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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 review and interviews indicated that the district 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. According to interviews, when students are referred for an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education, staff will establish the student’s dominant language prior to conducting assessments. Record review verified that students have been assessed in Haitian Creole and Spanish by bilingual evaluators. |

| **SE Criterion # 2 - Required and optional assessments** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews demonstrated that the district routinely provides educational assessments for students at the elementary level, 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:** |
| Student record review demonstrated that when a student is suspected of having a specific learning disability, 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:** |
| Student record review, document review, and interviews demonstrated that whenever an evaluation indicates that a student has a disability on the autism spectrum, IEP Teams consider and specifically address 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. Any area of need that is identified during IEP development is addressed with goals and accommodations. |

| **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:** |
| Student record review and interviews demonstrated that, upon reaching the age of majority and in the absence of any court actions to the contrary, when a student chooses to share or delegate special education decision-making with his or her parents or another willing adult, this choice is consistently made in the presence of the IEP Team and documented in written form in the student record. |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews demonstrated that required Team members consistently attend IEP meetings. When a required Team member is absent from the meeting, the district secures the parent's agreement in writing to excuse the Team member before 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. Staff 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 # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and staff interviews indicated that the within 30 working days of receipt of a parent's written consent to evaluate, all consented-to assessments are consistently completed. Record review and interviews also indicated that within 45 school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation, IEP Teams are consistently convened to determine whether the student is eligible for special education and provide to the parent either a proposed IEP and proposed placement or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility. |

| **SE Criterion # 12 - Frequency of re-evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and staff interviews demonstrated that the district consistently conducts re-evaluations every three years unless the parent and district agree that it is unnecessary. When it is agreed that a re-evaluation is not necessary, the district documents the agreement and convenes an IEP Team meeting to update the IEP by reviewing existing data and obtaining input from the student’s IEP Team members.  |

