

Finding Our Way in the New Era of Special Funding

Many special education directors are struggling to understand the new special education funding model. This new model is considerably more complex than the previous special education funding model used in Minnesota. However, the new model appears to offer a more stable predictable system to school districts within Minnesota. In working with the complexities of this new special education funding model I've come to realize that it is not only more complex but has a different feel.

In the past when asked by a principal or superintendent, "What is hiring additional special education staff going to cost?" I could reply that the state of Minnesota would pay approximately 2/3 of the cost of hiring the additional special education staff. In fact, the state of Minnesota may pay more for that staff with excess cost aid and in some cases the student may be eligible for tuition billing to a resident district. When asked a similar question regarding equipment or supplies, I could respond to the district they would likely receive approximately 1/2 of those costs from the state of Minnesota. When I was able to tell a district they were going to get a large percent of their expenditure reimbursed, it seemed to make the idea of the

additional expenditures more palatable. I described it like this, "Let's say you went to buy a car. You didn't really want a car, but you knew it was time for a different vehicle. Going to the dealership you expect to pay \$25,000 for the new car. Upon arriving at the dealership you discover the dealership has a rebate program, where the buyer gets two thirds of the cost of the car refunded. How do you feel? I would be thrilled; in fact I might buy a second car."



Todd Travis
MASE President and Director of
Special Education
Midwest Special Education
Cooperative

Under the new special education funding system in Minnesota, there is not a direct correlation between special education expenditure and reimbursement. School districts will be funded in one of three ways. In fact, when the hold harmless calculation is factored in, along with the individual cap on district funding, you're really funded one of five ways. When I began to discuss this with superintendents, much less principals, their eyes began to glaze. I cannot blame them for their response. Superintendents want a straight answer to the question, "How much additional revenue will hiring special education staff bring into the district?" Maybe some of you have the correct answer to this question. I do not.

While I do like the stability and predictability the new special education funding formula Minnesota promises to bring, I am concerned that it will make for more difficult decisions regarding increasing special education staffing when necessary. The new formula just feels different without direct correlation between special education expenditures and special education revenues.●

Inside this issue

Executive Notes	2
Legislative Update	4
Fall Conference Thank Yous	5
MASE Awards & Elections	6
Legal Notes	7
Research to Practice.....	8
Federal Advocacy.....	9
CASE Update	10
MnSELF History	11
New Members.....	12
Business Partners	13

Association Update Effective, Efficient, Engaging

As we are coming upon the end of the 2015 calendar year, I want to take this opportunity to review some of our successes at the state and national levels.

During the last state legislative session we were able to push back on the misguided efforts to address paperwork fatigue with the requirement that every school district in the state participate in a single on-line due process paperwork system. We received significant support from the Minnesota Rural Education Association (MREA). We will continue this year to advocate on behalf of our staff and the students that they serve, by calling for overall reduction of the paperwork demanded of them by MDE. We will continue to support efforts that allows our staff to spend a greater portion of their day in direct instruction with our students, versus generating paperwork. In addition, we will also advocate for expansion of the special education teacher licensure programs.

On the national level, our efforts to impact the maintenance of effort rules was rewarded by positive common sense legislation found in the ESSA. Our success was a product of collaboration with MASA and with Representative John Kline's staff. Overall, we had a very solid year working on behalf of you, our members. It has been my pleasure to be able to get out to regional meetings this fall. Much of our conversations have been about the upcoming legislative session.

On November 5, 2015 I had the opportunity to testify before the Joint House Education Finance and Innovation Policy Committees. If you want to read my full testimony feel free to send me an email at jpklaber@gmail.com.

In the meantime, I've provided you with a synopsis of what I have shared with our legislators. A significant take-away from my preparation for testifying was that while we have had a great deal of legislative focus on licensure reciprocity, someone may have "fallen asleep at the wheel" in terms of in-state special education teacher preparation programs. The answer to our staffing challenge cannot rest solely on stealing licensed folks from other states (something that those other states also hope to be able to do). We must also make sure that our own Minnesota teacher development programs are strong and vital. I hope all is well with you and I hope to see more of you at regional meetings later this school year.

Joint House Education Finance and Innovation Policy Testimony from the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education: Change in law on teacher licensure and new rules.



John Klaber
MASE Executive Director

Synopsis:

- School districts across the state cannot find individuals with special education licensure. It is no longer only a Greater Minnesota challenge or limited to specialty licensures.
- Licensure reciprocity with adjoining states must be put in place.
- Minnesota colleges and universities have dropped their undergraduate special education teacher training programs in the areas of E/BD, SLD, Autism and DCD, even though those licensures are required by law for teachers instructing students with more severe disabling conditions. Instead, they are offering ABS degrees requiring that teachers return within 5 years for more (expensive) graduate training. At that time the teacher is no longer licensed to serve a broader student population.
- Only 2 colleges or universities in Minnesota offer licensure programs for Transition Coordinator.
- There may be only a single college or university in Minnesota offering an undergraduate degree leading to licensure as an Early Childhood Special Education teacher.
- No college or university in Minnesota offers any degree leading to teacher licensure in Blind/Visually Impaired.
- Recommendations for further action are made. ●



SAVE THE DATE!

