|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | ESE Logo | **COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW**  **MID-CYCLE REPORT**  **District:** **Cambridge Public Schools**  **MCR Onsite Dates:** **11/08/2017 - 11/09/2017**  **Program Area: Special Education** |
|  |  |  |
| COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW **MID-CYCLE REPORT** | | |

| **SE Criterion # 3 - Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| A review of student records indicated that when a student suspected of having a specific learning disability is evaluated, the IEP Team creates a written determination as to whether or not he or she has a specific learning disability. However, not all Team members sign the written determination or, if there is disagreement as to the determination, Team members do not document their disagreement. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Revise procedures for ensuring that the written determination (mandated form 28M/10) as to whether or not the student has a specific learning disability (SLD) is signed by all Team members. Please see <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/cspd/sld_eligibility.pdf> and <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/iep/sld/default.html> for guidance on implementing these requirements. Provide training to special education staff on these procedures.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that IEP Teams complete the written eligibility determination for students suspected of having SLD. The oversight and tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure ongoing compliance.  Develop a report of the results of an internal review of student records, with SLD eligibility determinations conducted subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, to ensure that written eligibility determinations for students suspected of having a specific learning disability have been signed by all Team members.  **\*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 evidence of staff training, including the name of the presenter, agenda and signed attendance sheet with staff name, role and signature by **February 9, 2018**.  Submit a description of the school's internal oversight and tracking system by  **February 9, 2018**.  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 **May 11, 2018**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 02/09/2018 | 05/11/2018 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that IEP Team members at the high school, specifically general education teachers, consistently attend Team meetings unless the district and the parent agree, in writing, to excuse the required Team member’s participation and the excused member provides written input into the development of the IEP. |

| **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. 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.  A review of student records and staff interviews also indicated that when 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. The district consistently provides a complete copy of the amended IEP to parents. |

| **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 considerations of the skills and proficiencies needed by students in the district's meeting summary notes 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 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. Student records and staff interviews also indicated that throughout the district, including at the Amigos School, IEP Teams consistently provide parents with 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 indicated that Nonparticipation Justification statements in IEPs throughout the district, including those at the high school and elementary schools, are consistently individualized and consider the harmful effects of the removal of the student from the general education classroom. |

| **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 indicated that Notices of Proposed School District Action (N1s), to propose an evaluation or an IEP and summarize a Team's decisions and considerations, consistently describe the district’s proposed or refused action and reason for action, rejected options and reason for rejection, evaluation procedures, tests, records, or reports used as a basis for proposed or refused action, and any other factors relevant to the proposal or refusal. |

| **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 # 41 - Age span requirements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the ages of the youngest and oldest student in the high school instructional groupings, including all periods of academic support, do not differ by more than 48 months. |

| **SE Criterion # 51 - Appropriate special education teacher licensure** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents indicated that all individuals who design and/or provide direct special education services described in IEPs are appropriately licensed. |

| **SE Criterion # 52 - Appropriate certifications/licenses or other credentials -- related service providers** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents indicated that all persons providing related services, including physical therapists, school adjustment counselors, and speech and language pathologists, are appropriately certified, licensed, board registered or otherwise approved to provide such services by the relevant professional standards board or agency for the profession. |

| **SE Criterion # 54 - Professional development** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that, through professional development conducted at the beginning and throughout the school year, the district ensures that all staff, including both special education and general education staff, are trained on: a) state and federal special education requirements and related local special education policies and procedures; b) analyzing and accommodating diverse learning styles of all students in order to achieve an objective of inclusion in the general education classroom of students with diverse learning styles; and c) methods of collaboration among teachers, paraprofessionals and teacher assistants to accommodate diverse learning styles of all students in the general education classroom. In addition, according to the special education administrator, general and special education teaching staff receive training and support throughout the year, which includes relevant webinars, principals’ meetings, school administration meetings, Team Chair meetings, and presentations to all staff. |

| **SE Criterion # 55 - Special education facilities and classrooms** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Observations at the Fletcher Maynard Academy indicated that suspended middle school students and elementary students with specific learning disabilities no longer share the same room. Room 312, which previously served both populations of students, has been converted into a general education instructional space, and room 315 has been designated as a classroom for elementary students with specific learning disabilities.  Observations at the Haggerty Elementary School indicated that students with disabilities no longer walk through the front office to access speech and language services. The service delivery room has been relocated to room 204, which is located outside of the main office suite.  Between the time of the CPR and the MCR, Putnam Upper School relocated to a newly remodeled building with functional visual fire alarms throughout. Observations confirmed that all common spaces, including the main hallways, stairwells, and cafeteria, as well as rooms where hearing impaired students receive service and instruction, contain visual fire alarms. |