| **SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews demonstrated that at least annually on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, Team meetings are consistently held to consider student progress and to review, revise, or develop a new IEP, or refer the student for a re-evaluation, as appropriate. Additionally, student record review and interviews confirmed that the district has discontinued the practice of using amendments to change a student's educational placement. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Partially Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews demonstrated that IEP Teams address all elements of the most current IEP format provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, including developing benchmarks for annual goals and completing the Present Level of Educational Performance B (PLEP B) page for students with age-related or language concerns. Student records and interviews indicated that when the IEP Team evaluation shows a student's disability affects social skills development or when the disability makes the student vulnerable to bullying, harassment, or teasing, and for students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum, IEP Teams do not consistently consider and address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment or teasing.  |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| For those students whose records were identified by the Department, the district must reconvene the IEP Teams to consider and address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment or teasing. Please see *Technical Assistance Advisory SPED 2011-2: Bullying Prevention and Intervention* at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/11_2ta.html> and the additional resource document *Addressing the Needs of Students with Disabilities in the IEP and in School Bullying Prevention and Intervention Efforts* at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/bullying/considerations-bully.html>.Conduct training for IEP Team chairpersons on the requirements for addressing bullying prevention and intervention in the IEP. Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that IEP Teams consider and address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment or teasing. The tracking system should include oversight and periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or her designee to ensure ongoing compliance. Conduct an internal review of records for students whose disability affects social skills development, students vulnerable to bullying, teasing and harassment and students identified with ASD whose IEP development occurred after the implementation of all corrective actions for evidence that IEP Teams are addressing the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment or teasing in the IEP.**\*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, their role(s) and signature(s).** |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** |
| For those student records identified by the Department, submit a copy of the IEP and the Team Meeting Attendance Sheet (N3A) to demonstrate that the IEP Teams have reconvened. Submit this information by **November 14, 2014.**Submit evidence of training to IEP Team chairpersons 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 14, 2014.** Submit a description of the district’s internal oversight and tracking system with periodic reviews, along with the name/role of the designated personby **November 14, 2014.**Submit a report of the results of the internal review of records and include the following: The number of student records reviewed; The number of records in compliance; For any records not found in compliance, determine the root cause(s) of the non-compliance; and the district's plan to remedy the non-compliance. Submit this information by **February 23, 2015.** |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 11/14/2014 | 02/23/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Partially Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews with administration demonstrated that, following the development of the IEP, IEP Teams consistently provide a Team meeting summary but send one copy of the proposed IEP and two copies of the placement page within 10 days to the parent, rather than two (2) copies of the complete IEP. |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| Revise the district’s process to ensure that the district provides the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement following the development of the IEP.Conduct training for appropriate staff on the district’s revised process of sending two copies of the IEP and placement to parents.Develop an internal system of periodic review to ensure that the district provides parents with two copies of the proposed IEP and placement. The oversight system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or her designee to ensure ongoing compliance. Conduct an internal review of records with IEP development after all corrective actions have been implemented, including a sample of out-of-district students, for evidence that parents are sent two copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement.**\*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; c0 Name of person(s) who conducted the review, their role(s) and signature(s).** |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** |
| Submit the revised process and evidence of training for appropriate staff, including the agenda, training date, signed attendance sheets indicating the title/role of staff and the name and title of the presenter by **November 14, 2014.** Submit a description of the district's internal system of periodic review, along with the name/role of the designated person by **November 14, 2014.**Submit a report of the results of the internal review of records and include the following: The number of student records reviewed; The number of records in compliance; For any records not found in compliance, determine the root cause(s) of the non-compliance; and the district's plan to remedy the non-compliance. Submit this information by **February 23, 2015.** |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 11/14/2014 | 02/23/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Partially Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that IEP Teams do not always state why the removal from the general education classroom is considered critical to a student's program and provide 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. |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| Conduct training for IEP Team chairpersons and other key personnel to ensure that IEP Teams appropriately justify why a student's removal is considered critical when the student is removed from the general education classroom. Develop an internal system of oversight to ensure that IEP Teams develop appropriate non-participation justification statements in IEPs when a student is removed from the general education classroom. The system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or her designee to ensure ongoing compliance. Conduct a review of records for evidence that non-participation justification statements answer why the student's removal is considered critical to his/her program when the student is removed from the general education classroom. This sample must be drawn from records of students across the district's schools whose IEP development activities occurred subsequent to the completion of the district's corrective actions. **\*Please note that 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 level for the record review; b) Date of the review; c) Name of person(s) who conducted the review, their roles(s), and their signature(s).** |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** |
| Submit evidence of staff training, including an agenda, training materials, and signed attendance sheets, indicating name and role of staff by **November 14, 2014.** Submit a description of the district's internal system of periodic review, along with the name/role of the designated person by **November 14, 2014.** This progress report is due **November 14, 2014.**Submit a report of the results of the internal review of records and include the following: The number of student records reviewed; The number of records in compliance; For any records not found in compliance, determine the root cause(s) of the non-compliance; and the district's plan to remedy the non-compliance. This progress report is due **February 23, 2015.** |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 11/14/2014 | 02/23/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and interviews indicated that when parents revoke consent for special education services in writing, the district will promptly provide the parent with a written notice to discontinue services within a reasonable time frame and attach a copy of the Parent's Procedural Safeguards. Interviews verified that the district will not use mediation or request a due process hearing to obtain agreement or a ruling requiring the continuation of services, consistent with federal regulation. The district did not have any current records for parent revocation of consent at the time of the Mid-Cycle Review. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The district submitted the roster of special needs students as 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 interviews demonstrated that for families whose primary language is not English, the district consistently provides translated documents such as IEPs and progress reports. |

| **SE Criterion # 37 - Procedures for approved and unapproved out-of-district placements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews demonstrated that documentation of monitoring plans and all actual monitoring are consistently maintained in the records of every eligible student who has been placed out-of-district.  |