2016 MASE/MASA Spring Conference

March 10-11, 2016

Minneapolis Marriott Northwest, Brooklyn Park

Registration, agenda and lodging details coming soon!

MASE IMPACT
Winter 2015

IMPACT is a publication of the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education,
© copyright, MASE. No endorsement of products or services is intended.
Send materials to be considered for publication to:

Dave Christians

Associate for Leadership Support and Communications
1884 Como Avenue • St. Paul, Minnesota 55108
(651) 789-4061 • dchristians@mnasa.org

2015-2016 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President

Todd Travis

Director of Special Education, Midwest Special Education Coop

President Elect

Mary Clarkson

Director of Special Programs, Richfield Public Schools

Past President

Cheryl Johnson

Executive Director, Goodhue County Education District

Secretary

Julie Ladwig

Director of Special Education, Waseca Schools

Treasurer

Lori Fildes

Director of Special Services, Wayzata Schools

Area A

Dustin Hinckley (2014-16)

Special Education Supervisor, Bemidji Regional Interdistrict Council

Area B

Cathy Tryggestad (2015-17)

Director of Special Education, Northern Lights Special Education Cooperative

Area C

Bardie Skjonsberg (2014-16)

School Psychologist/Director of Special Education, Frazee-Vergas Public Schools

Area D

Lori Murdock (2015-17)

Director of Special Education, Freshwater Education District

Area E

Diane McCarron (2012-16)

Director of Special Education, SW/WC Service Coop

Area F-1

Stephanie White (2015-17)

Director of Special Education, Mankato Area Public Schools

Area F-2

Dan Armagost (2014-16)

Director of Special Education, S MN Sped Cons/Glenville-Emmons Schools

Area G

Mary Kreger (2013-17)

Director of Special Education, Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan Public Schools

Area H

Laura Pingry-Kile (2014-16)

Director of Special Services, Eastern Carver County Schools

MASA Component Group Representatives

Darren Kermes (2011-17)

Executive Director, MN River Valley/Carver Scott Education Coop

Nan Records (2015-17)

Director of Special Education, Sherburne-North Wright Special Education Coop

Retired Representative

Claudine Knoblauch (2015-17)

National CASE Liaison

Jill Skarvold (2015-16)

MNCEC Liaison

Marcy Doud (2013-17)

Director of Special Programs, West. St. Paul-Mendota Heights-Eagan Area Schools

Executive Director

John Klaber

PEMBERTON *Special Education*
LAW *Law Team*



Michael T. Rengel



Kristi A. Hastings



Joshua M. Heggem



Sarah C. Duffy

FERGUS FALLS (218) 736-5493
DETROIT LAKES (218) 847-4858



WADENA (218) 631-1400
ALEXANDRIA (320) 759-3143

www.pemlaw.com

L LANGUAGE! Live

+193L

**AVERAGE LEXILE GAIN
FOR ALL LEVEL 1 USERS**

See the results at www.teachlanguagealive.com

MASE Leadership Issues
(Formerly "Rural Issues")

Friday, January 15, 2016
Benton-Stearns Education District

&
Friday, April 22, 2016
Sauk Rapids Government Center

10 am - 2 pm

MASE "Rural Issues" has a new name - MASE Leadership Issues! We changed our name to remind all of our members that they are welcome to these popular meetings. Join your colleagues from across the state for good company and great discussion about current topics in special education leadership.

Hope to see you there! Questions? Call (651) 645-6272.

IMPACT is your newsletter and we encourage your input!
If you have ideas or an article to share, please contact us at
(651) 789-4061 or send an email to dchristians@mnasa.org.

2016 Legislative Session Preview

It seems like it's a long way off, but the 2016 Legislative Session is creeping up slowly. The Legislature will be convening on March 8, 2016, in what should be an interesting year. The Capitol is largely closed down for renovations with only the House chamber being open. The Senate will be meeting in the newly-constructed office building and holding its floor sessions in a large committee room while the official Senate chamber is restored. As a result of the construction work on the Capitol, some are predicting a short session, but recent history has shown that regardless of obstacles—physical or fiscal—sessions usually last into May in the non-budget year.

What makes a longer session likely this year is that two major bills—the tax bill and the transportation bill—were not passed in 2015, leaving a lot of money on the bottom line going into the 2016 session. Add to that the fact that the state's financial picture continues to improve as economic performance remains steady and there may be as much as \$1.5 billion available for the Legislature to dedicate toward tax relief and increased spending without endangering the overall budget.

Beyond the tax and budget issues, there will be a number of policy issues that will command the attention of the Legislature. One issue that is plaguing school districts and is especially difficult to the area of special education is that of the teacher shortage. Even in subject areas where there was once a surplus of teaching candidates, school districts are now finding it increasingly challenging to find and hire quality teachers across the instructional spectrum. It is even more difficult in the area of special education, where the shortage has become extreme with districts applying for an increasing number of variances to make certain students in special education classes receive the service they are entitled to.

There is no magic formula to solve this problem. Instead, a multitude of approaches will have to be employed to swell the ranks of prospective teachers.

First on the agenda will likely come in the form of several measures that were discussed but not enacted in 2015. Teachers and administrators from other states have often had difficulty getting a Minnesota license. This approach received a fair amount of attention during the 2015 session, but in the end, teachers and administrators with

licenses issued in other states did not see the barriers to receiving a Minnesota license reduced appreciably. Much has been made of the failure to address this angle of the teacher shortage and I fully expect it will be front and center in the 2016 discussion.

