|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | ESE Logo | **COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW**  **MID-CYCLE REPORT**  **District:** **Athol-Royalston Regional School District**  **MCR Onsite Dates:** **03/26/2014 - 03/27/2014**  **Program Area: Special Education** |
|  |  | Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education |
| COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW **MID-CYCLE REPORT** | | |

| **SE Criterion # 1 - Assessments are appropriately selected and interpreted for students referred for evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that tests and evaluation materials used are technically sound, validated instruments tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and related developmental needs, are selected and administered by trained evaluators to reflect aptitude and achievement levels, and are as free as possible from cultural and linguistic bias. They are administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the student knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, are not solely designed to provide a single general intelligence, and are not the sole criterion for determining an appropriate program. In interpreting evaluation data and making decisions the district uses information from a variety of sources, ensures that the placement decision conforms to placement in the least restrictive environment, and includes information related to enabling the student to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum. |

| **SE Criterion # 3 - Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents, student record review and interviews confirmed that IEP Teams complete the required documents for students suspected of having a specific learning disability, and create a written determination on the appropriate forms as to whether the student has a specific learning disability, which is signed by all members of the Team. Team members, who do not agree, document their disagreement in writing. |

| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents, student record review and interview indicated that when a student has a disability on the autism spectrum, the IEP Team considers and specifically addresses: the verbal and nonverbal communication needs of the student; the need to develop social interaction skills and proficiencies; the needs resulting from the student's unusual responses to sensory experiences; the needs resulting from resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines; the needs resulting from engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements; the need for any positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports to address any behavioral difficulties resulting from autism spectrum disorder; and other needs resulting from the student's disability that impact progress in the general curriculum, including social and emotional development. |

| **SE Criterion # 4 - Reports of assessment results** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that evaluators summarize in writing the procedures employed, the results, and the diagnostic impression, and define in detail and in educationally relevant and common terms, the student's needs, offering explicit means of meeting them. Summaries of assessments are completed prior to discussion by the Team and, upon request, are made available to the parent at least two days in advance of the Team meeting. |

