability-remove language “under IDEA” and • Direct them to Whose IDEA Is This? • Make document official enough that it gives consent for evaluation. • Pre-ETR Flow Chart on where it goes from here and if it doesn’t move forward what are the options? • Part of child find process? • Change the box at the top. Add sentence that “if you suspect your child has a disability, you need to request an evaluation in writing.” • Add that receipt of this letter starts the evaluation timeline. • Remove sentence about having documentation/records for review. • Make more family friendly • Change “your name” to “signature” • SD Info—it’s not suggested to make a copy for parent, it’s a requirement. 	

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
Election Results	Election Results-Slate approved, Mary Murray elected Vice-Chair, and April Siegel Green and Vicki Clark elected as Members-at-Large.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain in child’s official record. • Have districts post in schools and on their website. <p>Election results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mary Murray was elected as the Vice-Chair • April Siegel Green and Vicki Clark were elected as MALs. • The proposed slate approved <p>The next step is for the slate to go to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for approval and final appointments to the panel. Those selected will be notified in writing.</p>	Proposed slate to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for approval and final appointments.
Committees and Function of the Panel	Changing the format of SAPEC meetings in 2012-2013, review of committees and function of the panel.	<p>The executive committee met twice since the last meeting to help move forward the work of panel.</p> <p>Two more full panel meetings were added to the calendar, for a total of six, for next year so that timely advice can be given to the ODE. First meeting will be a two day meeting.</p> <p>Discussion regarding open meeting laws and trying to get Ohio’s law updated related to meeting electronically. Executive Committee is discussing how to get a waiver in legislation or a law change.</p> <p>Executive Committee will establish goals for the subcommittees. Executive Committee will select the members to be on the committees. Asked members to sign-up for a committee.</p> <p>Proposed subcommittees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seclusion and restraint • Closing the Achievement Gap • Operating Standards • Secondary Transition • Higher Education-Teacher Preparation 	Send email to members not attending to give them an opportunity to sign up for a committee.

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
		Standing Committees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership Committee • Elections Committee • Policies and Procedures Committee Executive Committee is discussing combining the Membership and Elections Committees.	
Recognition of Departing Panel Members	Certificates of Appreciation handed out to departing members.	Certificates of Appreciation for serving on the State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children were handed out to the panel members present whose terms expire on June 30, 2012.	
Constituency Reports	Children’s Mental Health Day May 10 th – Resiliency Ring at the Statehouse	ODMH-Kay Rietz-Ohio Resiliency Ring at the Statehouse for Children’s Mental Health Day on May 10, 2012 from 11 a.m. through 12:30 p.m. Event will include youth entertainment, presentations and formation of the resiliency ring.	
Public Comments	No public comment received.	There were no public comments.	
Adjourn		Marsha Wiley moved to adjourn the meeting; Jennifer Brickman seconded; meeting adjourned.	

State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC)

April 19, 2012

9:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

@ Worthington School District Education Center

9:30	Call to Order <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome and Introductions 	Sue Zake, Director and Debbie Zielinski, Chair
	Panel Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of Agenda • Approval of Jan. 19, 2012 Meeting Minutes 	Debbie Zielinski, Chair
	Panel Business-Membership and Elections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of process used to review applications and develop recommended slate • Election Process • Vote for Vice-Chair, Members-at-Large and Proposed Membership Slate 	Loretta Coil and Alice Roehrs, Membership Committee Co-Chairs Elaine Sieftring, Elections Committee Chair
	Updates from the Office for Exceptional Children <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ SPP/APR Update ☐ Seclusion and Restraint ☐ Dyslexia Project ☐ Rules update and <i>Whose IDEA Is This?</i> 	Sue Zake, Director
	SAPEC Review and Feedback of Parent Request for Evaluation Letter	Wendy Stoica, Assistant Director, OEC
	Subcommittees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ What subcommittees are needed? ☐ Assignments to committees and selection of subcommittee chairpersons <p>Proposed Subcommittees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ Closing the Achievement Gap ☐ Seclusion and Restraint ☐ Operating Standards ☐ Transition ☐ Higher Education-Teacher Preparation <p>Standing Subcommittees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☐ Policies and Procedures Committee ☐ Elections Committee ☐ Membership Committee 	Sue Zake, Director and Debbie Zielinski, Chair
	Constituency Reports (Opportunity for SAPEC members to report on relevant activities planned by the organization/constituency they represent.)	
	Public Comment (Opportunity for non-SAPEC members to comment on agenda items)	
1:00	Closing Remarks	