Incentives to help increase the pool of candidates should also be investigated. Loan forgiveness for teaching candidates in curricular areas could certainly steer college students into licenses that would give them a strong opportunity for immediate employment after graduation and at the same time reduce their financial burden.

Lastly, and this is another angle in an on-going chorus for change, would be a reduction in the paperwork required of special education teachers. Several stabs have been taken at this issue over the past decade, but to this point, none seem to be producing a meaningful reduction in the number of forms and reports special education staff must complete and file. I have spoken with several administrators who have paraprofessionals that they believe would make excellent teachers, but when approached with that suggestion, the paraprofessional often says something to the effect that if they became a teacher, they'd spend less time with students. Our reporting system has saddled teachers with a paperwork burden that is more than enough to discourage candidates from seeking work in the special education field and progress needs to be made towards dramatic reduction of this paperwork.

Given the health of the state's fiscal bottom line, I wouldn't be surprised if some attention is directed toward special education funding in 2016. The statewide cost to school districts in terms of the shortfall of funding in the special education formula is estimated to be \$600 million in the coming school year. The Governor's 2015 supplemental budget contained \$40 million in additional special education funding, but unfortunately that was not included in the final budget agreement.

I hope to get out to regional meetings before the 2016 Legislative Session, so don't hesitate to contact me if you are interested. I can be reached at 612-220-7459 or lundelllegislative31@gmail.com. ●



Brad Lundell
MASE Lobbyist

Thank you! 2015 MASE Fall Leadership Conference!



Thanks to everyone who made our 2015 MASE Fall Leadership Conference a great success! We had three wonderful days of learning, networking, and fun. Congratulations to Area F-2, winners of the coveted Wine Tasting Trophy, the votes for which were calculated by the ABV (Adjusted Booth Vote) which George Holt explained so expertly.

Congratulations to Nan Records, Director of Special Education, Sherburne-Northern Wright County Special Education Cooperative, who received the 2015 MASE Legacy Award.

Thanks to all who participated in the fundraising events — because of your participation, we raised \$8,593 for the Stenswick-Benson Scholarship Program, providing scholarships for aspiring special education leaders.

Special thank you to our 2015 Fall Conference Exhibitors!

- Achieve3000
- Benchmark Education
- Curriculum Associates
- Headway Emotional Health Services
- Houghton Mifflin Harcourt
- Infinitic
- Lexia Learning
- National Geographic/Cengage Learning
- PresenceLearning
- Rethink Autism
- Review360, Pearson
- SpEd Forms
- Strategic Staffing Solutions
- Transition Assessments and Curriculum Technologies
- Vizzle by Monarch Teaching
- Voyager Sopris Learning
- West Metro Learning Connections, Inc.
- Zaner-Bloser

Save the Date!

MASE Best Practices

May 4-6, 2016

Madden's Resort, Brainerd

Are You Moving?

Now is the time of year when many of our members are on the move! Help us keep track of you (and keep your MASE benefits and services coming to you). Please give Deb a call at (651) 645-6272 or (866) 444-5251 or email members@mnasa.org. Deb will update your records. If you have new colleagues in your area who are not MASE members, please let us know and we will send membership information to them.

We write the book on Education Law

KF&D

Knutson Flynn & Deans P.A.

651.222.2811

www.kfdmn.com

Achieving Our Clients' Goals Since 1947

2016 award nominations open until January 11, 2016:

Each year, MASE provides an opportunity to recognize outstanding members who are dedicated leaders and advocates for children and Minnesota education. We encourage you to consider nominating yourself or a colleague for recognition. Nominate someone who you feel reflects the qualities of a leader who is committed to education and who is an exemplary representative of MASE.

Award information, including nomination forms and past recipients, can be found on the MASE website. Please remember that anyone can nominate for MASE awards.

Nominations are open for the following awards:

- 2016 MASE Distinguished Service Award
- 2016 Special Education Administrator of the Year Award
- 2016 MASE Legacy Award
- 2016 MASE New Special Education Leader Award

MASE Officer Nomination Process:

MASE officers have the opportunity to influence education in Minnesota and serve their fellow colleagues.

We encourage you to nominate yourself or a colleague who you feel would be a strong leader for MASE. If you nominate a colleague, please contact your nominee and ask them whether or not they are interested in running for the position and so they know you have nominated them!

Nomination forms are available on the MASE Web site. Fill out our your nomination and return it to the MASE offices via mail or fax by January 11, 2016. You may also email your nomination to dchristians@mnasa.org.

MASE officers must be:

- Active Members in good standing in MASE.
- Members of CASE while serving their terms of office.

Nominations are open until 4:30 pm on January 11, 2016 for the MASE offices of: President-Elect and Secretary. The nomination forms are posted online at: www.mnase.org/board.html

MASE President-Elect

The President-Elect serves one year, followed by one year as President and one year as Past President.

Duties:

The President-Elect shall serve in the event of resignation or absence of the President. S/he shall serve as Co-chair of the Strategic Planning and Federal Advocacy Committees, appoint a Chair/Co-chair-Elect to each Standing Committee, and have such other responsibilities as necessary in regard to matters as delegated by the President and/or Board of Directors.