| **SE Criterion # 5 - Participation in general State and district-wide assessment programs** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents, student record review and interviews indicated that students with disabilities, including those participating in an alternate assessment and those enrolled in out-of-district placements, are included in the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) and other district-wide assessment programs, and that IEP Teams designate how each student will participate in the assessments and include the information on the “State or District-Wide Assessment” page of the student’s IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 6 - Determination of transition services** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interview indicated that, although they are invited, students (especially students who are 18 years old and over) were not encouraged, and do not consistently attend, Team meetings at which transition services are discussed or proposed. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must develop a procedure to encourage students, over the age of 14, to attend part or all of Team meetings where transition services are discussed or proposed, and provide training to appropriate staff at the middle and high school.  The district must submit the results of the review of a sample of student records from those Team meetings where transition services were discussed after all corrective actions had been implemented for evidence of the participation of students 14 and older.  \*Please note when conducting internal monitoring that district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the Department upon request: a) List of the student names and grade level 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 a description of the procedure to encourage students to attend part or all of Team meetings where transition services are discussed.  Provide evidence (agenda, attendance sheet with staff name, role and signature, and materials used) that appropriate middle and high school staff were trained on the procedures by **October 17, 2014.**  Submit the results of the review of records of students over the age of 14 to determine if students are in attendance at the Team meeting where transition services are discussed or proposed. Report the number of records reviewed and the number of records in compliance. For those records not in compliance, determine the root cause(s) and the specific actions taken by the district to remedy the non-compliance by **March 18, 2015**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 10/17/2014 | 03/18/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 7 - Transfer of parental rights at age of majority and student participation and consent at the age of majority** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interview indicated that the district does not consistently, at least one year prior to the student reaching age 18, inform the student and the parent/guardian of the rights that transfer from the parent/guardian to the student at the student's 18th birthday. Additionally, the district does not consistently document when the student chooses to share or delegate decision-making and place it in the student record or implement procedures to obtain consent from the student and/or parent to continue the student's special education program. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must develop a procedure to ensure that students and parents are consistently notified, at least one year prior to the student reaching age 18, of the rights that transfer from the parent/guardian to the student at the student's 18th birthday. Additionally, the district must have a procedure to ensure it documents in the student record when a student chooses to share or delegate decision-making. Further, it must implement procedures to obtain consent from the student and/or parent to continue the student's special education program. Training on the procedure must be provided to Team chairs or key staff responsible for this process at the high school. (Please refer to Administrative Advisory SPED 2011-1 on the Age of Majority: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/11_1.html> )  The district must develop an internal oversight and tracking system for the transfer of parental rights and the securing of consent at the age of majority. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or his/her designee to ensure continuing compliance.  The district must conduct a review of student records for:  1. all students who attained the age of 17, subsequent to the district’s implementation of all corrective actions, to ensure that those students (and their parent or guardian) were appropriately informed of the transfer of rights to the student at the age of 18.  2. all students who attained the age of majority, subsequent to the district’s implementation of corrective actions, to ensure that the district documented when the student chose to share or delegate decision-making and obtained consent from the appropriate person(s).  \*Please note when conducting internal monitoring that district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the Department upon request: a) List of the student names and grade level 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:** | | | |
| Provide a detailed description of the district's new procedures for the transfer of parental rights at the age of majority, student participation and consent. Provide evidence of training of appropriate staff, including agendas, materials and attendance sheet with staff name, role and signature by **October 17, 2014**.  Provide a description of the district’s internal oversight and tracking system, along with the role of the person responsible by **October 17, 2014**.  Submit a report of the results of the two internal reviews and include the following information for each sample: number of student records reviewed; number of records in compliance; for records not in compliance, determine the root cause(s); and the specific action(s) taken by the district to remedy the non-compliance by **March 18, 2015.** | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 10/17/2014 | 03/18/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that, at the middle and high school level, the district does not consistently ensure that a general education teacher is in attendance at the Team meeting if the student is participating or may be participating in a general education program. Also, the district does not consistently secure written excusal from parents agreeing that a general education teacher or other required Team member's attendance is not necessary, and ensure that the excused Team member provides written input into the development of the IEP. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must provide training to key personnel at the middle and high school level who are responsible for Team composition and attendance, on the requirements for the excusal of Team members.  The district must develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that required Team members are in attendance or the appropriate excusal procedures are followed and documented. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or his/her designee to ensure continuing compliance.  The district must conduct a student record review for students whose Team meetings were conducted after all corrective actions have been implemented for evidence of general education teacher participation and report the results of that review to the Department.  \*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:** | | | |
| Provide evidence of training on Team composition and attendance and the procedures for the excusal of Team members to responsible staff. Include agendas, materials and attendance sheet with staff name, role and signature by **October 17, 2014**.  Provide a description of the district’s internal oversight and tracking system, The tracking system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or his/her designee to ensure continuing compliance by **October 17, 2014**.    Submit the results of the review of student records. Report the number of records reviewed, the number of records in compliance, and for any records not in compliance, submit the results of a root cause analysis of the non-compliance and a detailed description of the district's plan to remedy such remaining non-compliance by **March 18, 2015**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 10/17/2014 | 03/18/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interviews demonstrated that the district does not consistently, within 45 school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation, determine whether the student is eligible for special education and provide to the parent either a proposed IEP and proposed placement or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must conduct an analysis of student records to identify the root cause(s) for not consistently determining a student’s eligibility for special education and providing to the parent either a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility, within 45 school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation.  Based on the results of the analysis, describe the steps the district will take to correct the root causes and provide a timeline for the implementation of those corrections.  The district must develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the parent is provided with either a proposed IEP and proposed placement or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within 45 school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or his/her designee to ensure continuing compliance.  The district must conduct a review of the records of students whose initial evaluations or re-evaluations were conducted after all corrective actions have been implemented to determine compliance with timelines and report the results of that review to the Department.  \*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 analysis of student records, including the number of records reviewed along with a description of the root cause(s) of any non-compliance and a description of the steps the district will take to correct the root cause(s) along with the district’s proposed timeline for implementation of those corrective actions by **October 17, 2014**.  Provide a description of the district’s internal oversight and tracking system, along with the role of the person responsible by **October 17, 2014**.  Submit the results of the second review of student records. Report the number of records reviewed, the number of records in compliance, and for any records not in compliance, submit the results of a root cause analysis of the non-compliance and a detailed description of the district's plan to remedy such remaining non-compliance by **March 18, 2015**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 10/17/2014 | 03/18/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that for all grade levels, including the middle and high schools, parents receive reports on the student's progress toward reaching the goals set in the IEP at least as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students and progress report information sent to parents includes written information on the student's progress toward the annual goals in the IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interviews demonstrated that while the district no longer uses amendments to extend the IEP beyond its anniversary date, the district does not consistently hold a Team meeting at least annually on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, 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. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must conduct an analysis of student records to identify the root cause(s) for the district's inconsistency in conducting Team meetings on or before the anniversary date of the IEP. Based on the results of the analysis, provide the steps the district proposes to take to correct the root causes and a timeline for the implementation of those corrections.  The district must develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure 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. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or his/her designee to ensure continuing compliance.  The district must conduct a review of the records of students whose annual reviews were conducted after all corrective actions were implemented for evidence of meeting the timeline for completion and report the results of that review to the Department.  \*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 analysis of student records. Include a description the root cause(s) and the steps the district will take to correct the root cause(s) along with the district’s proposed timeline for the implementation of corrective actions by **October 17, 2014**.  Provide a description of the district’s internal oversight and tracking system, along with the name/role of the person responsible by **October 17, 2014**.  Submit the results of the second review of student records. Report the number of records reviewed, the number of records in compliance, for any records not in compliance, submit the results of a root cause analysis of the non-compliance and a detailed description of the district's plan to remedy such remaining non-compliance by **March 18, 2015**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 10/17/2014 | 03/18/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents, student record review and interviews indicated that the district ensures that the IEP contains goals and benchmarks for services identified in the service delivery grid, and that the IEP is not changed at a higher administrative level within the district.  Additionally the district ensures that whenever the IEP Team evaluation indicates that a student's disability affects social skills development, or when the 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. The district further ensures that 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. |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Record review and interviews documented that the while the district does provide an appropriate summary at the conclusion of the Team meeting, the district does not consistently provide the parent with the proposed IEP and proposed placement, along with the required notice (Notice of Proposed School District Action), within the 10 working days of the Team meeting.  Additionally, the district does not provide the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement as is required. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must develop a procedure to ensure that parents are receiving two (2) full copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement within 10 days of the Team meeting when a parent has been provided with summary notes at the conclusion of the Team meeting. Appropriate staff must be trained on this procedure.  The district must develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that parents are receiving two (2) full copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement, along with the required notice, within 10 days of the Team meeting. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or his/her designee to ensure continuing compliance.  The district must conduct a student record review for Team meetings that were conducted, after implementation of all of the corrective actions for evidence that 2 copies of the IEP and proposed placement were provided within timelines. Report the results of that review to the Department.  \*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 record review; 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:** | | | |
| Provide a detailed description of the district’s newly developed procedure and evidence (agenda, dated attendance sheet with staff signature and role, materials presented) that responsible staff were trained by **October 17, 2014**.  Provide a description of the district’s internal oversight and tracking system, along with the name/role of the person responsible by **October 17, 2014**.  Submit the results of the review of student records. Report the number of records reviewed, the number of records in compliance, and for any records not in compliance, submit the results of a root cause analysis of that non-compliance and a detailed description of the district's plan to remedy remaining non-compliance by **March 18, 2015**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 10/17/2014 | 03/18/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents, student record review and interviews indicated that the program selected is the least restrictive environment for students, with consideration given to any potential harmful effect on the student or on the quality of services that he or she needs. If the student is removed from the general education classroom at any time, 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.  The district does not remove an eligible student from the general education classroom solely because of needed modification in the curriculum.  Miller’s River Academy, an unapproved day school for students with emotional and behavioral needs in the 3rd through 12th grades, which was the subject of a finding in the previous Coordinated Program Review, no longer exists in the district. |