Times on the agenda are subject to change; the SAPEC meeting will be adjourned when the business items are completed.

STATE ADVISORY PANEL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

January 19, 2012

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
Call to Order, Welcome and Introduction	Introduction of members and guests		
Panel Business			
	Approval of Minutes from Nov. 3, 2011	Handout #1-Draft Nov. 3, 2011 Meeting Minutes Cynthia McIntosh moved to accept the Nov. 3, 2011 Meeting Minutes. Susan Scarponi seconded. Meeting minutes approved.	
Committee Reports			
	Policies and Procedures Committee – Marsha Wiley, Chair	Handout #2 Proposed SAPEC Bylaws and Operating Procedures Review of proposed changes which were covered at the last meeting. Terri McIntee motioned to bring the proposed bylaws to a vote and Tom Ash seconded. Unanimous vote to approve the proposed bylaws. Motion carried. Effective date of the revised Bylaws is January 19, 2012.	
	Membership Committee – Alice Roehrs-Co-Chair and Loretta Coil-Co-Chair	Membership Committee is preparing for the application process which begins on February 1 st and ends on February 29, 2012. Membership committee is charged with finding representation in counties that are underrepresented and disability categories that are underrepresented. Membership Committee is meeting 3 times in March to review applications and interview applicants. System developed to help review and narrow down applicants with a weighted system. Slate of proposed candidates will be brought to the next meeting for a vote. Once the slate is approved by the panel, it moves to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for a final decision. Handout #3 SAPEC Flyer Handout #4 SAPEC Application Members with terms expiring will receive an email notification and application to reapply if they are still eligible. If they are not eligible to reapply they will also receive email notification of that. Discussion of concerns regarding applying for Vice-Chair position but not being reappointed. Encouraged to reapply.	

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
		<p>Discussion regarding possibly changing when the membership application period and voting so that the slate would be known by the last meeting of the school-year. Look into revising the Bylaws to allow this. Executive committee will meet to discuss this possibility.</p> <p>Handout #5 Membership List-updated 1/15/2012 Handout #6 SAPEC Officers-updated 1/15/2012</p> <p>Debbie Zielinski encouraged members to step up and apply for leadership roles within the panel. She also advised the panel that some states have adopted that leadership of the panel alternate between the two groups: Parents of children with disabilities and individuals with disabilities and the professional organizations and members. She proposed that Ohio look at this possibility.</p>	<p>ODE and the Executive committee will meet to discuss the proposal to change the dates of the SAPEC application period and discuss the leadership of the panel.</p>
	<p>Elections Committee – Elaine Siefring, Chair</p>	<p>Vice-Chair special election and member-at-large election will be held at the April meeting. No letters of interest have been received and the deadline is January 31, 2012.</p> <p>Member-at-large request for letters of interest will go out next week.</p>	
<p>ODE Update</p>			
	<p>Comprehensive Monitoring System for Continuous Improvement</p>	<p>19 onsite reviews are completed. Several of the reports have been issued. Summary reports go out within 90 days of the review.</p> <p>Need better parent involvement. Not a lot of parents are showing up for the parent meetings and some that do come do not understand the purpose of the meetings. ODE is working to improve this.</p> <p>Summary Reports from the monitoring visits will be posted on ODE’s website.</p>	
	<p>Parent Mentor Project</p>	<p>Handout #7 Parent Mentor Program Brochure</p> <p>This program has been in place for 21 years. This money to support this project is a state legislated budget item. There is a small waiting list of districts for this project. However, any district can employ a parent mentor with their own IDEA funds.</p> <p>Parent mentors are a resource for families and to assist in empowering the</p>	