The President shall preside at the annual business meeting of MASE and at the meeting of the Board of Directors. S/he shall appoint ad hoc committee chairpersons subject to the approval of the officers. This officer shall act for MASE between annual meetings, clearing, by mail, telephone, e-mail or other forms of electronic communication whenever necessary, important actions with the officers. The President, or such alternate as s/he may designate, shall represent MASE at meetings of other groups where MASE representation is desired or required. The President may appoint a parliamentarian to serve at all business meetings of MASE.

The Past President shall serve as Co-chair of the Legislative Committee and have such other responsibilities as necessary in regard to matters delegated by the President and/or Board of Directors.

In the year following past-presidency, s/he serves as MASE Nominating Committee Chair.

MASE Secretary 2016 - 2018

The Secretary serves a two-year term.

Duties:

The Secretary shall keep accurate minutes of MASE meetings and meetings of the officers. S/he shall carry on correspondence and other responsibilities as necessary in regard to matters as delegated by the President and/or Board of Directors.

Transgendered Students: A New Territory for IDEA Eligibility?

Nancy E. Blumstein, neb@ratwiklaw.com
Ashley R. Geisendorfer, age@ratwiklaw.com
Attorneys at Ratwik, Roszak & Maloney, P.A.

With the Office for Civil Rights flexing its enforcement muscle and state and federal courts puzzling over what it means to discriminate on the basis of sex, transgender student issues have been a hot topic in recent years. While bathroom and locker room access have driven the transgender student discussion, these cases may also have ramifications in the special education arena.

For instance, in a case that primarily involved a transgender student's access to the bathroom of her choice, the Maine Supreme Court noted that the student was receiving services for her gender identify issues, including gender dysphoria, through a Section 504 plan. *Doe v. Regional School Unit 26*, 86 A.3d 600 (Me. 2014). This note, all but lost in the substance of the bathroom issue, highlights just how easy it is for a school district to overlook its potential child find obligations to these students under both IDEA and Section 504.

It is important to note that identifying as transgender is not itself a disability and neither the Americans with Disabilities Act or Section 504 covers "gender identity disorders not resulting from physical impairments." See 42 U.S.C. § 12211. That being said, transgender students often live with depression and anxiety. These mental impairments may have a significant impact on the student's ability to access and benefit from education. For example, almost a third of LGBT students who participated in the latest National School Climate Survey, conducted by the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network, reported that they had missed at least one day of school in the prior month as a result of feeling unsafe or uncomfortable at school.

The medical community has also recognized the psychological stress associated with a gender transition or a burgeoning realization that one's assigned gender does not comport with one's internal sense of self. Likewise, the DSM-V classifies the clinically significant distress or impairment of social, occupation, or other important areas of functioning that sometimes accompanies the rejection of one's assigned sex as "gender dysphoria." If the psychological stress a transgender student experiences is

sufficiently severe to interfere with daily tasks such as sleeping, concentrating, learning, or coming to school, the affected student may have a disability entitling the student to Section 504 protection and, possibly, to special education services and related services under the IDEA.

A student need not have a gender dysphoria or depression diagnosis in hand to trigger a school's child find obligations under the IDEA and Section 504. Rather, if school personnel notice a negative shift in a student's behavior or personality that affects the student's receipt of educational benefits or attendance, this may indicate a need for an evaluation. Disengagement from school, angry outbursts, unexcused absences, or falling asleep in class could all signal that the student is suffering from depression or anxiety related to their transgender status.

School personnel must also be on the watch for peer-to-peer bullying, as the OCR has warned that bullying on any basis can affect a disabled student's receipt of FAPE. See Dear Colleague Letter: Responding to Bullying of Students with Disabilities, 64 IDELR 115 (OCR 2014). In addition, Minnesota's Safe and Supportive School Act requires personnel to report and have a policy addressing all suspected incidents of bullying, including bullying related to a student's actual or perceived gender identity. Minn. Stat. § 121A.031, subd. 2(g).

In short, it is important that school district special education administrators are mindful that students who are gender nonconforming or transgender may experience significant mental health issues, including anxiety and worry about whether they will be accepted by their peers, family and community. Staff should be aware that these mental health needs may trigger a school district's child find responsibilities under both Section 504 and IDEA. Especially considering the potential legal ramifications, it always a good idea to consult an attorney with experience in special education and sex discrimination claims before making an evaluation decision in these types of cases. ●



Nancy E. Blumstein
Attorney
Ratwik, Roszak & Maloney,
P.A.

RESEARCH TO *practice*

When Evidence-Based Practices do not produce desired effects: Should we throw the baby out with the bathwater?

