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| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews demonstrated that whenever an evaluation indicates that a child has a disability on the autism spectrum (ASD), IEP Teams consider and specifically address the following areas: 1) the verbal and nonverbal communication needs of the child; 2) the need to develop social interaction skills and proficiencies; 3) the needs resulting from the child's unusual responses to sensory experiences; 4) the needs resulting from resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines; 5) the needs resulting from engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements; 6) the need for any positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports to address any behavioral difficulties resulting from autism spectrum disorder; and 7) other needs resulting from the child's disability that impact progress in the general curriculum, including social and emotional development. Record review demonstrated that IEP Teams utilize an ASD checklist to guide the IEP development, adding goals and services to the service delivery grid based on the identified areas of student need and listing the outcome of the discussion in the Additional Information section of the IEP. |

| **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:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the district consistently informs the student and the parent/guardian one year prior that the educational decision making rights will transfer from the parent/guardian to the student upon the student's 18th birthday.However, the district has not implemented procedures to document the student's decision and place it in the student record when a student chooses to share or delegate decision-making. Also, the district does not obtain consent from the student with sole or shared decision-making rights upon reaching the age of 18 to continue his/her special education program. |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| Conduct activities for individual students identified by the Department on the *Student Record Issues Worksheet* and provide copies of the student decision-making documentation when a student chooses to share or delegate decision-making. Also provide a copy of the signature page of the IEP to demonstrate that consent has been obtained from students who have turned 18. Conduct a root cause analysis to determine why the district does not implement procedures to: 1) document the student's decision or place it in the student record when a student chooses to share or delegate decision-making, and 2) obtain consent from the student upon reaching the age of 18 to continue the student´s special education program. Upon identification of the cause(s), indicate the corrective action(s) to address these issues.(Please refer to Administrative Advisory SPED 2011-1 on the Age of Majority @: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/11_1.html> )Conduct an internal review of at least six high school student records for all students who have attained the age of majority, subsequent to the district's implementation of corrective actions, to ensure that the district has: 1) documented when the student chose to share or delegate decision-making and 2) obtained consent from the student upon reaching age 18 to continue the student's special education program. **\*Please note when conducting internal monitoring that district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the ESE 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 narrative description of the corrective actions taken for each student identified in the *Student Record Issues Worksheet*. Please include documentation identified in the worksheet by **June 1, 2015**.Submit the results of the district's root cause analysis, including the corrective actions, the person(s) responsible and the associated timelines by **June 1, 2015**.Submit a report of the results of the internal review of high school student (age18+) records. Indicate the number of student records reviewed and the number of records in compliance with this criterion; for all records not in compliance, determine the root cause(s) of the noncompliance and the district's plan to remedy the non-compliance by **November 20, 2015**. |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 06/01/2015 | 11/20/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Partially Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that after the Team determines whether a student is eligible for special education, the district does not consistently provide to the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within forty-five (45) school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or re-evaluation. |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| Develop procedures regarding the requirement that after determining whether a student is eligible for special education, the district must provide to the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within forty-five (45) school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation, or re-evaluation. Train appropriate staff members about these new procedures.Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the district provides to the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within required timelines. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or his/her designated person to ensure ongoing compliance. Conduct an internal review of a sample of student records from across all school levels subsequent to the implementation of all corrective actions, to ensure that the district does provide the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement, or a written statement of no eligibility within 45 school working days of receipt of the parent’s written consent to an initial evaluation or re-evaluation. **\*Please note when conducting internal monitoring the district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the ESE 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 evidence of training of appropriate staff members on newly revised procedures including agenda, attendance sheet with name(s)/role(s), training materials and name of presenter by **June 1, 2015**. Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system with periodic reviews, along with the name and role of the person responsible by **June 1, 2015**. Submit a report of the results of the internal record review and include the number of records reviewed, the number in compliance with this criterion, an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance, and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to remedy any identified noncompliance by **November 20, 2015**. |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 06/01/2015 | 11/20/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Partially Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the district routinely provides parents with summary notes and the service delivery grid at the conclusion of the Team meeting and later provides two copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement, along with the required notice.However, the school district does not consistently provide these documents within two weeks of the IEP Team meeting. |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** |
| Revise district procedures for provision of the IEP to parents to ensure two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement along with the Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1) form are sent within two weeks of the Team meeting. (Please refer to Special Education Memorandum on Parent response to proposed IEP and proposed placement @: [http://www.doe.mass.edu/news/news.aspx?id=3182](https://mail.doe.mass.edu/owa/redir.aspx?C=w78u1yYkFUCT43WM6pQZhzHfnosjS9IIix5ruurwiDi3mnDvGH2ISs6U7CDOtDjCfKaucpYp9oI.&URL=http%3a%2f%2fwww.doe.mass.edu%2fnews%2fnews.aspx%3fid%3d3182) ) Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the district is providing the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement along with the (N1) form within two weeks of the Team meeting. The tracking system should include oversight and periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education to ensure ongoing compliance. Conduct an internal review of a sample of student records from all buildings to ensure that two (2) copies of the IEP, proposed placement and Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1) form are being provided within two weeks of the IEP meeting. This sample must be drawn from records with IEP development that occurred after all corrective actions have been implemented. **\*Please note when conducting administrative monitoring the district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the ESE 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 a description of the procedures and the internal oversight and tracking system along with the name/role of the person(s) responsible for the oversight by **June 1, 2015**. Submit the results of an administrative review of student records. Indicate the number of records reviewed and the number in compliance; for all records not in compliance determine the root cause(s) for any continued noncompliance and provide the district's plan to remedy any identified noncompliance. Please submit this to the ESE by **November 20, 2015**. |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** |
| 06/01/2015 | 11/20/2015 |  |  |

| **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 # 29 - Communications are in English and primary language of home** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that communications with parents are consistently provided in simple and commonly understood words and are in both English and the primary language of the home if such primary language is other than English. Further, in instances when the district provides notices orally or in some other mode of communication that is not a written language, the district keeps written documentation to demonstrate that it has provided such notice in an alternate manner, of the content of the notice and of the steps taken to ensure that the parent understood the content of the notice. This documentation is kept at all individual school buildings. |

| **SE Criterion # 32 - Parent advisory council for special education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews with a representative of the Special Education Parent Advisory Council (SEPAC) and district staff indicated that procedures are in place for the SEPAC to advise the district on matters that pertain to the education and safety of students with disabilities. The SEPAC has regular meetings with school district officials and its members participate in district surveys on such matters. |

| **SE Criterion # 56 - Special education programs and services are evaluated** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and staff interviews demonstrated that the district regularly evaluates its special education programs and services. The district has hired outside contractors to evaluate its programs and services and sends surveys to parents seeking their opinions on the efficacy of program offerings. |