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| **SE Criterion # 2 - Required and optional assessments** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that the district consistently provides all required assessments consented to by the parent, specifically classroom observations for students suspected of a specific learning disability (SLD), a history of the student's educational progress in the general curriculum, and a teacher assessment of the student’s attention skills, participation behaviors, communication skills, memory and social relations with groups, peers and adults. |

| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated that, for students on the autism spectrum, IEP Teams consistently consider and specifically address the verbal and nonverbal communication needs of the student; the need to develop social interaction skills and proficiencies; the needs resulting from the student's unusual responses to sensory experiences; the needs resulting from resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines; the needs resulting from engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements; the need for any positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports to address any behavioral difficulties resulting from autism spectrum disorder; and other needs resulting from the student’s disability that impact progress in the general curriculum, including social and emotional development.  Information from the Team’s consideration is documented in IEP goals and objectives, Notices of Proposed School District Action (N1), and in Team meeting summary notes. |

| **SE Criterion # 4 - Reports of assessment results** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that all assessment reports, including home assessments, speech language assessments, and achievement assessments, consistently contain educationally relevant recommendations and define in detail and in educationally relevant and common terms the students' needs and offer explicit means of meeting those needs. |

| **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 is absent from the 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 consistently provides written input in advance of the meeting to the parent and IEP Team for development of the IEP, which is documented in the Team summary notes and maintained in the student record. |

| **SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicated that within 30 school working days of receipt of a parent's written consent to evaluate, all consented-to assessments are consistently completed. Record review 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 # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records across all grade levels 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. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated that when a student is on the autism spectrum, has a disability that affects social skills development, or a disability that makes them vulnerable to bullying, harassment or teasing, IEP Teams address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing in the student’s IEP. The Team’s considerations are documented in the Team meeting summary notes and reflected in the IEP as goals, accommodations, and services. |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that following the development of the IEP, the district consistently provides a Team meeting summary and sends two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and placement within 10 school working days to the parent, including for students in out-of-district placements. |

| **SE Criterion # 19 - Extended evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated that when IEP Teams find a student eligible for special education but evaluation information is insufficient to develop a full or partial IEP, Teams and parents agree to initiate an extended evaluation period. Student records also demonstrated that IEP Teams routinely reconvene within eight (8) weeks or less to review the results of the extended evaluation and develop a complete IEP. Record review and interviews confirmed that the district has discontinued the practice of using extended evaluations as placements. |

| **SE Criterion # 21 - School day and school year requirements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that IEP Teams routinely consider a student’s need for an educational program that is more than the regular school year and indicate on the IEP why the longer program is necessary. According to record review and interviews, an extended year program is identified when the student has demonstrated or is likely to demonstrate substantial regression in his or her learning skills and substantial difficulty in relearning such skills. Record review and interviews also indicated that the district has discontinued its practice of offering extended school year only to students placed in specific programs. |

| **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:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that when a student is referred for an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education, the district consistently sends written notice to the parent(s) within five (5) school days of receipt of the referral, along with the district’s notice of procedural safeguards. |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that the district conducts all evaluations, including home assessments, classroom observations, communication and developmental assessments, upon receipt of written parental consent as part of an initial evaluation or re-evaluation to determine special education eligibility. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that the district consistently sends Team meeting notices (N3) at least one month prior to the scheduled meeting to ensure that parents have the opportunity to attend. Student records and interviews also indicated that the district reschedules Team meetings to ensure parent participation, which is documented in the student record. When they cannot attend in person, parents participate in Team meetings via phone conferencing; this method of participation is documented on the Team attendance sheet (N3A).  The district provided its special education student roster as requested by the Department. |

| **SE Criterion # 36 - IEP implementation, accountability and financial responsibility** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that the district consistently develops, proposes and monitors the full implementation of IEPs for each student placed out-of-district. |

| **SE Criterion # 37 - Procedures for approved and unapproved out-of-district placements** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| A review of student records demonstrated that monitoring plans are consistently documented in records of students in out-of-district placements.  However, interviews, documents, and record review determined that written contracts do not contain the out-of-district program's agreement to provide access to the school district and Department to conduct unannounced site visits; consequently, written contracts do not meet the minimum content requirements for contracts as established by state regulations. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Prior to developing the district’s corrective actions, review the Department’s guidance on special education contracts between school districts and out-of district programs, available at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/02_5.html>.  Revise the district’s written contract for out-of-district public and private agencies based on the Department’s guidance. Provide training to relevant special education Team chairpersons and other key staff on the revised contract.  Ensure that all written contracts for out-of-district students meet the minimum content requirements by the start of the 2015-2016 school year.  Following the implementation of all corrective actions, conduct an internal review of records for approximately 10-15 out-of-district students to ensure that all written contracts for the 2015-2016 school year include the out-of-district program's agreement to provide access to the school district and the Department to conduct unannounced site visits.  **\*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 revised written contract for out-of-district public and private agencies. This progress report is due **August 18, 2015.**  Submit evidence of training to IEP Team chairpersons and key staff, along with the agenda, training date, signed attendance sheets indicating the title/role of staff and the name and title of the presenter by **August 18, 2015.**  Submit the results of the internal review of records. Indicate the number of student records reviewed and the number of student records in compliance; for all records not in compliance with this criterion, determine the root cause(s) of the noncompliance and provide the district's plan to remedy the non-compliance. This progress report is due **December 9, 2015.** | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 08/18/2015 | 12/9/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 43 - Behavioral interventions** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews confirmed that for students whose behavior impedes their learning or the learning of others, IEP Teams routinely consider and provide functional behavioral assessments, counseling services, and supports such as positive behavioral interventions before placing these students in more restrictive settings. |

| **SE Criterion # 44 - Procedure for recording suspensions** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that the district consistently documents the number and duration of suspensions for all special education students. The district uses a database to record and track suspension data, which is monitored by building principals, assistant principals, and special education staff. |

| **SE Criterion # 45 - Procedures for suspension up to 10 days and after 10 days: General requirements** |
| --- |
| **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 without conducting a manifestation determination and examining whether the student could remain in a less restrictive environment with added supports, services or behavior plan. |

| **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 indicated that prior to a suspension that constitutes a change in placement for a student with disabilities, the district consistently conducts a manifestation determination to determine whether the student’s behavior was caused by or had a direct and substantial relationship to the disability or was the direct result of the district´s failure to implement the IEP. According to record review and interviews, the district ensures that manifestation determination meetings are convened within 10 days of the decision to suspend to examine the appropriateness of the student’s IEP and placement. |

| **SE Criterion # 51 - Appropriate special education teacher licensure** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| A review of teacher licensure and interviews demonstrated that eight (8) special education teachers who design and/or provide direct special education services described in IEPs are not appropriately licensed or waivered. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Ensure that special education teachers are appropriately licensed or have secured waivers by the start of the 2015-2016 school year.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system for the district’s special education teachers to ensure that they are appropriately licensed or waivered. The tracking system should include oversight and periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or their designee to ensure ongoing compliance. | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| For the special education teachers identified by the Department, submit a copy of each staff person’s current special education license or approved waiver. This progress report is due **August 18, 2015.**  Submit a description of the district’s internal oversight and tracking system with periodic reviews, along with the date of the system's implementation and the name/role of the designated person by **August 18, 2015**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 08/18/2015 |  |  |  |