| **SE Criterion # 21 - School day and school year requirements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews documented that the Team routinely considers the need for an educational program that is less than or more than the regular school day or school year, including extended day or year, and/or residential services, and indicates on the IEP why the shorter or longer program is necessary. |

| **SE Criterion # 22 - IEP implementation and availability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents, student record review and interviews indicated that where the IEP of the student in need of special education has been accepted in whole or in part by that student's parent, the school district provides the mutually agreed upon services without delay. |

| **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:** |
| Documents, student record review and interviews indicated that when a student is referred for an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education, the school district sends written notice to the student's parent(s) within 5 school days of receipt of the referral, along with the district's notice of procedural safeguards. The written notice seeks the consent of the parent for the evaluation to occur, and provides the parent with the opportunity to express any concerns or provide information on the student's skills or abilities and to consult regarding the nature of the proposed evaluation. |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents and interviews demonstrated that the district informs the parent that consent may be revoked by the parent at any time and that except for initial evaluation and initial placement, consent may not be required as condition of any benefit to the child. If the parent has given consent for special education services and then, at any time following, revokes his/her consent to the student’s special education services in writing, the district discontinues all special education services and does not use mediation or request a due process hearing to obtain agreement or a ruling requiring the continuation of services, consistent with federal regulation. If a parent revokes consent in writing, the district acts promptly to provide written notice to the parent/guardian of the district’s proposal to discontinue services, as well as information on how the parent can obtain a copy of his/her right to procedural safeguards. The district provides the notice in a reasonable time before the district intends to discontinue the services. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The district provided the student roster documentation required by the Department. |

