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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 consistently provides all required assessments consented to by the parent, specifically a history of the student's educational progress in the general curriculum and a teacher assessment of the student's attention skills, participation behaviors, communication skills, memory and social relations with groups, peers and adults. |

| **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. The information gathered from the checklist is reflected in the goals and accommodations in the IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that the district consistently obtains written parental consent to excuse the attendance of a Team member when that member’s participation at the IEP Team meeting is not necessary. |

| **SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of middle and high school 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. |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Partially Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicated that IEP Teams do not always state why the removal from the general education classroom is considered critical to a 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:** |
| Conduct training for IEP Team chairpersons and other key personnel to ensure that IEP Teams appropriately justify why a student's removal is considered critical when the student is removed from the general education classroom. Develop an internal system of oversight to ensure that IEP Teams develop appropriate Non-Participation Justification statements in IEPs when a student is removed from the general education classroom. The system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or her designee to ensure ongoing compliance.  Conduct an internal administrative review of approximately 15 student records from across the district’s schools to ensure that Non-Participation Justification statements are appropriately developed. This sample must be drawn from records with IEP development subsequent to the implementation of all 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 by **October 30, 2015**.Submit a description of the district's internal oversight and tracking system with periodic reviews, along with the name/role of the designated person by **October 30, 2015**.Submit a report of the results of the internal review of records. Indicate the number of student records reviewed and the number of student records in compliance; for all records not in compliance with this criterion, determine the root cause(s) of the noncompliance and provide the district's plan to remedy the non-compliance. This progress report is due on **February 5, 2016.** |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 10/30/2015 | 02/05/2016 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 22 - IEP implementation and availability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that the district consistently informs parents, in writing, of a delay in IEP implementation for all special education services, including those provided by a school adjustment counselor. This notice includes the reasons for the delay and the actions the district will take to address the lack of space or personnel. |

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

| **SE Criterion # 32 - Parent advisory council for special education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Not Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and interviews confirmed that the district has not established a school-wide parent advisory council (PAC) on special education or sought a waiver from the Department to meet this requirement in an alternative manner.Interviews and document review also demonstrated that the district does not conduct at least one workshop annually on the rights of students and their parents and guardians under the state and federal special education laws.  |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| Prior to developing a corrective action, review the Department’s guidance on Special Education Parent Advisory Councils, at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/2015-1.html>.Following a review of this guidance, develop a detailed plan to establish a parent advisory council that offers membership to all parents of students with disabilities in the district, as well as other interested parties, along with by-laws regarding officers and operational procedures; the opportunity to participate in the planning, development and evaluation of the district's special education programs; and events such as the annual parents’ rights workshop. To meet this requirement in an alternative manner, the district must complete an Alternative Compliance Waiver (<http://www.doe.mass.edu/forms/waivers/form_d.pdf>) for approval from Program Quality Assurance (PQA). |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** |
| Submit a plan that describes how the district will meet the requirement for a parent advisory council by **October 30, 2015.** Depending on the district’s plan, submit evidence that 1) a parent advisory council with by-laws regarding officers and operational procedures has been established, or 2) the district’s alternative means to meet the requirement for a PAC has been approved by PQA. This progress report is due **February 5, 2016.** |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 10/30/2015 | 02/05/2016 |  |  |