Nowadays, many administrators embrace the notion of using research to inform policies and practices in schools. But, what happens when policies, practices, and frameworks that are empirically supported through rigorous research do not produce the desired results when implemented in school settings? Should we abandon those practices and start over? Unfortunately, this scenario happens more often than not. In fact, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) recently released the results of a research study evaluating Response to Intervention (RtI) practices for elementary school reading this past November (www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20164000/). Response to Intervention (RtI) is an empirically validated framework shown to produce positive outcomes for students when implemented with fidelity. Many districts around the country are in the process of implementing this framework, and RtI is supported in ESEA and IDEA legislation. The IES study compared a reference sample of elementary schools in 13 states to an impact sample of 146 elementary schools with three or more years of implementing the RtI framework in the area of reading. This study did not focus on the overall effectiveness of RtI, rather, it focused on comparing students who scored just above the district identified proficiency target to students who scored just below. One of the findings that is generating a great deal of interest is that for students who score just below the school-determined eligibility cut point in Grade 1, assignment to receive reading interventions did not improve reading outcomes and, in fact, produced negative impacts. After the findings of this study were released, my e-mail account was flooded with reactions and questions regarding the study. The most common response was “panic” and whether this study meant that districts should stop implementing an RtI framework. The short answer is no.

Before I expand on my response, I think it is helpful to briefly review the key research behind effective use of RtI known as implementation science. Implementation science is the study of methods that influence the integration of evidence-based interventions into practice settings. Implementation science helps answer the following questions. Why do established programs lose effectiveness over days, weeks, or months? Why do tested programs sometimes exhibit unintended effects when transferred to a new setting? The real message

around implementation science is that effective intervention practices or models coupled with ineffective or inefficient implementation will result in ineffective, unsustainable program and outcomes! Implementation science focuses on stages of implementation over time and implementation “drivers” that provide the infrastructure needed for effective implementation that support high fidelity, effective, and sustainable programs.



Kim Gibbons, Ph.D.
Associate Director
Center for Applied Research
and Educational Improvement

Circling back to the recent RtI study, were the results surprising? Not really. As a field, we recognize the difficulty around scaling up evidence-based practices. The results of the RtI study confirmed that it really was a study about “scaling” and not about the effects of the framework on student outcomes. It confirmed that it is difficult to implement educational initiatives on a large scale. While an in-depth analysis of the study is outside the scope of this article (the report was over 300 pages long), there are some important “takeaways” from the study. First, effective universal instruction (Tier 1) is critical and needs to be the priority. All too often, I have observed districts with large numbers of students below proficiency standards who devote most of their time, energy, and resources to developing Tier 2 and 3 interventions for all students below target. Unfortunately, most districts do not have the resources to provide supplemental and intensive interventions to all students below target. More energy and resources need to be directed at improving universal instruction to prevent large numbers of students from needing supplemental and intensive support. Second, districts need to identify effective interventions that match students’ needs. While many of the buildings in the “impact study” reported using Tier 2 interventions, we do not know whether interventions were research-based or matched to student need. Many schools in the study focused their interventions in the area of fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, but even if the study

When Evidence-Based Practices, continued on page 13.

The Political Roller Coaster Ride Lives on in Washington

While spending a week in July in the sweltering heat of DC for the CASE Legislative Conference, we witnessed the excitement and frenzy of the both the House and Senate as they worked to move forward their proposed bills to reauthorize the ESEA. This was an opportune time to engage our representatives in both the House and Senate on the issues faced by schools across Minnesota and to provide some practical insight on the impact of the proposed language in both the House and Senate bills.

During our visits to the Hill we were able to meet with all but one of our state representatives. We shared our support and enthusiasm for moving forward the reauthorization of ESEA and encouraged them to pursue the reauthorization of IDEA once this legislation was enacted. Our discussions with legislators and their staff was a change from previous visits in that the focus was on regular education legislation (ESEA) versus discussion surrounding the re-authorization of IDEA. Throughout our conversations we emphasized that the health of regular education was predictive of positive outcomes for students with disabilities. The following were our talking points:

1. Support for greater flexibility within Maintenance of Effort rules.
2. Opposition to allowing portability of Title I or other Federal funds from high need schools to any school. This portability proposes to allow for funds to follow a student, regardless of the resources of the school and has the potential to decimate Title I services in high poverty schools.
3. Appreciate funds flowing to special education and making the case that an overall increase in educational funding was necessary.
4. Sequester rules needed to be modified or ended and caps removed.
5. Appreciate that monitoring of educational progress no longer came with punitive measures. By contrast, we emphasized that data collection was valuable and that disaggregation of the data had and would continue to serve to shed light on groups of students who were under-performing.
6. General opposition to moving federal funds to private

schools (vouchers).

7. Support for increased flexibility across targeted funding streams.

A highlight from the trip was seeing how many representative Aides recognized John Klaber, Executive Director for MASE. John reiterated that he was their Minnesota contact and was willing and able to provide them with timely feedback from members of our organization on most any topic related to public education.

Just before the Thanksgiving break, Sen. Lamar Alexander, R-Tenn., Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., Reps. John Kline, R-Minn., and Bobby Scott, D-Va., announced that they have a framework for moving forward on the long-stalled rewrite of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The goal is to pass a bill to revise the ESEA—the current version of which is the No Child Left Behind Act—for the first time in 15 years, by the end of 2015. ●



Mary Clarkson
Director of Special Programs
Richfield Public Schools

Have you renewed your MASE membership?

Membership materials have been mailed. For more information or additional membership materials, contact the MASE office at (651) 645-6272 or members@mnasa.org or visit our website at www.mnase.org.

Quality Conferences
Network of Your Colleagues
Skill Development Workshops
Publications
State and National Legislative Advocacy
and Much More!

