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| **SE Criterion # 2 - Required and optional assessments** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicated that the district consistently completes educational assessments, including a history of the student's educational progress in the general curriculum. |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that progress reports are provided at least as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students and consistently address student progress towards IEP goals.  A review of student records and staff interviews also indicated that students whose eligibility terminated because the student graduated or exceeded the age of eligibility are provided with a summary of academic achievement and functional performance, including recommendations on how to assist the student in meeting his or her postsecondary goals. |

| **SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicated that at least annually, on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, a Team meeting is held to consider the student's progress and to review, revise, or develop a new IEP or refer the student for a re-evaluation, as appropriate. A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that IEP Teams consistently review and revise IEPs to address any lack of expected student progress towards the annual goals and in the general curriculum. Record review and staff interviews also indicated that if the district and parent agree to make changes to a student's IEP between annual IEP meetings, the IEP Team is reconvened to amend the IEP. Parents are advised that they may request a complete copy of the amended IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that upon determining that the student is eligible for special education, IEP Teams develop the IEP, addressing all elements of the current IEP format provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Staff interviews indicated that the IEP is not changed outside of the Team meeting.  A review of student records also indicated that IEP Teams specifically address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing for students whose disability affects social skills development, when the student's disability makes him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment or teasing, and for students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum. A review of student records indicated that IEP Teams document their considerations of the skills and proficiencies needed by students in the district's Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1), as well as in the Additional Information section of the IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicated that IEP Teams develop the IEP prior to determining the appropriate placement to deliver the student's identified services and accommodations. Record review demonstrated that Teams consistently ensure that students are educated in the school she or he would attend if the student did not require special education, unless otherwise required by the IEP. A review of student records indicated that placements are based on the IEP, including the types of related services, types of settings, types of service providers and location where services are to be provided.  A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that parents receive summary notes at the conclusion of the IEP Team meeting, which include a completed IEP service delivery grid describing the types and amounts of special education and related services proposed by the district and a statement of the major goal areas associated with these services. Record review and staff interviews demonstrated that the district consistently sends two copies of the proposed IEP and placement within two calendar weeks of the Team meeting. |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that when a student is removed from the general education classroom, the Team states why the removal is considered critical to the student's program and 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. |

| **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 and staff interviews indicated that whenever the district proposes an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education, an IEP or amendment, a placement, or other action, the district uses the Department's Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1) and Notice of School District Refusal to Act (N2). A review of student records demonstrated that notices consistently contain narratives of the district's proposed actions and include:  1. a description of the action the district proposed to take;  2. a description of why the district took the action;  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; and  6. a description of what steps, if any, the district proposed to take. |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that when parental consent to the services proposed on a student’s IEP is required, and the parent fails or refuses to participate, the district does not routinely secure consent from the parent through multiple attempts using a variety of methods or consistently document its efforts. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review those records in which a Team meeting was held in the 2016-2017 school year and the district did not make multiple attempts using a variety of methods or document its efforts to secure consent when the parent failed or refused to participate. Analyze the information to determine the root cause(s) of the non-compliance. Based on this root cause analysis, indicate the specific corrective actions the district will take to remedy the non-compliance and a timeline for implementation of those corrective actions.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the district’s attempts to secure parental consent are documented in the student record. The system should include oversight and periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure ongoing compliance.  Subsequent to all corrections, develop a report of the results of an internal review of student records in which Team meetings were conducted, ensuring the district made multiple attempts to secure parental consent, using a variety of methods, and documented such efforts.    **\*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 results of the root cause analysis that includes a description of the district's proposed corrective actions, the timeline for implementation, and the person(s) responsible by **September 15, 2017**.  Provide a detailed description of the district's internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **September 15, 2017**.  Submit the results of the internal review of student records and include the following:  1. the number of 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 **November 17, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/15/2017 | 11/17/2017 |  |  |

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

| **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 documents and staff interviews indicated that when an IEP Team determines that behavior resulting in a suspension longer than 10 days is not a manifestation of the student's disability, the district is able to provide services to enable the student, although in another setting, to continue to participate in the general education curriculum and to progress towards IEP goals.  At the time of the Mid-Cycle Review, the district did not have any current records for students with suspensions exceeding 10 school days. |

| **SE Criterion # 54 - Professional development** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the district provides comprehensive training annually for special education and general education staff on state and federal special education requirements. |

| **SE Criterion # 56 - Special education programs and services are evaluated** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and interviews indicated that special education programs and services are regularly evaluated. Specifically, the district annually reviews survey data from families, consults with external agencies such as the New England Center for Children and Landmark Outreach, conducts internal meetings with school personnel, and analyzes student needs, both at the individual level and in the aggregate, to inform program planning and staffing needs. As a result of its evaluation efforts, the district has recently initiated language-based programming, modified pre-school screening and writing instruction, and enhanced services to better support students with disabilities on the autism spectrum. |