|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | ESE Logo | **COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW**  **MID-CYCLE REPORT**  **District:** **Weston Public Schools**  **MCR Onsite Dates:** **01/13/2015**  **Program Area: Special Education** |
|  |  | Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education |
| COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW **MID-CYCLE REPORT** | | |

| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated that whenever an evaluation shows that a student has a disability on the autism spectrum (ASD), 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.  Record review demonstrated that IEP Teams use a checklist to guide the IEP development of these required areas for ASD students. Teams document their consideration of each area in the IEP, along with goals and accommodations for identified areas of student need. |

| **SE Criterion # 4 - Reports of assessment results** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicated that the occupational therapy and achievement assessment summaries consistently include the procedures employed, the results and diagnostic impression and define in detail and in educationally relevant and common terms, the student’s needs, offering explicit means of meeting them. |

| **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 at the high school level demonstrated that within forty‑five school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial or re-evaluation, the district does not consistently 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:** | | | |
| Conduct a root cause analysis to determine why high school IEP Team meetings are not consistently convened within 45 working school days after receipt of signed parental consent. Upon identification of the cause(s), indicate the corrective actions to address the issue(s) of delayed IEP Team meetings.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that IEP Team meetings are consistently convened within 45 school working days of receipt of signed parent's consent to an initial evaluation or re-evaluation. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or her/his designee to ensure ongoing compliance.  Conduct an internal review of approximately 10 records of high school students representing all grade levels (freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors) to ensure that IEP Team meetings are convened within 45 school working days or less after receipt of parental consent to an initial evaluation or re-evaluation. This sample must be drawn from records with evaluations conducted subsequent to the implementation of all corrective actions.  **\*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, their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit the results of the district’s root cause analysis, including the corrective actions and the associated timelines **by May 7, 2015**.  Submit a description of the district’s internal oversight and tracking system to monitor scheduling IEP meetings within 45 school working days of receipt of signed parent's consent, including the date of the system's implementation and the staff responsible for the oversight by **May 7, 2015.**  Submit the results of the review of student 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 **October 30, 2015**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 05/07/2015 | 10/30/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 9A - Elements of the eligibility determination; general education accommodations and services for ineligible students** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated that to determine whether a student is eligible for special education, the district convenes a Team meeting with all required Team members, including the parent, and determines if the student has one or more disabilities, if the student is making effective progress in school, if any lack of progress is a result of the student’s disability, and if the student requires special education and/or related services in order to make effective progress or access the general curriculum. Interviews demonstrated that the practice of holding meetings without the parent to develop an IEP prior to determining eligibility has been discontinued. |

| **SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews demonstrated that at least annually on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, Team meetings are consistently held to consider student progress and to review, revise, or develop a new IEP, or refer the student for a re-evaluation, as appropriate. Student records and interviews confirmed that the district has discontinued the practice of using amendments to extend the dates of the IEP.  Record review also determined that IEP goals are developed to reflect current student needs and are not carried over from year to year. Additionally, student record review demonstrated that for students in out-of-district placements, the IEP is developed at a Team meeting convened by a district Team chairperson with the out-of-district placement staff and proposed to the parent by the district. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records, documents, and interviews indicated that for students identified on the autism spectrum or when 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 skills and proficiencies to address or avoid bullying, harassment and teasing are individualized and documented in the Present Levels of Educational Performance B: Other Educational Needs (PLEP B) page, developed as goals and benchmarks, and documented on the service delivery grid of the IEP by IEP Teams.  A review of records and interviews also demonstrated that when students receive specialized instruction, these supports and services are consistently documented in the IEP service delivery grid.  Record review and interviews also determined that the district has completely discontinued the practice known as “Procedures Lite,” through which parents agreed to waive procedural rights guaranteed under federal and state special education laws. |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Although the district provides a Team meeting summary at the end of the Team meeting and sends two copies of the proposed IEP and placement to parents, a review of records indicated that the IEP is not sent within 10 days of the Team meeting for students in both in-district and out-of-district placements. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Using a sample of in-district and out-of-district student records between September-December 2014, conduct a root cause analysis to determine why IEPs and placements are not proposed immediately following the IEP Team meeting.  Prior to developing a corrective action, review the Department's guidance on the immediate provision of proposed IEPs at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/news/news.aspx?id=3182>.  Following identification of the root cause(s) and review of the Department’s guidance, indicate the corrective actions the district proposes to take to address the immediate provision of proposed IEPs and placements within three to five days (without a Team summary) or within two weeks (with a Team summary).  Conduct an internal administrative review of approximately 10 student records from a sample of in-district and out-of-district placements to ensure that IEPs and placements are proposed immediately following the IEP Team meeting. This sample must be drawn from records with Team meetings held subsequent to the implementation of all corrective actions.  **\*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, their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit the results of the district's root cause analysis, including the corrective actions and the associated timelines by **May 7, 2015**.  Submit the results of the review of student 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 **October 30, 2015**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 05/07/2015 | 10/30/2015 |  |  |

