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| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review, document review and an interview indicated that whenever an evaluation indicated that a student has a disability on the autism spectrum, the IEP Team considered and specifically addressed the following:  1) the verbal and nonverbal communication needs of the student;  2) the need to develop social interaction skills and proficiencies;  3) the needs resulting from the student's unusual responses to sensory experiences;  4) the needs resulting from resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines;  5) the needs resulting from engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements;  6) the need for any positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports to address any behavioral difficulties resulting from autism spectrum disorder;  7) and other needs resulting from the student's disability that impact progress in the general curriculum, including social and emotional development. |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and an interview indicated that invited related service providers  (guidance counselor, school psychologist, speech pathologist) missed Team meetings without the parent and district agreeing in writing that the attendance of the Team member was not necessary, either because the member's area of the curriculum or related services was not being modified or discussed, or because the district and the parent agreed, in writing, to excuse a required Team member's participation and the excused member provided written input into the development of the IEP to the parent and the IEP Team prior to the meeting. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Develop procedures regarding the requirements for the excusal of an IEP Team member who cannot attend an IEP Team meeting, and review them with all appropriate staff members.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the district follows requirements if an IEP Team member cannot attend an IEP Team meeting. The tracking system should include supervisory oversight and periodic reviews by a designated person to ensure ongoing compliance.  Complete an internal review of a sample of IEP Team meetings, from the elementary, middle and high schools, conducted after corrective actions have been implemented, to determine if the district follows requirements when an IEP Team member needs to be excused.  \*Please note when conducting internal monitoring the district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the Department upon request: a) List of student names and grade levels for the records reviewed; b) Date of the review; c) Name of person(s) who conducted the review, with their role(s) and signature(s). | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit evidence (copy of procedures, meeting agenda, attendance sheet, and other materials, if any) that appropriate staff have been informed of requirements regarding IEP Team member excusals, by September 15, 2014.  Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system with periodic reviews, along with the name and the role of the designated person, by September 15, 2014.  Submit the results of the internal review of IEP Team meetings to ensure the procedures for the excusal of an IEP Team member who cannot attend an IEP Team meeting are being followed. Include the number of records reviewed, the number in compliance with this criterion, the root cause of any non-compliance, and the corrective actions the district will take to remedy any non-compliance, by January 15, 2015. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/15/2014 | 01/15/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| After determining whether a student is eligible for special education, the school district did not consistently provide to the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within forty-five (45) school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation, or re-evaluation. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Develop procedures regarding the requirement that after determining whether a student is eligible for special education, the school district must provide to the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within forty-five (45) school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation, or re-evaluation, and review them with appropriate staff members.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the district provides to the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within required timelines. The tracking system should include supervisory oversight and periodic reviews by a designated person to ensure ongoing compliance.  Complete an internal review of a sample of IEP Team meetings, from the elementary, middle and high schools, conducted after corrective actions have been completed, to determine if the district provides to the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written statement of no eligibility within required timelines.  \*Please note when conducting internal monitoring the district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the Department upon request: a) List of student names and grade levels for the records reviewed; b) Date of the review; c) Name of person(s) who conducted the review, with their role(s) and signature(s). | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit evidence (copy of procedures, meeting agenda, attendance sheet, other materials, if any) that appropriate staff have been informed of the requirement to provide to the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within required timelines, by September 15, 2014.  Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system with periodic reviews, along with the name and the role of the designated person, by September 15, 2014.  Submit the results of the internal review of IEP Team meetings to ensure that the district provides the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within required timelines. Include the number of records reviewed, the number in compliance with this criterion, the root cause of any non-compliance, and the corrective actions the district will take to remedy any non-compliance, by January 15, 2015. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/15/2014 | 01/15/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and an interview indicated that progress reports were complete and addressed all of the goals in the IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and an interview indicated that at least annually, on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, a Team meeting was held to consider the student's progress and to review, revise, or develop a new IEP or refer the student for a re-evaluation, as appropriate. During the review period the district did not use an amendment to change the placement of a student without the benefit of a Team meeting. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review, documents, and an interview indicated that the IEP Team consistently completed the Present Levels of Educational Performance: B Other Educational Needs (PLEP B) forms for all students who had other educational needs, such as language needs for an English Language Learner or age specific considerations.  Whenever the IEP Team evaluation indicated that a student's disability affected the social skills development, or when the student's disability made him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment, or teasing, the IEP addressed the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing. For students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum, the IEP Team considered and specifically addressed the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing. |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and an interview indicated that the district provided the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement immediately following the development of the IEP; or a summary, followed by two copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement within 10 days of the Team meeting. |

| **SE Criterion # 24 - Notice to parent regarding proposal or refusal to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the student or the provision of FAPE** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and an interview indicated that the district gives notice within a reasonable time. The Notice of Proposed School District Action form (N1) is consistently placed in student files and contains the responses to the following federally required questions:  1. What action is the school district proposing to take?  2. Why is the school district proposing to act?  3. What rejected options were considered and why was each option rejected?  4. What evaluation procedure, test, record or report was used as a basis for the proposed action?  5. What other factors were relevant to the school district’s decision?  6. What next steps, if any, are recommended? |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and an interview indicated that during the review period no parent gave consent for special education services and then revoked consent to those special education services. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The district provided the student roster documentation required by the Department. |

| **SE Criterion # 29 - Communications are in English and primary language of home** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and an interview indicated that the district communicates with parents in simple and commonly understood words in both English and the primary language of the home if such primary language is other than English. |

| **SE Criterion # 45 - Procedures for suspension up to 10 days and after 10 days: General requirements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| See SE 46. |

| **SE Criterion # 46 - Procedures for suspension of students with disabilities when suspensions exceed 10 consecutive school days or a pattern has developed for suspensions exceeding 10 cumulative days; responsibilities of the Team; responsibilities of the district** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review, documents and an interview indicated that prior to a suspension that constitutes a change in placement for a student with disabilities, district personnel, the parent, and other relevant members of the Team, met to review all relevant information in the student's file, including the IEP, any teacher observations, and parent information, to determine whether the behavior was caused by or was related to the disability or was the result of the district's failure to implement the IEP. During the review period, no student was placed in an interim alternative educational setting. |

| **SE Criterion # 54 - Professional development** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and an interview indicated that the district provides in-service training for all locally hired and contracted transportation providers before they begin transporting any special education student receiving special transportation. |

| **SE Criterion # 55 - Special education facilities and classrooms** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Observation and an interview indicated that two substantially separate classrooms that had been located in the basement of Elm Street School were moved upstairs and the special education students were included into the life of the school and were given the same priority as general education students in the allocation of instructional space. |