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| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and interviews with staff demonstrate that whenever an evaluation indicates that a child has a disability on the autism spectrum, the IEP Team is appropriately considering and addressing:  1) The verbal and nonverbal communication needs of the child;  2) The need to develop social interaction skills and proficiencies;  3) The needs resulting from the child'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 the autism spectrum disorder; and  7) Other needs resulting from the child's disability that impact progress in the  general curriculum, including social and emotional development.    The Team documents its discussion in the IEP through the goals and in the Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1) sent to parents. |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and interviews with staff demonstrate that required members of the Team are consistently present at IEP Team meetings. Members of the Team attend IEP Team meetings unless:  • The district and the parent agree, in writing, that the attendance of the Team member is not necessary because the member's area of the curriculum or related services is not being modified or discussed; or  • The district and parent agree, in writing, to excuse a required Team member's participation and the excused member provides written input into the development of the IEP to the parent and IEP Team prior to the meeting. |

| **SE Criterion # 12 - Frequency of re-evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and interviews with staff demonstrate that re-evaluations are consistently conducted every three years. |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and interviews with staff demonstrate that when a Team meeting is held during the progress reporting period, staff appropriately complete a progress report for the student and document the student’s progress towards reaching the goals set forth in the current IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and interviews with staff demonstrate that the school consistently holds an annual review IEP Team meeting on or before the anniversary date of the IEP to review, revise, or develop a new IEP or refer the student for a re-evaluation, as appropriate. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Review of student records and interviews with staff demonstrate that when the IEP Team evaluation finds that a student’s disability affects social skills development, or when the student’s disability makes him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment or teasing, or when a student has been diagnosed with a disability on the autism spectrum, the Team does not consistently consider and specifically 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](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/11_2ta.html) for assistance and guidance on meeting this requirement.  Provide the IEP Team chairpersons with training 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 and teasing. The tracking system should include supervisory oversight and periodic reviews to ensure ongoing compliance.    Develop a report of the results of an internal review of records to ensure that IEP Teams, that have convened after all corrective actions have been implemented, 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, with 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 Special Education Team Meeting Attendance Sheet (N3A) to indicate that the IEP Teams have reconvened. Submit this information by **February 7, 2014**.  Submit evidence of training Team chairpersons. Include the agenda, signed and dated attendance sheet with staff role, and training materials by **February 7, 2014**.  Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system with periodic reviews, along with the name/role of the designated person(s) responsible by **February 7, 2014**.  Submit a report of the results of the record review and include the following:   * The number of records reviewed; * The number of records in compliance; * For records not in compliance, determine the root cause(s); and * The specific action(s) taken by the charter school to remedy the non-compliance.   Submit the above information by **May 9, 2014**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 02/07/2014 | 05/09/2014 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records indicates that the IEP Non-participation Justification statement states why the removal of the student is considered critical to the student’s program and the basis for the Team’s 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:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| While the charter school does not have a parent who has revoked consent to a student’s special education services, document review and interviews indicate that the charter school has appropriate procedures in place regarding the revocation of consent. According to the school’s procedures, if a parent revokes consent in writing, the school will act promptly to provide written notice to the parent of the school’s proposal to discontinue services based on the written revocation of consent. The procedures indicate that the school will provide this notice a reasonable time before it intends to discontinue the student’s services. The school will also provide information on how the parent can obtain a copy of the procedural safeguards. |

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

| **SE Criterion # 47 - Procedural requirements applied to students not yet determined to be eligible for special education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of documents demonstrates that student codes of conduct have been updated and contain appropriate procedural requirements applied to students not yet determined to be eligible for special education. Specifically, the procedures indicate that if prior to the disciplinary action the charter school had knowledge that the student may be a student with a disability, then the school makes all protections available to the student until and unless the student is subsequently determined not to be eligible. |

| **SE Criterion # 51 - Appropriate special education teacher licensure** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of documents and interviews with staff demonstrate that the charter school uses qualified teachers to provide specialized instruction or has a qualified teacher consult with or provide direct supervision for someone who is not qualified but is delivering specialized instruction.  The charter school’s qualified teachers hold a valid license in special education or have successfully completed an undergraduate or graduate degree in an approved special education program. |