

2635

Buckheit, James

From: Allison Brink [akbrink@ptd.net]
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2007 7:23 PM
To: Buckheit, James
Subject: Re: Comments on Chapter 16

Thank you Mr. Buckheit. I would like to be added to your mailing list. Please send to:
Allison Brink
7763 Carlton Rd.
Coopersburg, PA 18036

On Oct 1, 2007, at 10:42 AM, Buckheit, James wrote:

Dear Ms. Brink:

Thank you for your comments. They will be considered as "official" comments submitted in response to the proposed changes published by the State Board of Education in the September 8, 2007 edition of the Pennsylvania Bulletin. As required by the Regulatory Review Act, your comments will be shared with the chairs of the House and Senate Education Committees and the Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC). They will also be shared with each member of the State Board of Education.

Should you wish to be notified and receive a copy of the final regulations when they are submitted to the legislative committees and IRRC for approval, please send me your mailing (not email) address and you will be added to our mailing list.

Jim Buckheit

Executive Director

State Board of Education

333 Market Street

Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

-----Original Message-----

From: Allison Brink [mailto:akbrink@ptd.net]
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2007 12:32 PM

10/2/2007

To: j buckheit@state.pa.us
Subject: Comments on Chapter 16

Dear Mr. Buckheit,

The biggest problem with Chapter 16 is that there is nothing written about compliance. School should have to comply with Chapter 16 or face action from the PDE. I understand that compliance checks began last year. However, simply determining if a child has had a GIEP is not sufficient. It is a good place to start. The PDE should be determining if a school district is in compliance with ALL the regulations of Chapter 16. If the district is not, they should be afforded a set amount of time to become compliant, or face a large monetary penalty or withdrawal of funding. Schools must take Chapter 16 seriously.

A GIEP is identified as a Gifted Individualized Education Program. It seems that many districts do not understand the meaning. A full explanation should be written into the statutes.

Present level of Education Performance needs to be defined with examples. School districts routinely use the child's grades from the previous years and PSSA scores to define PLEPs. Neither of which tells the team the student's level of performance.

Teachers should be required to complete some continuing education credits on gifted education on a yearly basis. As it stands now, the school district has to offer courses on gifted education; the teachers do not have to attend. Every teacher will have a gifted student in his or her classroom; they should know how to teach them. Our colleges do not properly prepare teachers to teach gifted students. Most courses of study in Pennsylvania cover gifted education in one day. Gifted students have needs that are not being met by our teachers.

Finally, our state of Pennsylvania does not properly fund gifted education. We must realize that many of our gifted students are our future leaders, researchers, writers, philosophers. Our gifted students spend too much time in classrooms watching other children learn and not being challenged in any way. We must provide funding to educate our teachers to teach gifted students; we must provide funding so that there are appropriate resources in the classroom for gifted students; and we must provide funding so that our gifted teachers are not overloaded.

10/2/2007

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments.

Sincerely,

Allison Brink

akbrink@ptd.net

7763 Carlton Rd.

Coopersburg, PA 18036

610-838-6831

10/2/2007