CASE Matters to Us in MN

MOE. Reauthorization of IDEA. Reauthorization of ESEA. Vouchers. These are all issues looming on the horizon that matter to us in Minnesota. And, since CASE takes an active role in these and other issues impacting special education by providing resources and materials, leading discussions with stakeholders, and providing professional development valuable to leaders in special education, CASE (Council of Administrators of Special Education) matters to our work.

We have significant work to do each and every day within our districts and the state, making it very difficult to stay in sync with committee meetings and events happening at the federal level. Yet, because we are a unit within CASE, we have a presence on Capitol Hill through CASE that keeps abreast of all issues and regularly meets with members of Congress. Then three times a year CASE brings members together from each state to find out what matters to all of us at the local and state level, giving us a chance to provide guidance and direction to CASE around the issues.

Recently, Mary Clarkson (MASE president-elect) and I (CASE liaison) attended the fall CASE board meeting in Atlanta, giving us a chance to provide input to the issues at the forefront of special education. During those 2 days, it became even more apparent to me why it matters that our Minnesota group is part of the CEC/CASE organization. Even though work seems to move "slower than molasses" on Capitol Hill, once things are in the news, it can be too late to then jump into that work since so much has already happened. CASE is a strong voice that shapes policy. Being part of the discussion early and often matters!

One issue at the forefront of work at the federal level is regarding Maintenance of Effort (MOE). For the last four years, CASE has been working with other national organizations (i.e., AASA, the School Superintendents' Association) to address concerns expressed by CASE members. CASE provided input to a recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report that calls for more flexible spending requirements while protecting services. CASE has also been a voice on Capitol Hill that districts should not be penalized when requirements of IDEA are maintained but efficiencies found. The presence of CASE providing input, justification, examples, and solutions has mattered; this past year was the first time that many on Capitol Hill were aware of the need to make changes to

MOE.

The groundswell of attention at the national level and within states around dyslexia, dyscalculia, and dysgraphia also is an area in which CASE is working. CASE has led the work with AASA, NASP, NASDSE, NEA, NSBA and other educational groups, in clearly explaining IDEA eligibility and providing rationale why it is not necessary to include those terms (or other medical diagnoses) in an IEP to ensure appropriate services are provided. It really does matter that CASE has been the leading voice that IDEA establishes educational eligibility criteria rather than a medical diagnosis of a disease or disorder.

Professional development also matters for our continued growth and development as leaders in our districts and the state. CASE knows that professional development matters and has now partnered with NASDSE (National Association for State Directors of Special Education) to do a joint conference. Next fall (September 25-27, 2016) will be the first joint national CASE-NASDSE conference and will be held in Milwaukee, WI. This joint venture is aimed at increasing collaboration at the state and local level as well as the organizational collaboration at the national level. With this endeavor being next door in Wisconsin, mark the dates on your calendar! This partnership with NASDSE is important for the work and presence of CASE -- which in turn matters for us even at the state and local level.

So, as you're working on all the myriad of issues and situations that come your way as a special education administrator, be sure to remember that CASE is a resource for you in many ways: policy, materials/products, and professional development, www.casecec.org. It really does matter that CASE is a strong national organization that provides leadership and support to us by shaping policies and practices that impact the quality of education. It matters to us as leaders in special education and it matters to the students who are impacted by our leadership. ●



Jill Skarvold
CASE Liaison, MASE

MnSELF *history*

Special Education Administration: How it Evolved in Minnesota

Deb Wall
MnSELF President

Dr. Norena Hale
Special Education Consultant

The MnSELF (Minnesota Special Education Leaders Foundation) has sponsored the research and drafting of a historical book on special education administration in Minnesota. The work was funded through Minnesota Historical & Cultural Heritage Grants under the Legacy Funds.

Dr. Norena Hale was hired to conduct the research and drafting. She is now coordinating the layout design and publication of the document as approved by the Minnesota Historical Society. It is expected the book will be available next spring.

Following are some excerpts from the overview:

Education in Minnesota began when it became a Territory in 1849 and a state in 1858. The first education administrators were state department of education superintendents, most often ministers, and town superintendents in each township, both positions appointed with no requirements.

When three or four one-room schoolhouses came together, it was considered a graded school, still mostly for grades one through eight. A principal teacher was appointed as the head teacher with no extra compensation at first. This position gradually evolved into the elementary principal position as more one-room schoolhouses were brought into the graded school. The principal teacher position also evolved into the superintendent position in growing cities by specific legislative permission.

For many years, there were ungraded schools, graded schools, elementary school districts, high schools, and secondary schools. Not until the consolidated schools movement were the positions of elementary principal, secondary principal, and superintendent brought together into a single school district.

The education of children with disabilities in Minnesota followed a different path. At first the families of these children were encouraged and sometimes mandated to place their handicapped child in state institutions. Physicians or ministers were in charge and little or no education was provided until much, much later. At the same time charitable

organizations, mostly Catholic, created orphanages and schools for the “unfortunate” as many referred to these children.

The first law was passed in 1915 authorizing public schools to provide services and receive state aid “if they had five children” of a single disability, “the deaf, the blind, the mentally subnormal, and speech defectives. Often it was the mothers that wanted an education for their child who taught these classes. As these classes expanded, supervisory positions began as principals in special segregated schools. Then the state department of education began, informally at first then more formally, interpreting special program supervision standards for agriculture, industrial arts to include supervisors for special classes for handicapped children.

