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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 routinely provides educational assessments, including a history of the student's educational progress in the general education curriculum and teacher assessments that address attention skills, participation behaviors, communication skills, memory and social relations with groups, peers and adults. In addition, a review of student records and interviews confirmed that the district no longer requires parents to complete a home assessment before requesting an evaluation. Finally, a review of student records indicated that the district’s evaluation consent form (N1A) includes all assessment categories. |

| **SE Criterion # 3 - Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that when a student is suspected of having a specific learning disability, IEP Teams consistently use the required components to document the student’s disability: Historical Review and Educational Assessment, Area of Concern and Evaluation Method, Exclusionary Factors, and Observation. In addition, IEP Teams consistently create a written determination as to whether or not the student has a specific learning disability, which is signed by all members of the Team. |

| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that whenever an evaluation indicates that a student has a disability on the autism spectrum, IEP Teams use a checklist to indicate student verbal and nonverbal communication; social interaction skills and proficiencies; unusual responses to sensory experiences; resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines; engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements; positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports; and other needs that impact progress in the general curriculum, including social and emotional development. Areas of need that are identified during IEP development are addressed as goals and accommodations. |

| **SE Criterion # 4 - Reports of assessment results** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that assessment summaries consistently contain evaluator's recommendations, and the summaries are documented in student records. In addition, student record review and interviews indicated that assessment summaries are made available to parents at least two days prior to scheduled IEP Team meetings. |

| **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 provides written input in advance of the meeting to the parent and IEP Team for development of the IEP. Interviews indicated that the district and parent agree in writing when excusing Team members who are not necessary because their area of the curriculum or services is not being modified or discussed. |

| **SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that within forty‑five school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial or re-evaluation, the district consistently determines whether the student is eligible for special education and provides to the parent either a proposed IEP and proposed placement or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility. In addition, record review indicated that that, following the development of the IEP, the district provides a Team meeting summary and sends the proposed IEP and placement within ten days or fewer to the parent. |

| **SE Criterion # 9A - Elements of the eligibility determination; general education accommodations and services for ineligible students** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that when a student does not need direct services, IEP Teams consistently identify appropriate services through the district’s general education program as next steps in the Notice of School District Refusal to Act (N2). |

| **SE Criterion # 12 - Frequency of re-evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that the district consistently conducts re-evaluations every three years unless the parent and district agree that it is unnecessary. When it is agreed that a re-evaluation is not necessary, the district documents the agreement and convenes an IEP Team meeting to update the IEP by reviewing existing data and obtaining input from the student’s IEP Team members.  |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that all progress reports, including those from related service providers, are consistently completed and documented in student records. In addition, a review of student records confirmed that when required, progress reports are translated into the home language for parents whose primary language is not English. |

| **SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews 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. Additionally, a review of student records and interviews confirmed that the district has discontinued the practice of using amendments to change a student's educational placement. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that whenever the IEP Team evaluation indicates that a student's disability affects social skills development or a student's disability makes him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment, or teasing, the IEP addresses the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing. For students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum, the IEP Team considers and specifically addresses the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing.A review of student records demonstrated that when applicable, the Present Level of Educational Performance B (PLEP B) page of the IEP is consistently filled out for students with age-related or language concerns. In addition, the district consistently documents all services in the service delivery grid, including paraprofessionals and related services. Lastly, a review of student records and interviews confirmed that the district consistently documents special education consultation in the Service Delivery Grid A section. |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that IEP Teams consistently develop IEPs based on student needs and then determine appropriate placements. In addition, a review of student records confirmed that the district consistently provides a Team meeting summary and sends the proposed IEP and placement within 10 days of the meeting to the parent. Record review also indicated that when appropriate, IEP Teams consistently document any parent objections in the Team summary notes and in Notices of School District Proposed Action (N1). |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Please see SE 18A. |

| **SE Criterion # 22 - IEP implementation and availability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that consented-to IEPs are consistently implemented without delay at the beginning of each school year.  |

| **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 school days of receipt of the referral, along with the district’s notice of procedural safeguards.  |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Partially Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| According to document review and interviews, the district’s written notice proposing to discontinue special education services based on a parent’s written revocation of consent does contain information as to how the parent can obtain a copy of his/her right to procedural safeguards, but does not indicate when services will end and requires parental signature to revoke services. The district did not have any current records for parent revocation of consent at the time of the mid-cycle review. |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| Please review the Department’s Administrative Advisory SPED 2010-1 at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/10_1.html> before developing the district’s corrective action.Revise the district’s written notice and process for parent revocation of consent using the Department’s guidance.Conduct training for all IEP Team chairpersons and any relevant staff on the revised notice and process for parent revocation of consent.Develop a report of the results of an internal review of records in which a parent has revoked consent to a student's special education services in writing following the implementation of the district's corrective actions. **\*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 notice and process regarding parent revocation of consent. This progress report is due **October 3, 2014.**Submit evidence of training to IEP Team chairpersons and key staff and include the agenda, training date, signed attendance sheets indicating the title/role of staff and the name and title of the presenter by **October 3, 2014.**Submit the results of a 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. This progress report is due **January 30, 2015.** |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 10/03/2014 | 01/30/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The school district uploaded its student roster as requested 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 demonstrated that for families whose primary language is not English, the district consistently provides translated documents and progress reports.  |

| **SE Criterion # 33 - Involvement in the general curriculum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that general education teachers consistently attend IEP Team meetings for students whose access and participation in the general curriculum is discussed.  |

| **SE Criterion # 35 - Assistive technology: specialized materials and equipment** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that IEP Teams routinely consider a student's need for assistive technology during IEP development and document such considerations in the Present Level of Education Performance B (PLEP B) page of the IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 39A - Procedures used to provide services to eligible students enrolled in private schools at private expense whose parents reside in the district** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that the district consistently convenes annual Team meetings and conducts three-year re-evaluations for students enrolled in private placement at parental expense. |

| **SE Criterion # 42 - Programs for young children three and four years of age** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and interviews confirmed that all inclusionary pre-school instructional groupings for three and four-year olds do not exceed 15 students per teacher and classroom aide. Document review and interviews also confirmed that instructional groupings for four-year olds in substantially separate programs do not exceed nine students per teacher and classroom aide.  |

| **SE Criterion # 49 - Related services** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Please see SE 18A. |

| **SE Criterion # 55 - Special education facilities and classrooms** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of facilities confirmed the following: 1) the Occupational/Physical Therapists’ rooms are no longer identified as such at the Dallin Elementary School; 2) the Ottoson Middle School's Supported Learning Center B is no longer located at the end of a corridor and isolated from other classrooms, but has been relocated to a wing with general education classes; 3) the behavioral/therapeutic rooms in Arlington High School are no longer labeled as such; 4) the LABBB program located at Arlington High School is no longer identified with a sign as "behavioral program;" and 5) the high school's Supported Learning Center for students with severe disabilities has been relocated to a classroom that is an appropriate size for the number of enrolled students. |