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
		<p>parent.</p> <p>Brochure updated this year. Parent mentor information on the ODE website, keyword search parent mentor.</p> <p>Parent Mentor Projects report their work 2 times a year to ODE.</p>	
	Jon Peterson Special Needs Scholarship Rules update	The rules were passed by the State Board of Education and now they go to the JCARR for review and hearing on Monday, January 23, 2012.	The rules passed by the State Board of Education emailed to the members.
Complaint Process Policy	Draft Complaint Process Policy review by SAPEC prior to submission to OSEP as part of the Corrective Action Plan	<p>Handout #8-Draft Complaint Process Policy</p> <p>Formalizing OEC's complaint process policy is part of the Corrective Action Plan for OSEP to formalize our complaint process policy. This policy is to assist ODE in meeting complaint timelines.</p> <p>The panel had table discussions regarding the policy.</p> <p>Outcomes/Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add that parents can contact ODE for assistance in filing a complaint near the front of the policy (look for language from OSEP); • Create guidance and training for parents on how to file a complaint and a visual chart or checklist on the complaint process; • Ensure all documents are consistent with this policy; • Concerns regarding not accepting a fax or emailed complaint due to requiring an original signature; • Insufficiency--Add language regarding refiling a complaint and that there is a 1 year timeframe. 	SAPEC to assist with revision of <i>Whose IDEA Is This?</i>
Complaints, Due Process Findings and Decisions, Mediations, IEP Facilitations and State Level Reviews	Review of quarterly decisions	Review of Handout #9-Complaints, Due Process Findings and Decisions, Mediations, IEP Facilitations and State Level Reviews.	
Race to the Top (RttT)	Race to the Top Area E Family and Community Engagement update	<p>Handout #10-Race to the Top Area E</p> <p>Race to the Top Application Area E-Family and Community Engagement – a 4 year plan to increase family and community engagement and maximizing the</p>	

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
		<p>effectiveness of this engagement.</p> <p>Family Engagement Plans are only successful when you intentionally build relationships with parents to increase academic achievement. ODE is looking at Family and Civic Engagement plans of districts and whether or not they are implementing them.</p> <p>Capacity Building: 12 county core teams; 74 persistently lowest achieving schools; ESCs will house these materials once the grant expires so this important work continues.</p> <p>Elements ODE is developing: professional development curricula and toolkits; training professional development and coaching; community of learners; and data management system.</p>	
<p>New Alternate Assessment</p>	<p>Provide a status report on the new alternate assessment</p>	<p>History:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early 90's only Kentucky and Maryland had a test for the 1% population; • 1997, when IDEA was authorized-mandated all students be assessed-primarily by portfolios; • 2001 NCLB impact on alternate assessments forced shift from measuring functional skills to content knowledge; • Today most states are testing on content using portfolio assessment, checklists and body-of-evidence. <p>Advantages of the proposed adaptive alternate assessment: task-based; test difficulty adapted to student ability; administered and scored by teachers (scores available quickly); high reliability and validity of the scores; aligned to state academic content standards; cheaper than portfolio assessments; and less administration time (about one hour per content area).</p> <p>Training requirements for test administrators: every test administrator will receive training. Ohio's train-the-trainer model will be used.</p> <p>Scoring: the test administrator scores student responses to each item; scores are recorded by the test administrator.</p> <p>Administration and scoring fidelity-a percentage of the assessment will be double scored (once by the teachers and then by a second) to ensure fidelity.</p>	