All along the way, parent and other advocates increased pressure on the legislature and schools to provide and expand educational services. This advocacy finally led to a 1957 law requiring special education services for most children “who are educable” – one of the first in the nation.

Program supervision evolved first for each disability area. In 1967 the Title VI amendment was added to the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA). Federal monies were used to encourage the creation of special education administration in larger single districts and in inter-district cooperatives in rural areas. These positions were added to the consolidated schools bringing together general and special education administration in all schools by the late 1970s.

The MnSELF is a 501(c)(3) non-profit charitable corporation created to support: (1) Workshops to encourage/help individuals determine if they wish to pursue a career as a special education administrator; (2) Training/mentorship for new special education administrators; (3) Training/support for veteran special education administrators and (4) Researching and documenting the history of special education.

Deb Wall, MnSELF President, believes this work is of historical significance and the soon to be published document will be helpful in developing future special education leaders. She stated “knowing where our field has been helps us understand and develop the systems that will meet the needs of students with disabilities in the future.” She also acknowledged Claudine Knoblauch’s, **Special Education Administration, continued on page 13.**

WELCOME

new members

Tami Alphas, Ass't. Director of Special Services, Albert Lea Area Schools

Jennifer Babiracki, Special Education Supervisor, Anoka-Hennepin School District

Michelle Barries, Special Education Supervisor, South Washington County Schools

Melissa Brateng, Admin. Intern-Special Education, Intermediate School District 287

Christine Breen, Student Support Services Supervisor, Minnetonka Public Schools

Brent Brunetta, Director of Special Education, Grand Rapids School District

Kate Butkowski, Supervisor of Special Education, St. Cloud Area Schools

Cheryl Carbone, Director of Special Education, MN Transitions Charter School

Jennifer Davie, Special Education Coordinator, Hopkins Public Schools

Janeen Eddie, Special Education Coordinator, Byron Public Schools

Jenna Eder, Special Education Coordinator, Belle Plaine & Jordan Public Schools

Cheryl Flowe-Rance, Grad Student, The Harvest Network of Schools

Jennifer Grabow, Program Manager-Early Childhood, Moorhead Area Public Schools

Dena Hagen, Ass't. Director of Special Services, Duluth Schools

Maggie Helwig, Ass't. Director/Principal, Goodhue County Education District

Robin Henslin, Special Services Supervisor, Wayzata Public Schools

Zacary Holm, Director of Special Services, Eagle Ridge Academy

Kate Hulse, Admin. Intern-Mental Health, Intermediate School District 287

Alicia Jepsen, Director of Early Childhood Programs, St. Cloud Area Schools

Heather Johnson, Program Supervisor-Special Education, Anoka-Hennepin School District

Deb Jokela, Supervisor of Special Education, St. Cloud Area Schools

Emily Kafle, Director of Special Education, Lionsgate Academy

Ryan Kasl, Special Education Coordinator, Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools

Jen Lecy, Special Education Coordinator, St. Cloud Area Schools

Sara Lein, Ass't. Director of Special Education, West St. Paul-Mendota Hgts-Eagan Area Schools

Dana Maney, ECSE Supervisor, N. St. Paul-Maplewood-Oakdale School District

Craig Mares, Ass't. Director of Special Services, Farmington Area Public Schools

Mary Ann Martin, Director of Special Education, Dilworth-Glyndon-Felton School District

Sarah McGuire, Special Services Coordinator, Owatonna Schools

Jessica Metke, Special Education Program Facilitator, Minneapolis Public Schools

Jill Moes, Special Services Supervisor, South Washington County Schools

Jill Murphy, Director of Care & Treatment/Alt. Prog., St. Cloud Area Schools

Nicole Norton, Director of Special Services, Brooklyn Center Community Schools

Karen Nudell, Director of Federal Programs, Detroit Lakes Schools

Tony Pierce, Ass't. Principal of Special Services, Grand Rapids School District

Kris Pitt, Supervisor of Special Education, St. Cloud Area Schools

Carol Potter, Executive Director of Student Services, St. Cloud Area Schools

Sara Richards, Ass't. Director of Student Support Services, Alexandria School District

Reed Sather, EBD Coordinator, Faribault Public Schools

Laura Seifert-Hertling, Director of Special Services, Fridley Public Schools

Sonni Sellner, Special Services Supervisor, St. Francis School District

Billie Jo Steen, Principal, Moose Lake Community Schools

Amy Sward, Special Education Coordinator, Lakeville Area Public Schools

Wendy Van Batavia, Ass't. Director of Special Education, Midwest Special Education Cooperative

John Weekley, Supervisor of Special Education, St. Cloud Area Schools

Lindsay Woodard, Ass't. Director of Special Education, Goodhue County Education District

Jana Zaremba, Special Education Teacher, Stillwater Area, Public Schools

Bev Zelinski, Student Services Coordinator, Mounds View Public Schools

BUSINESS

partners

Special thanks to our 2015-16 MASE Business Partners!

The MASE Business Partnerships program strengthens the ties between MASE members and their collaborative partners in the public, private and non-profit sectors. Our goal is to advance the field of special education and improve student outcomes with an emphasis on proven, evidence-based practices.

