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| **SE Criterion # 1 - Assessments are appropriately selected and interpreted for students referred for evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and staff interviews indicate that for students whose primary language is not English and who have not attained former limited English proficiency (FLEP) status, the district determines language dominance prior to assessing the student for special education eligibility. Tests and other evaluation materials 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. The English language education coordinator or instructor assists in determining student needs, including language dominance for assessment purposes. Records also demonstrate that the district contracts with outside agencies for interpretation services when it does not have resources to accurately assess a student based on the current language needs. |

| **SE Criterion # 3 - Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and staff interviews indicate that when a student suspected of having a specific learning disability is evaluated, the IEP Team consistently creates the written eligibility determination as to whether or not the student has a specific learning disability, which is signed by all members of the Team, or if there is a disagreement as to the determination, one or more Team members document their disagreement. The Team completes the forms used to determine eligibility for a specific learning disability: 1) Historical Review and Educational Assessment (SLD 1); 2) Area of Concern and Evaluation Method (SLD 2); 3) Exclusionary Factors (SLD 3); and 4) Observation (SLD 4). All eligibility process forms are maintained within the student record. |

| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and staff interviews demonstrate that whenever an evaluation indicates that a student has a disability on the autism spectrum, IEP Teams consider and specifically address the following areas: 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; and 7) other needs resulting from the student's disability that impact progress in the general curriculum, including social and emotional development. Record review demonstrates that IEP Teams utilize a checklist to guide the IEP development, adding goals and services to the IEP based upon the identified areas of student need. This checklist is maintained within the student record. |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and staff interviews indicate that members of the IEP Team attend Team meetings unless: 1) 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 2) the district and the parent agree, in writing, to excuse a required Team member’s participation, and the Team member provides written input into the development of the IEP to the parent and the Team prior to the meeting. Student records and interviews also indicate that the district now proposes alternative means of attendance, such as teleconferencing, if parents are unable to attend the IEP Team meeting, or parents are offered a time to reschedule. |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and staff interviews indicate that the Team consistently determines the student's needs before deciding the placement for services. Additionally, the parent is provided with a summary of the goals and services and the service delivery grid at the conclusion of the IEP Team meeting. Two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and placement, along with the Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1), are then provided to the parent within two calendar weeks from the Team meeting. |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records indicates that if the student is removed from the general education classroom at any time, the Team specifically states in the IEP Non-participation Justification statement why the removal is considered critical to the student's program. The statements are tailored to the individual student and explain in detail why the student is unable to remain in a less restrictive environment, with the use of supplementary aids and services, based on his or her individual educational needs. |

| **SE Criterion # 22 - IEP implementation and availability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Staff interviews indicate that once the district obtains written parental consent of the IEP, each teacher and service provider is immediately informed of his or her specific responsibilities related to the implementation of the student’s IEP and the student’s accommodations, modifications, and supports. When the signed and accepted IEP is received by the district, the Team chairperson is notified by email through the district’s eSPED system. The Team chairperson then instructs all staff responsible to review the IEP and provide written acknowledgement of this review, resulting in immediate implementation of the IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and staff interviews indicate that when a parent is unable to attend a Team meeting, the district documents its attempts to reschedule meetings at a mutually agreed upon time and uses other methods, such as conference calls or video conferencing, to ensure parent participation. See also SE 8. |

| **SE Criterion # 32 - Parent advisory council for special education** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Staff and parent interviews indicate that the special education director collaborates with and supports the Parent Advisory Council (PAC); however, the PAC has not been involved in the evaluation of the district's special education programs and services. Additionally, the district only sends meeting notification flyers out by email, which may exclude new families or families who do not have computer access. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Develop a plan for involving the PAC in the evaluation of the district’s special education programs, and develop procedures for ensuring distribution of PAC flyers to all parents of children with disabilities and other interested parties. Please see *Guidance for Special Education Parent Advisory Councils*: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/pac/default.html>. | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| By **May 6, 2016**, submit a copy of the plan for involving the PAC in the evaluation of the district’s special education programs, and submit the procedures to be followed to ensure that PAC meeting notification flyers have been made available to parents of children with disabilities and other interested parties.  By **May 6, 2016,** submit evidence that appropriate staff have been informed of the procedures to be followed regarding the dissemination of PAC meeting notification flyers.  By **October 7, 2016,** submit evidence of participation of the PAC in the evaluation of the district’s special education programs, which may include copies of agendas and sign-in sheets in which the evaluation was discussed and/or the evaluation report that includes the participating members. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 05/06/2016 | 10/07/2016 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 55 - Special education facilities and classrooms** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Observations and staff interviews demonstrate that the program for students with disabilities on the autism spectrum located at the Pakachoag Elementary School has moved to the Swanson Road Intermediate School. This program is now located amongst general education classrooms, which maximizes the inclusion of such students into the life of the school. |