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
		Timeline and next steps: finalize extended standards; ODE will then start the professional development and training of the teachers through the SSTs; and Performance Based Assessment in place for the March 2013 testing.	
Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended	Provide a status report on the Ohio Academic Content Standards-Extended and encourage review and feedback through the online survey tool	<p>What are “extended” standards?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessible to students with significant cognitive disabilities; • Reduce the Academic Content Standards in breadth and depth; and • Provide statements of what a student with a significant cognitive disability is expected to understand and be able to do to make progress in the curriculum. <p>Ohio is extending the Common Core Standards for English language arts, math, science and social studies and there are 3 levels of extension varying in complexity.</p> <p>Extending Standards Project Committee convened that included general education teachers, special education teachers, parents, community school members and curriculum coordinators.</p> <p>Ohio chose Delaware and North Carolina’s extended standards to model the extended standards.</p> <p>Challenges: no common language between subject areas; no models from other states for science and social studies; and maintaining essence of standards.</p> <p>Purpose: meaningful access for instruction while allowing the development of an alternate assessment while maintaining the fidelity of the standards.</p> <p>Feedback opportunities: Look for a focus group invitation for trainings in February through the SSTs. Within the next few weeks the drafts of the standards will be posted on the ODE website for public comment for one month.</p>	Members are encouraged to review the Extended Standards online and use the online survey tool to submit written feedback.
Special Education Profiles and the Annual Performance Report	District profiles were distributed in January and a state profile is available online	The district’s special education profiles went out at the beginning of January. ODE also created a state profile to give a visual of how the state performed. Kara Waldron guided members through how to read and use the profile and encouraged them to review it on their own. The state profile can be viewed at: http://www.edresourcesohio.org/profile2011/ohio/index.php	ODE to send members the link to review the state profile.
Duties of the Panel	SAPEC needs to provide more advice and feedback to meet their	Thomas Lather discussed the purpose of the SAPEC Panel and that it isn’t currently functioning to meet the duties. The panel needs to have a way to give feedback and issues to the department for consideration. The structure of the	ODE and the Executive Committee will

Agenda Item	Key Points	Discussion/Recommendations	Next Steps
	purpose and duty	<p>meetings currently is that ODE provides SAPEC with a lot of information but does not receive much formal feedback, advice or suggestions from the panel. ODE and the Executive Committee will meet to discuss ways to restructure the work of the panel.</p> <p>The purpose and duties of the panel are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To advise ODE on the unmet needs of children with disabilities in the state. • Comment publicly on any rules or regulations proposed by the state regarding the education of children with disabilities • To advise the SEA in developing evaluations and reporting on data to the Secretary under section 618 of the act; • To advise the SEA in developing corrective action plans to address findings identified in federal monitoring reports under Part B of the act; and • To advise the SEA in developing and implementing policies relating to the coordination of services for children with disabilities. <p>Suggestions from the panel on how to restructure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members submit agenda items; • Formal process for submitting feedback to ODE; • ODE come to SAPEC for feedback before decisions are made not after; • Committee groups to work on specific issues or topics; • Review the Help Me Grow committee meeting structure for ideas on how to engage the panel. 	meet to discuss ways to restructure the work of the panel.
Constituency Reports		<p>Debbie Zielinski shared Handout #11 related to an upcoming State Advisory Panel Webinar on Feb. 17, 2012 on the topic of communication with the public and encouraged the panel to participate.</p> <p>Jason Johnson thanked the members for their support and concerns after he resigned from the SAPEC Vice-Chair position and thanked Alice Roehrs and Loretta Coil for stepping up to lead the Membership Committee. Encouraged the members to apply for leadership roles within the panel.</p>	
Public Comments		No public comment.	
Adjorn		Jason Johnson motioned to dismiss and Janet Lineberry seconded. Meeting adjourned.	

