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| **SE Criterion # 3 - Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interview indicate that when a student is suspected of having a specific learning disability (SLD), IEP Teams do not consistently use all required SLD forms to document the student’s disability: Historical Review and Educational Assessment, Area of Concern and Evaluation Method, Exclusionary Factors, and Observation, when completing the mandatory SLD Team Determination of Eligibility. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must develop procedures for Teams to consistently use all required forms to document the student’s disability when a student is suspected of having a specific learning disability. Please see *Memorandum on Specific Learning Disability - Eligibility Process/Forms* at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/iep/sld/>  The district must provide training on the newly developed procedures for all staff that may be responsible for assuming the role of Team chairperson.  The district must develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure staff consistently use all required SLD forms to document the student’s disability, with periodic reviews by the special education director or designee to ensure continued compliance.  The district must conduct a review of student records of any students diagnosed with SLD, who have had an initial or re-evaluation Team meeting after corrective action is completed, to ensure all four required forms are completed.  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 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 the Department with a copy of the procedures developed to ensure Teams complete all required documentation when students are suspected of having a specific learning disability by **September 30, 2015.**  Provide evidence of the review of the newly developed procedures by **September 30, 2015**.  Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system with timelines and the name and role of the designated person responsible by **September 30, 2015.**  Submit the results of a review of student records. Report the number of records reviewed, the number of records in compliance and for any record not found in compliance, report on the root cause of continued non-compliance and steps taken to be in full compliance by **December 30, 2015**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/30/2015 | 12/30/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documents, record review and interview indicate no student currently enrolled in the district has a diagnosis on the autism spectrum.  The district has developed a checklist and trained staff to ensure IEP Team members will specifically address the following for a student with a diagnosis on the autism spectrum: 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 # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interview indicate each IEP Team discusses the provision of programs and services to the student in the least restrictive environment. The basis for a determination that a student must be removed from the general education classroom at any time is documented in the individualized Nonparticipation Justification statement on the student's IEP. |

| **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 the district provides parents with a Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1), that includes complete information about the district's proposal for an evaluation or IEP, summarizes the Team's decisions and considerations, describes the school's proposed action, includes rejected options, and if applicable, the reason for a rejection. |

| **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 # 32 - Parent advisory council for special education** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Not Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Document review and interview indicate that although the district regularly meets with parents and offers an annual workshop on state and federal special education rights of students, the district has not successfully established a district-wide parent advisory council (PAC) on special education. In interview, district staff report the intent to apply for a Request for a Waiver for Alternative Compliance for the requirement to establish a PAC. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| The district must seek approval from Program Quality Assurance (PQA) for an Alternative Compliance Waiver.  Please see the Administrative Advisory SPED 2015-1: Special Education Parent Advisory councils, Acceptable Alternatives, and Use of Social Media: [www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/2015-1.html](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/2015-1.html) | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| The district must submit a copy of an approved waiver from the Department for the district to establish an acceptable alternative to establishment of a special education parent advisory council by **September 30, 2015.** | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/30/2015 |  |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 56 - Special education programs and services are evaluated** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Documentation review and interview indicate the district is regularly evaluating its special education programs and services, and has made changes to its programs after analyzing evaluation results. |