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| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review, document review, and staff interviews indicated that whenever an evaluation shows that a student has a disability on the autism spectrum, IEP Teams consider and specifically address 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 # 7 - Transfer of parental rights at age of majority and student participation and consent at the age of majority** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that the district consistently obtains consent from students with sole or shared educational decision-making rights to continue the students’ special education program upon attainment of the age of majority.  |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and staff interviews demonstrated that required Team members consistently attend IEP meetings. When a required Team member is absent from the meeting, the district secures the parent’s agreement in writing to excuse the Team member before 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. Staff 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:** |
| Student record review and staff interviews indicated that within 30 days of receipt of a parent’s written consent to evaluate, all consented-to assessments are consistently completed. Record review and interviews also indicated that within 45 school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation, IEP Teams are consistently convened to determine 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. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review, document review, and staff interviews indicated that when the IEP Team evaluation shows 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. 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.Student record review also demonstrated that IEP Teams appropriately and consistently complete the Present Levels of Educational Performance for other educational needs (PLEP B) information page of the IEP for students with age-specific considerations. |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Partially Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that IEP Teams do not always state why the removal from the general education classroom is considered critical to the student's program and provide 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. |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| Please ensure that IEP Team chairpersons and other key personnel are trained in the appropriate development of Non-Participation Justification statements that answer why the student’s removal is considered critical when the student is removed from the general education classroom.Please develop an internal system of periodic review for the appropriate development of Non-Participation Justification statements in IEPs and identify the person(s) responsible by name and title for this internal monitoring.Please conduct a student record review of 15 records for evidence that Non-Participation Justification Statements appropriately answer why the student’s removal is considered critical to his/her program when the student is removed from the general education classroom. This sample must be drawn from records of students across the district’s schools whose IEP development activities occurred subsequent to the completion of the district’s corrective actions. \***Please note that 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 level for the record review; b) Date of the review; c) Name of person(s) who conducted the review, their roles(s), and their signature(s).** |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** |
| Submit evidence of staff training, including an agenda, training materials, and signed attendance sheets, indicating name and role of staff. Submit a description of the oversight system and identify the person(s) responsible for monitoring the development of Non-Participation Justification statements, including the date of the system's implementation and the staff responsible for the review. This progress report is due **May 30, 2014.**Submit a report of the results of an internal review of records. Include the number of records reviewed and the number of records in compliance. For any records not in compliance, determine the root cause(s) of the non-compliance, and the district's plan to remedy the non-compliance. This progress report is due **September 22, 2014.** |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 05/30/2014 | 09/22/2014 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
|  **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and staff interviews indicated that when parents revoke consent for special education services in writing, the district will promptly provide the parent with notice to discontinue services within a reasonable timeframe and attach a copy of the parent’s procedural safeguards. Interviews verified that the district will not use mediation or request a due process hearing to obtain agreement or a ruling requiring the continuation of services, consistent with federal regulation.The district did not have any current records for revocation of consent at the time of the mid-cycle review. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The district submitted the roster of special needs students as required by the Department. |

| **SE Criterion # 37 - Procedures for approved and unapproved out-of-district placements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student records, document review, and staff interviews indicated that monitoring plans are maintained for each student in an out-of-district placement and kept in the student’s record.  |

| **SE Criterion # 42 - Programs for young children three and four years of age** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review, staff interviews, and observations demonstrated that Pentucket’s Sweetsir and Page Schools’ inclusionary programs for students three and four years of age conform to the required class size of no more than 15 students with one teacher and one aide when six or seven students with disabilities are enrolled in the class. |

| **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:** |
| Staff interviews and review of student schedules demonstrated that special education students who are also identified as English Language Learners have access to an English Language Education program consistent with the requirements of M.G.L. c. 71A and receive English as a Second Language (ESL) services consistent with their language proficiency needs.  |

| **SE Criterion # 52 - Appropriate certifications/licenses or other credentials -- related service providers** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and staff interviews indicated that all related service professionals, including the district’s speech and language pathologists, are appropriately licensed.  |

| **SE Criterion # 56 - Special education programs and services are evaluated** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and staff interviews indicated that the Pentucket Regional School District regularly evaluates its special education programs and services, with its most recent evaluation conducted during the 2012-2013 school year.  |