Tier 1

Bethel University
cmERDC
Eide Bailly LLP
Foster, Jacobs & Johnson, Inc.
Kennedy & Graven, Chartered
Media Line Communications
Robert W. Baird & Co.
Rethink
Rupp, Anderson, Squires & Waldspurger, P.A.

Scholastic
SpEd Forms
Strategic Staffing Solutions
Transition Assessments and Curriculum
UCP/Infinitec
University of St. Thomas, Dept. of
Special & Gifted Education
University of Wisconsin-Stout
WestEd

Tier 2

Booth Law Group, LLC
Knutson, Flynn & Deans, P.A.
Ratwik, Roszak, & Maloney, P.A.
West Metro Learning Connections, Inc.

Tier 3

Achieve3000
Curriculum Associates
Pemberton Law
Voyager Sopris Learning

When Evidence-Based Practices, from page 8.

demonstrated that the right students were selected and received intervention (which was not the case), the quality of what students received at Tier 2 appears to have been inconsistently implemented and not matched to the needs of the students. Would we expect students to benefit from an intervention that did not target their skill deficit? Finally, collecting data on the fidelity of implementation of interventions is extremely important so that decisions about effectiveness of interventions are based on interventions that were actually implemented correctly and with adequate time and frequency. While participants in the Rtl study were asked about fidelity, it was not directly assessed. So, at the end of the day, it is hard to know what actually occurred during the Tier 2 interventions.

In summary, why do established programs lose effectiveness over days, weeks, or months? Why do tested programs sometimes exhibit unintended effects when transferred to a new setting? My message is that it is all about implementation. Districts must use implementation science to bring evidence-based practices to scale, AND they must collect objective data on the fidelity of implementation. Let's not throw the baby out with the bathwater when we find unexpected outcomes. Rather, let's continue focusing on the research and providing

Special Education Administration, from page 11.

previous MnSELF president, work in the initial MN Historical Society grant and Dr. Norena Hale's many talents in accomplishing this important work.

Watch for the announcement of the history being available through MnSELF, Amazon.com, and other places in the Spring 2016. ●

References

1. (During the early history of helping children and other people with disabilities, the word "unfortunate" was often used to refer to them instead of handicapped or disabled. Oscar Sullivan in his book, *Disabled Persons: Their Education and Rehabilitation* (1926), referred to "the unfortunate of the world" in his summary of the history. See Figure 10. At the national Conference of Charities and Correction in 1896, Professor Folwell referred to the "increase of this unfortunate class.")

2. (Laws of Minnesota, Chapter 238, Section 1, 1915)

3. (Laws of Minnesota, Chapter 867, Sections 1 - 4, 1957; Note: The language about children "who are educable" or a child "who is educable" was not removed from state statute until 1985 when Minnesota Statutes 1984, section 120.03, subdivision 1 was amended).

2015

Thursday - Friday, December 24-25
Winter Holiday - MASE Offices Closed

2016

Friday, January 1
Winter Holiday - MASE Offices Closed

Friday, January 15
MASE Leadership Issues, Sauk Rapids Gov't. Center

Monday, February 15
Summer Newsletter Submissions Due

Wednesday, March 9
MASE Board of Director's Meeting
MASE New Leaders Cohort V
At Ruth's Table
Marriott NW, Brooklyn Park

Thursday-Friday, March 10-11
MASA/MASE Spring Conference, Marriott NW,
Brooklyn Park

Tuesday, March 22
MASE Day at the Capitol

Friday, March 25
Spring Holiday - MASE Offices Closed

Wednesday - Saturday, April 13-16
CASE CEC, St. Louis, MO

Friday, April 22
MASE Leadership Issues, Sauk Rapids Gov't. Center

Wednesday, May 4
MASE New Leaders Cohort VI, Madden's, Brainerd

Monday, May 16
Summer Newsletter Submissions Due

Wednesday - Friday, May 4-6
MASE Best Practices Conference, Madden's, Brainerd

Monday, May 30
Memorial Day Holiday - MASE Offices Closed

Thursday-Friday, June 16-17
MASE Board of Directors Retreat, Madden's, Brainerd

Wednesday, June 22
MASE New Leaders Cohort VII - Director's Session,
MASE Offices, St. Paul

Friday, August 2
Fall Newsletter Submissions Due

Wednesday-Friday, October 26-28
MASE Fall Leadership Conference, Cragun's, Brainerd

Monday, November 14
Winter Newsletter Submissions Due

Save the Date!

MASE Day at the Capitol Tuesday, March 22, 2016

The day will begin with a breakfast and legislative meeting starting at 8 am at the Best Western Capitol Ridge and the group will then head to the Capitol to meet with various legislators. The group will then reconvene back at the hotel at around 2:30 pm.

If you are interested in staying overnight at the Best Western Capitol Ridge on March 21 or 22, please request the MASE group rate. The rate is \$119.99 a night. Please call (651) 227-8711.

All MASE members are welcome to attend. Questions? Please contact John Klaber (jpklaber@gmail.com).

Are You Receiving Our Communications?

Let us know if you are not receiving any of our following publications:

- Weekly eUpdates
- General emails
- Quarterly newsletter
- Members Only website passwords

Please contact us at members@mnsa.org.