MEMORANDUM

To: SCPD Policy & Law Committee

From: Brian J. Hartman

Re: Recent Regulatory Initiative

Date: September 12, 2016

Consistent with the requests of the SCPD and GACEC, I am providing an analysis of one (1) final regulation published in the September Registry of Regulations. Given time constraints, the analysis should be considered preliminary and non-exhaustive.

DOE Final IEP Regulation [20 DE Reg. 172 (September 1, 2016)]

The SCPD and GACEC commented on the initial version of this proposed regulation in February, 2016. The Department of Education then published a revised proposed regulation in May which incorporated some revisions suggested by the Councils. The Councils issued comments on the May version. A copy of the May 25 SCPD letter is attached for facilitated reference. The commentary focused on the notice of IEP meeting omitting an overview of procedural safeguards. The DOE proposed to require merely an “offer” of procedural safeguards at the meeting itself:

22.2.3 A full copy of the procedural safeguards under state and federal law and regulations shall be offered to the parents at the IEP meeting.

The DOE has now adopted a final regulation which reflects a compromise with two improvements: 1) a summary of the procedural safeguards is included with the notice; and 2) a full copy of the procedural safeguards is not merely offered, but given, to the parent at the meeting. At 174. The final regulation represents a significant improvement over the proposed version.

Since the regulation is final, the Councils may wish to consider either taking no further action or sharing a “thank-you” communication to the DOE for adopting a revised standard.

Attachment

E:legis/2016/916bils
F:pub/bjh/legis/p&d2016/916bils
May 25, 2016

Ms. Tina Shockey, Education Associate  
Department of Education  
401 Federal Street, Suite 2  
Dover, DE 19901

RE: 19 DE Reg. 969 [DOE Revised Proposed IEP Regulation (5/1/16)]

Dear Ms. Shockey:

The State Council for Persons with Disabilities (SCPD) has reviewed the Department of Education’s (DOE’s) revised proposal to amend its IEP standards. DOE issued an initial proposed regulation amending its IEP standards in February 2016. SCPD commented on that initiative on February 22, 2016. Instead of issuing a final regulation, the DOE is now publishing a revised proposed regulation which covers additional standards and was published as 19 DE Reg. 969 in the May 1, 2016 issue of the Register of Regulations. SCPD has the following observations on the latest proposal.

First, the DOE incorporates edits verbatim based on the “First” and “Third” recommendations in the SCPD’s February 22 letter. Council appreciates that DOE considered its recommendations.

Second, in its February 22 letter, the SCPD identified a “disconnect” between §22.2.3 and State statute, 14 Del.C. §3134(1). The DOE permits “offering” (but not automatically providing) a copy of procedural safeguards at the conclusion of an IEP meeting. The statute contemplates provision of the procedural safeguards with the notice (§3134(1)). The DOE views a “notice of meeting” as not covered by §3134(1). At 969. This makes little sense. Even if arguably permitted under federal law, State law can exceed minimum federal standards. Consider the following:

A. Section 3134(8) contemplates a norm of schools providing a copy of the proposed IEP with the notice. This ostensibly represents a proposal to change a student’s FAPE and Section 3133 therefore requires issuance of a §3134-compliant notice, i.e., one which includes “a full explanation of all of the procedural safeguards available to the parents under state and federal law and regulations.”

B. If the compliant notice is not provided prior to the meeting, the parent will not be aware of sources of legal and other assistance (e.g. DLP; PIC) [§3134(6)]; recent test and
evaluation results [§3134(3)]; and other factors underlying the proposed changes to the IEP [§3134(4)].

C. Providing information about rights at the conclusion of an IEP meeting, rather than prior to the meeting, undermines effective parental participation. It is inherently a dysfunctional approach to promoting informed parental participation in the meeting.

Thank you for your consideration and please contact SCPD if you have any questions or comments regarding our observations on the proposed regulation.

Sincerely,

Daniese McMullin-Powell, Chairperson
State Council for Persons with Disabilities

cc: The Honorable Matthew Denn
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Mr. Brian Hartman, Esq.
Developmental Disabilities Council
Governor’s Advisory Council for Exceptional Citizens

19reg969 IEP 5-1-16