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| **SE Criterion # 1 - Assessments are appropriately selected and interpreted for students referred for evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record reviews and interviews indicated that the district conducts comprehensive evaluations for students with speech language needs, including relevant functional and developmental information from a variety of sources such as student performance, remedial supports, prior assessments, teacher and parent input, and the student's cumulative record.In addition, a review of student records confirmed that in cases where the student's primary language is not English, the district consistently ensures that evaluations are provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the student knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally by establishing the student’s language dominance prior to conducting the assessments. |

| **SE Criterion # 2 - Required and optional assessments** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that the district routinely provides educational assessments, including a history of the student's educational progress in the general education curriculum and teacher assessments that address attention skills, participation behaviors, communication skills, memory and social relations with groups, peers and adults.  |

| **SE Criterion # 3 - Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that when a student is suspected of having a specific learning disability, IEP Teams consistently use the required components to document the student’s disability: Historical Review and Educational Assessment, Area of Concern and Evaluation Method, Exclusionary Factors, and Observation. In addition, IEP Teams consistently create a written determination as to whether or not the student has a specific learning disability, which is signed by all members of the Team. |

| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that whenever an evaluation indicates that a student has a disability on the autism spectrum, IEP Teams use a checklist to guide the consideration of student verbal and nonverbal communication; social interaction skills and proficiencies; unusual responses to sensory experiences; resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines; engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements; positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports; and other needs that impact progress in the general curriculum, including social and emotional development. Areas of need that are identified during IEP development are addressed as goals and accommodations. |

| **SE Criterion # 6 - Determination of transition services** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that the district consistently discusses and documents the student's transitional needs annually, beginning when the student is 14 years old, by completing a Transitional Planning Form (TPF). |

| **SE Criterion # 7 - Transfer of parental rights at age of majority and student participation and consent at the age of majority** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that the district consistently informs students and parents one year prior to the student reaching age 18 of the transference of educational decision-making rights to the student upon attainment of the age of majority. |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that when a required Team member cannot attend an IEP meeting, the district secures the parent's agreement in writing to excuse the Team member prior to the meeting. The required excused Team member provides written input in advance of the meeting to the parent and IEP Team for development of the IEP. Interviews indicated that the district and parent agree in writing when excusing Team members who are not necessary because their area of the curriculum or services is not being modified or discussed. |

| **SE Criterion # 9A - Elements of the eligibility determination; general education accommodations and services for ineligible students** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that when a student is found not eligible for special education, IEP Teams consistently consider a variety of supports, including remedial interventions and eligibility for accommodations under a Section 504 plan. This information is documented in the Notice of School District Refusal to Act (N2). |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that whenever the IEP Team evaluation indicates that a student's disability affects social skills development or a student's disability makes him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment, or teasing, the IEP addresses 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 considers and specifically addresses 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:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that following the development of the IEP, the district consistently provides a Team meeting summary and sends two copies of the proposed IEP and placement within 10 days to the parent. |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that when a student is removed from the general education classroom, the IEP Team consistently states why the removal is considered critical to the student's program and the basis for its conclusion that education of the student in a less restrictive environment, with the use of supplementary aids and services, could not be achieved satisfactorily. |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Not Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and interviews confirmed that the district has not developed a written notice and process to discontinue special education services based on a parent’s written revocation of consent. At the time of the mid-cycle review, the district did not have any current records for parent revocation of consent.  |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| Please review the Department’s Administrative Advisory SPED 2010-1 at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/10_1.html> before developing the district’s corrective action.Develop a written notice and process for parent revocation of consent using the Department’s guidance.Conduct training for all IEP Team chairpersons and any relevant staff on the newly developed notice and process for parent revocation of consent.Develop a report of the results of an internal review of records in which a parent has revoked consent to a student's special education services in writing following the implementation of the district's corrective actions. **\*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 the student names and grade levels for the records reviewed; b) Date of the review; c) Name of person(s) who conducted the review, their role(s), and signature(s).** |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** |
| Submit the district's newly developed notice and process regarding parent revocation of consent. This progress report is due **November 7, 2014.**Submit evidence of training to IEP Team chairpersons and key staff and include the agenda, training date, signed attendance sheets indicating the title/role of staff and the name and title of the presenter by **November 7, 2014.**Submit the results of a review of student records and include the following: 1) The number of records reviewed; 2)The number of records in compliance; 3) For any records not in compliance, determine the root cause; and 4) The specific corrective actions taken to remedy the non-compliance. This progress report is due **February 23, 2015.** |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 11/07/2014 | 02/23/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The school district uploaded its student roster as requested by the Department. |

| **SE Criterion # 29 - Communications are in English and primary language of home** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that for families whose primary language is not English, the district consistently provides translated documents such as IEPs and progress reports. |

| **SE Criterion # 32 - Parent advisory council for special education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and interviews confirmed that the district meets monthly with the Parent Advisory Council (PAC); included in the yearly programming co-sponsored by the district and the PAC is the annual workshop on the rights of students and their parents under the state and federal special education laws. In addition, the district meets with the PAC an additional six times throughout the year to specifically discuss special education program evaluation. |

| **SE Criterion # 43 - Behavioral interventions** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The Department found no issues related to the district's implementation of this criterion. |

| **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:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that the district has discontinued the practice of placing students into Interim Alternative Education Settings (IAES) for behavior that does not involve weapons, illegal drugs, or serious bodily injury to another person while at school. Furthermore, in cases where a student has been suspended for 10 consecutive or cumulative days and the behavior is not a manifestation of the disability, the district consistently offers tutoring so that the student can continue to progress in the general education curriculum and to progress towards IEP goals. |

| **SE Criterion # 48 - Equal opportunity to participate in educational, nonacademic, extracurricular and ancillary programs, as well as participation in regular education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that for students with disabilities who are not accepted into a vocational school program, the district offers alternative vocational options. According to student records and interviews, the district has contracted with an outside agency to provide job coaching, vocational skill building, and job placements. |

| **SE Criterion # 53 - Use of paraprofessionals** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews confirmed that paraprofessionals do not design instruction for students with disabilities; rather, they consistently implement instruction under the supervision of an appropriately licensed professional who is proximate and readily available to provide such supervision.  |

| **SE Criterion # 55 - Special education facilities and classrooms** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A facilities review of the Penn Brooke Elementary School confirmed that special education students no longer receive instruction in the loft space above the library; services are provided in classrooms equal in all physical respects to the average standards of general education classrooms. In addition, Penn Brooke’s related services spaces are no longer identified by stigmatizing signs. |

| **SE Criterion # 56 - Special education programs and services are evaluated** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and interviews confirmed that the district regularly evaluates its special education programs and services. According to document review, the district’s most recent evaluation was conducted in May 2013 and focused on in-district programming by population, differentiated instruction, and staff professional development. |