| **SE Criterion # 40 - Instructional grouping requirements for students aged five and older** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents and interviews indicated the size and composition of instructional groupings for eligible students receiving services outside the general education classroom are compatible with the methods and goals stated in each student's IEP. Student groupings for pull out services do not exceed 12 students with certified teacher and one aide, and groupings for sub-separate students do not exceed 8 students with one certified teacher. |

| **SE Criterion # 41 - Age span requirements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents and interviews indicated that there are two special education instructional groupings in the district in which the ages of the youngest and oldest student differ by more than 48 months. Waivers for these programs were approved by the Department in October 2013. |

| **SE Criterion # 43 - Behavioral interventions** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review, interviews and observation confirmed that Miller's River Academy, which at the prior Coordinated Program Review often served as a default placement for students in grades 3-12 with behavioral issues, is no longer in existence. Currently, for a student whose behavior impedes their learning or the learning of others, the Team considers the student's behavior including positive behavioral interventions and the possible need for a functional behavioral assessment. |

| **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:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Documents, student record review and interviews, confirmed that the district does conduct manifestation determinations within 10 days of suspension for students with disabilities as required and that the district's 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, are appropriate with the exception of the section on interim alternative educational settings, where the district neglects to mention that a student may also be placed in such a setting on the authority of a hearing officer if the officer orders the alternative placement after the district provides evidence that the student is substantially likely to injure him/herself or others. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must provide an amended, updated copy of the procedures for suspension of students with disabilities to include the authority of a hearing officer to order placement in an interim alternative educational setting after the district provides evidence that the student is substantially likely to injure him/herself or others. This updated information must be added to the high school student handbook.  The district must describe how this amended procedure and the amended handbook will be shared with students, parents and staff. | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Provide an amended, updated copy of the procedures for suspension of students with disabilities and an amended copy of the high school student handbook. Provide a detailed description of when, where, and how this was shared with students, parents and staff by **October 17, 2014**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 10/17/2014 |  |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 48 - Equal opportunity to participate in educational, nonacademic, extracurricular and ancillary programs, as well as participation in regular education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents, interviews and observation confirmed that all students have an equal opportunity to participate in and, if appropriate, receive credit for the vocational, supportive, or remedial services that may be available as part of the general education program as well as the non-academic and extracurricular programs of the school. Students with disabilities at the high school receive art, music, and physical education along with their peers. Miller’s River Academy, where students did not receive physical education, no longer exists. |

| **SE Criterion # 51 - Appropriate special education teacher licensure** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents and interviews confirmed that all special education teachers who design and/or provide direct special education services described in IEPs are appropriately licensed. |

| **SE Criterion # 55 - Special education facilities and classrooms** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Documents, interviews and observation indicated that at Riverbend Elementary, a 3rd and 4th grade school, the Strive K-2 behavior class is placed in this building with no other kindergarten, 1st grade or 2nd grade students. Also at Riverbend Elementary, the 3rd-4th grade Strive behavioral class is situated on the second floor flanked by the computer class, nurse, speech, psychologist, library, art and music, but no general education classrooms. These placements do not maximize these students' inclusion in the life of the school.  At the Athol Middle School, Rooms 311 and 313, both rooms housing sub-separate instructional groups are clustered at the end of a hallway next to the "Glass Room", a space used for the delivery of pull out special education services, and do not minimize the separation of these students or maximize their inclusion in the life of the school. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must move the Strive K-2 class into a building with other students of the same age to minimize their isolation. The district must move the Strive 3rd and 4th grade students into a more appropriate space at the Riverbend Elementary School so that they are not isolated from their peers.  Sub-separate classes in rooms 311 and 313 at the Athol Middle School must be moved to other spaces in the school to more fully include them into the life of the school.  After the district makes the appropriate changes, the Department will make a site visit to ensure that the required changes have been made. | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| The district must provide clearly marked floor plans for the programs cited at Riverbend Elementary School and Athol Middle School, indicating specific special education instructional spaces, and the designated purpose of each additional classroom, including grade level by **October 17, 2014.**  Provide the date that the district has arranged with the Department to conduct the onsite visit to ensure all required changes were made by **October 17, 2014**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 10/17/2014 |  |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 56 - Special education programs and services are evaluated** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents and interviews confirmed that the district regularly evaluates special education services. |