SAPEC Slate of Recommended Candidates Term July 1, 2012 June 30, 2015

Name	Representing
Staci Anderson	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Tom Ash	Administrators - Buckeye Association of School Administrators (BASA)
Victoria Ann Baker-Willford	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Bill Bauer	*Individuals with Disabilities and Institutions of Higher Education
David Beck	State Child Welfare Agency Responsible for Foster Care - Ohio Department of Job and Family Services (ODJFS)
Mary Binegar	Teachers-Ohio Education Association (OEA)
Janee Brant	State Adult Corrections Agency - Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections (ODRC)
Katrina Bush	State Agencies Involved in Financing and Delivery of Related Services - Ohio Department of Developmental Disabilities (ODDD)
Mary Callicoat	*Parents of Children with Disabilities and Public Charter Schools
Pat Cloppert	Administrators - Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (OCECD)
Tony Cochren	*Individuals with Disabilities and McKinney Vento (Local Representative)
Loretta Coil	*Parents of Children with Disabilities and Private Schools
Cindy Crowe	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Jennifer Elliott	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Neva Fox	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Kathleen Hall	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Kate Kandel	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Cynthia Macintosh	State Juvenile Corrections Agency - Ohio Department of Youth Services (ODYS)
Vicki Palur	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Susan Rydzinski	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Elaine Siefring	Parents of Children with Disabilities
April Siegel-Green	Administrators - Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators (OAPSA)
Cindy Stickley	McKinney Vento (State Representative-ODE, Ex-Officio)
Michelle Wagner	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Barbara Weinberg	Administrators - Part C/619 (ODE-Ex-Officio)
Marsha Wiley	Parents of Children with Disabilities
Sandee Winkelman	Parents of Children with Disabilities

H.B. 96 DYSLEXIA PILOT PROJECT

Introduction

One in five American children has trouble reading. Early intervention programs have proven to be successful in reducing the number of children who become eligible and require special education supports and services. These programs are aimed at children between five and six years old, in kindergarten or first grade, who without such instruction are at high risk for developing reading difficulties. Research shows that direct, explicit, and early instruction in phonemic awareness and phonological processing has proven to address the deficits. High-risk children are those who are likely to develop reading problems because of early language problems, a family history of reading problems, or low scores on a kindergarten screening test.

House Bill 96 signed by Governor Kasich in January 2012 requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to establish a pilot project involving school districts to provide early screening and intervention services for children with risk factors for dyslexia. The pilot project must operate for three full school years, beginning with the 2012-2013 school year. The specified goal of the pilot project is to evaluate the effectiveness of early screening and reading assistance programs for children with risk factors for dyslexia and to evaluate whether those programs can reduce future special education costs.

The state Superintendent will select six school districts to participate in the pilot project on a voluntary basis. At least one of the districts must be located in an urban setting, one in a suburban setting, and one in a rural setting. To be considered for the pilot project, school district's proposal must:

- (1) Identify a method of screening children for low phonemic awareness and other risk factors for dyslexia,
- (2) Provide for the enrollment of children identified as having risk factors in a reading program staffed by teachers trained in multisensory structured language programs, and
- (3) Include a methodology for evaluating the reading program's effects on the children's identified risk factors.

A selected school district may establish a partnership with a regional library or library system for purposes of the pilot project.

Each school district participating in the pilot project must screen children who are six years old or younger for indications of dyslexia and provide those suspected of having dyslexia with reading intervention services. After providing those early intervention services, the district must administer assessments, approved by the state Superintendent, to determine whether the intervention services have improved students' reading and learning.

When a child is suspected of having dyslexia, the school district must notify the child's parent(s) of that fact and that the child is eligible for reading intervention services through the pilot project. The district must require the parent(s) to indicate in writing that the parent(s) voluntarily and knowingly consent to the child's participation in the pilot project. Moreover, the district must provide the parent(s) information about dyslexia. Finally, each participating district is required to report annually to the state Superintendent about the operation and results of the pilot project to facilitate the Superintendent's evaluation of it.

The bill requires the state Superintendent to evaluate the pilot project and report its results to the General Assembly by December 31, 2014. The report also must contain legislative recommendations whether to continue, expand, or make changes to the pilot project.

For purposes of the H.B. 96 Dyslexia Pilot Project, dyslexia is defined as "a specific learning disorder that is neurological in origin and that is characterized by unexpected difficulties with accurate or fluent word recognition and by poor spelling and decoding abilities not consistent with the person's intelligence, motivation, and sensory capabilities, which difficulties typically result from a deficit in the phonological component of language."

