

# 2635

**From:** Independent Regulatory Review Commission [No-Reply@irrc.state.pa.us]  
**Sent:** Sunday, September 14, 2008 3:57 AM  
**To:** Help  
**Subject:** IRRC Website - New Message



# IRRC

## Independent Regulatory Review Commission

A new message has arrived from the IRRC Website

**First Name:** Tim

**Last Name:** McGuire

**Company:**

**Email:** [gifted@fm.st](mailto:gifted@fm.st)

**Subject:** Comment on Regulation 6-307; Title 22, Chapter 16

**Message:**

Dear Chairman Coccodrilli: I am a retired teacher, mayor of Homewood Borough, PA, and the parent of a profoundly gifted child. I write to urge you, and the other Commissioners, to disapprove the proposed regulation, 6-307, at the scheduled IRRC Public Meeting on September 18th, 2008. The comments you have received from the National Association of Gifted Children, the preeminent authority on gifted education, should be enough to consider the need for revision. The letter you received from Todd McIntyre, Applied Gifted Ed, describes in great detail the many issues that urgently need to be resolved in the proposed regulation. The proposed revisions do not represent a fundamental, substantive improvement for the education of more than 68,000 gifted children in the Commonwealth. Most importantly, the regulation does not have "teeth" when it comes to compliance. There is nothing in the regulation that compels school districts to comply with the regulations. And there is nothing in the regulation to suggest that compliance monitoring, which now takes place in only 10 out of 501 districts per year, will improve. At the current level of monitoring it would take over 50 years to assess compliance in the state. Because the current monitoring process only reviews ten gifted student records in ten districts, per year, it would take 680 years to get a complete picture of compliance in the commonwealth. This is incredulous in an age where one individual with a PC could easily analyze and report on basic compliance for every student in the Commonwealth for pennies, per student, per year. What happens when a district is out of compliance? What do they have to lose if, in the very, very small chance they are monitored and found out of compliance? Not much. Is the current 30 cents per year, per gifted student, as it is currently spent, enough to ensure an appropriate education for our gifted children . . . if it is even decided to continue the current level of spending? The regulation does not require even this minuscule amount of expenditure for compliance monitoring. Lastly, you have received comment in support of these regulatory changes from PAGE. Please be aware that the comments you have received from PAGE are not representative of its membership. There was no vote of the membership on this subject. In fact, discussion of this subject was disallowed on its discussion board. Any email raising concerns about the regulation was censored and not posted. Those who insisted on discussing it were banned from the discussion board. At the annual PAGE Business Meeting of its membership, any member who wished to discuss the regulations was silenced and threatened with removal. My point is this. Any comment on this regulation from PAGE is not from its membership but instead from a handful of individuals on the Board. It is not in anyway representative of its members . . . a group that has dwindled considerably due to its refusal to have an open discussion on this very issue. NAGC, the well-respected parent organization of PAGE, disagrees with PAGE on approval of the proposed regulation in its current form. PAGE also is currently in court over their refusal to allow discussion of this very issue. Please take all of this into consideration when you review the comments that have been submitted on this regulation. The fate of more than 68,000 of our brightest children is in your hands. A little time for revision of this important regulation isn't much to ask considering what is at stake. Sincerely, Tim McGuire