|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | ESE Logo | **COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW**  **MID-CYCLE REPORT**  **District:** **New Bedford Public Schools**  **MCR Onsite Dates:** **11/05/2015 - 11/06/2015**  **Program Area: Special Education** | | | | |
|  | |  | Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education | | | | |
| COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW **MID-CYCLE REPORT** | | | | | | | |
| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** | | | | | |
| **Rating:** | | | | | |
| Not Implemented | | | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | | | |
| A review of records of students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum indicates that IEP Teams do not consider and address the following:  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 the 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. | | | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | | | |
| Provide training to Team chairpersons on the requirements for consistently considering and addressing the seven areas of need when developing an IEP for a student on the autism spectrum.    Develop an internal oversight and tracking system for ensuring that IEP Teams consider and specifically address the special requirements for students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum. The oversight and tracking system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Student Support Services to ensure ongoing compliance.  For those students whose records were identified by the Department, the district must reconvene the IEP Teams to consider and address the special requirements for students on the autism spectrum and update the IEP, as appropriate.  Develop a report of the results of an internal review of records, in which IEP Teams convened subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, to ensure appropriate completion of the IEP for students on the autism spectrum.  **\*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:** | | | | | |
| Submit the training information, including the agenda, sign-in sheet and training materials by **February 24, 2016**.  Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system with periodic reviews, along with the name and role of the designated person by **February 24, 2016**.  For those student records identified by the Department, submit a copy of the IEP and the Team Meeting Attendance Sheet (N3A) indicating that the IEP Teams have reconvened. Submit this information by **March 24, 2016**.  Submit the results of a review of student records and include the following:   1. The number of student 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.   Please submit the above information by **May 12, 2016**. | | | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | | | |
| 02/24/2016 | | | 03/24/2016 | 05/12/2016 |  |

| **SE Criterion # 4 - Reports of assessment results** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews and a review of student records indicate that assessments, including educational assessments and speech and language evaluations, are completed prior to the IEP Team meeting and, upon request, are made available to parents at least two days in advance of the Team discussion. |

| **SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| A review of student records indicates that within 45 school working days of receipt of the parent's written consent to a re‑evaluation, the school district does not consistently determine whether the student continues to be eligible for special education nor provides the parent with either a proposed IEP and placement or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review a sample of student records in which a re-evaluation was conducted since the start of the school year and in which the proposed IEP and placement or written explanation of the finding of no eligibility was not provided to the parent within 45 school working days. Analyze the information to determine the root cause(s) for the non-compliance. Based on this root cause analysis, indicate the specific corrective actions the district will take to remedy the non-compliance.  Develop a report of the results of an internal review of student records, in which a re-evaluation was conducted subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, to ensure that IEP Teams are determining eligibility and the district is providing documentation to the parent within 45 school working days of receiving consent.  **\*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:** | | | |
| Submit the results of the root cause analysis with specific proposals for remedying the non-compliance, the associated timelines, and the person(s) responsible by **February 24, 2016**.  Submit the results of a review of student records and include the following:   1. The number of student 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.   Please submit the above information by **May 12, 2016**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 02/24/2016 | 05/12/2016 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 12 - Frequency of re-evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicates that re-evaluations are conducted every three years unless the parent and district agree that a re-evaluation is unnecessary. |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicates that progress reports are updated, maintained in the records, and are focused on the student’s progress towards reaching the annual goals set forth in the IEP. Progress reports are signed and dated; parents receive progress reports at least as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students. Progress reports are translated for parents whose primary language of the home is other than English. |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicates that the district provides parents of students in out-of-district placements with two copies of the proposed IEP and placement along with the required notice immediately following development at the Team meeting. Specifically, at the Team meeting parents are provided with a summary, which includes a completed IEP service delivery grid describing the types and amounts of special education and/or related services proposed by the district and a statement of the major goal areas associated with these services, then the district sends the proposed IEP and placement to parents within two calendar weeks. |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records sets forth that the IEP Non-participation Justification statement indicates why the removal of the student from the general education classroom 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 # 22 - IEP implementation and availability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews and a review of documentation indicate that general education staff are informed of their specific responsibilities related to the implementation of the students’ IEPs and the accommodations to be provided in the classroom. Specifically, general education teachers receive the most recent IEP for every special education student assigned to their classroom. Teachers are then responsible for submitting signed receipts indicating that they have reviewed the IEP; the signed receipts are tracked and monitored by the Director of Special Education. |

| **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 indicates that the district responds to all questions on page 2 of the Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1). Specifically, the N1 form includes:   1. A description of any action the district is proposing to take; 2. An explanation of why the district is proposing to act; 3. A description of any other options that the district considered and the reasons why those options were rejected; 4. A description of each evaluation procedure, test, record, or report used as a basis for the proposed action; 5. A description of any other factors relevant to the district's decision; 6. A description of the next steps, if any, that are recommended. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The district provided its special education student roster as required 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 indicates that the district consistently provides translations of special education documents, including progress reports, which contain information on the student's progress towards the goals set in the IEP, and the Meeting Invitation (N3) notice, which is used to invite participants to IEP Team meetings. The district translates these documents for parents who are limited English proficient. |

| **SE Criterion # 32 - Parent advisory council for special education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews and a review of documentation indicate that the district translates parent advisory council (PAC) materials, including notices of upcoming meetings and events, as well as print materials related to the meeting topic. Translators are also available at PAC meetings to provide interpretation for attendees. |