| **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 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:** | | | |
| 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/his designee to ensure ongoing compliance.    Conduct an internal administrative review of approximately 10 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 **May 7, 2015.**  Submit a description of the oversight system for monitoring the development of appropriate Non-Participation Justification statements, including the date of the system's implementation and the staff responsible for the oversight by **May 7, 2015.**    Submit the results of the review of student records. Indicate the number of records reviewed, the number found to be compliant, and an explanation of the root cause for any continued noncompliance and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the school to address any identified noncompliance. This progress report is due by **October 30, 2015.** | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 05/07/2015 | 10/30/2015 |  |  |

| **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:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| A review of student records indicated that when a student is referred for an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education by the parent or the instructional support team, the district sends written notice to the student's parent within 5 school days of receipt of the referral, along with the district’s notice of procedural safeguards.  Record review also determined that Notices of Proposed School District Action (N1) do not consistently explain why the district has proposed or refused to take action, including any other options that the district considered and the reasons why those options were rejected, or a description of the evaluation procedures, tests, records, or reports used as the basis for the school district's decisions. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Conduct training for IEP Team chairpersons on the completion of the federally required written notice to parent(s) to document the proposal or refusal to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of students.  Develop an internal system of oversight to ensure that special education staff members appropriately complete written notices. The oversight system should include periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education or her/his designee to ensure ongoing compliance.  Conduct an internal administrative review of approximately 10 student records from across the district’s schools to ensure that the notice to parent(s) proposing an IEP, placement, evaluation, or other actions contains all federally required elements. This sample must be drawn from records with Team meetings convened 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 **May 7, 2015.**  Submit a description of the oversight system for monitoring the completeness of written notices, including the date of the system's implementation and the staff responsible for the oversight by **May 7, 2015.**  Submit the results of the review of student records. Indicate the number of records reviewed, the number found to be compliant, and an explanation of the root cause for any continued noncompliance and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the school to address any identified noncompliance. This progress report is due by **October 30, 2015.** | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 05/07/2015 | 10/30/2015 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| See SE 9A regarding parent participation in the eligibility determination process.  The district submitted the roster of special needs students as required by the Department. |

| **SE Criterion # 53 - Use of paraprofessionals** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews and a review of teachers’ schedules demonstrated that seven (7) additional special education teachers have been hired at the high school to design and implement instruction for students with disabilities. Paraprofessionals who were designated as tutors provide support for students under the supervision of the special education teaching staff. |

| **SE Criterion # 54 - Professional development** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews and document review indicated that professional development is annually provided to both special education and general education staff on the topics of state and federal special education requirements, local special education policies and procedures, analyzing and accommodating diverse learning styles or methods of collaboration among teachers, paraprofessionals and teacher assistants to accommodate diverse learning styles of all students in the general education classroom. |

| **SE Criterion # 55 - Special education facilities and classrooms** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A facilities review at the Woodland Elementary School demonstrated that the special education and related services classrooms are identified only by teacher name and room number, consistent with the identification of general education classrooms. |