The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) recognizes the importance of early intervention and early identification and the need for districts to have a strategic plan in place. The project period is for three years, and pilot funds are to be used to train staff, integrate evidence-based practices, instructional materials, and implement an effective plan for evaluating the progress made by the participants.

Advisory Committee

International Dyslexia Association

Rebecca Tolson, Northern Ohio
Charlotte G. Andrist, Central Ohio
Susan Nolan, Ohio Valley

32° Masonic Children's Dyslexia Center

Jean Colner

Ohio School Psychologists Association

Ann Brennan

State Library Association

Janet Ingraham Dwyer

Marburn Academy

Earl Oremus

College of Mount St. Joseph

Amy Murdoch

Ohio State University Schoenbaum Family Ctr

Howard Goldstein

Ohio State University - The Learning Place

Dorothy Morrison

Shayne Piasta

Emily Bennett

Parent Representative

Gayle Long

RFP

Proposals due: TBD (May or June)

Awardees Notified: TBD (June)

Contact:

Wendy Stoica, Assistant Director
Ohio Department of Education
Office for Exceptional Children
25 South Front Street, Mail Stop 202
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4183

PARENT REQUEST FOR INITIAL EVALUATION LETTER

April 2012

Why was this letter created?

Ohio Legal Rights Services (OLRS), Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (OCECD) and several legal aide offices across the state requested that a template be created for parents of children with suspected disabilities that parents would use to request an initial evaluation for a suspected disability under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA).

What is the purpose of this letter?

This letter allows parents the opportunity to request an initial evaluation for a suspected disability under IDEA that allows school district personnel to understand exactly what the parent is requesting, to document the beginning of the required timelines and to provide the district with additional background information about the child and the reasons why the parent suspects a disability if the parent chooses to share this information.

How will it be used?

The finalized letter will be shared with parent advocacy agencies and located online at www.edresourcesohio.org so parents will have easy access to this template. During the 2012-2013 content review of *Whose IDEA is This?* this letter will be included as an optional form. This will allow parents to request an initial evaluation from their school district of residence and do so in a timely and complete way.

Using this Letter to request an evaluation is Not Required; it is presented as an option. It is suggested that a request for an evaluation be in writing and that the receipt of the request be acknowledged by the principal, special education director, or other special education personnel. Ohio Administrative Code, Rule 3301-51-06(B)(3) requires the school district to respond to you in writing within 30 days of receiving your request for an evaluation.

Date _____

Your Name _____

Address _____

Child's Name _____ Child's Date of Birth _____

Name of School Child Attends _____ Grade _____

Dear Principal Special Education Director Teacher Intervention Specialist Other _____

I am writing to you because my child is having difficulties in school.

Optional: I am sharing the following information so you know more about my concerns.

For example, you can provide information about:

- subjects such as reading or math, behavior problems, hearing or vision problems or
- a diagnosis or condition that may adversely affect your child's educational performance and the name of the person who provided the diagnosis.

(Attach additional pages if needed.)

I have or can obtain copies of my child's records from outside providers for school officials to review and consider.
Yes _____ No _____

I believe that _____ (Child's Name) needs to be evaluated for a suspected disability under the Individuals with Disabled Education Improvement Act (IDEA).

If you need more information, please call me at _____. The best time to reach me is _____.

You may also e-mail me at my personal e-mail account _____.

Thank you very much for your assistance. I look forward to your prompt reply.

Sincerely,

_____ (Your Name)

It is suggested that an appropriate school staff member – principal, special education director, intervention specialist - complete the following upon receipt of this letter and make a copy of this letter for the parent.

School staff member's name: _____; Position _____

Date request for evaluation received: _____

Parent given a copy of *Whose Idea Is This?* (Please initial answer) Yes _____ No _____

If you do not hear back from your child's school principal or other staff member in 30 days, please contact:

_____ at _____.