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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 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 and staff interviews indicated that IEP Teams have developed a checklist to guide the IEP development of these required areas for students on the autism spectrum. Teams document their consideration of each area in the Additional Information section of the IEP, along with goals and accommodations for identified areas of student need. The checklist is also maintained in the student record. |

| **SE Criterion # 10 - End of school year evaluations** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that when the consent to evaluate is received between 30 and 45 school working days before the end of the school year, the district is no longer postponing completing the re-evaluation process until the start of school in September. In the records reviewed, the district completed all evaluations prior to the close of the school year and the staff members interviewed indicated that the district has stopped the practice of carrying evaluations over to the next school year. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the district discontinued the practice known as "Procedures Lite" two years ago after learning that the practice violated the rights contained in the Notice of Procedural Safeguards by asking parents to agree to waive procedural rights guaranteed under federal and state special education laws, for one year (or longer, if agreed to in subsequent years). Record review confirmed that meetings and evaluations are being held according to required timelines and IEPs are written annually. |

| **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 parents receive summary notes and a service delivery grid at the conclusion the Team meeting. When the district issues the IEP to the parent, only one copy of the IEP and proposed placement page is provided with two signature pages. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Develop a set of revised procedures and review with staff responsible for implementation of the requirement to provide parents with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement.  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. The tracking system should include oversight and periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education to ensure ongoing compliance.  Develop a report of the results of an internal review of a sample of student records across all grade levels (2 per level) to ensure provision of two (2) copies of the IEP, and proposed placement. 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 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, with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit a copy of the updated procedures, name(s) of staff responsible and date of implementation of the requirement to provide parents with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement by **September 30, 2015.**  Submit the internal oversight and tracking system with periodic reviews along with name/role of the person(s) responsible for the oversight on provision of two (2) complete copies of the IEP. Provide to ESE by **September 30, 2015**.  Submit a report of the results of the internal 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 by **January 15, 2016**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/30/2015 | 1/15/2016 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the IEP Team does not consistently state why students are removed from the general education classroom, why the removal is considered critical to the student's program or give 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. The statements included in the student records were generic, non-specific and gave no reason for removal from the general education classroom. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Conduct training for Team Chairs on developing Non-participation Justification statements in the IEP to ensure that the Team states the reason(s) why the removal is considered critical to the student's program or gives 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.    Develop an internal oversight system for periodic review of the appropriateness of Non-participation Justification statements in the IEP by the Director of Special Education to ensure ongoing compliance.  Conduct a student record review of 8 records (2 per grade level) across all grade levels for evidence that the Non-participation Justification statements answer why the removal is considered critical to the student's program for those students removed from the general education setting for special education services. This sample must be drawn from records with IEPs developed 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 for the record review; b) Date of the review; c) who conducted the review, their role(s), and their signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit evidence of Team Chair training and include date of training, agenda, signed training attendance sheet(s) with name(s)/role(s), training materials and name of presenter by **September 30, 2015**.  Submit a narrative of the system of internal monitoring and periodic review of Non-justification Participation statements by **September 30, 2015**.  Submit a report of the results of the internal record review. 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 noncompliance and submit the district's plan to remedy the noncompliance. Submit the results of this report to Department by **January 15, 2016.** | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/30/2015 | 1/15/2016 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicated that following IEP meetings where the district proposes a change in placement, student schedules are no longer changed the next day prior to receiving a signed Individualized Education Plan and Placement Consent form. A review of student schedules, which the district attaches to the IEP, and matched IEP signatures along with interviews, confirmed that the district discontinued the practice and now waits for a signed IEP before changing a student's schedule. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The district provided the student roster documentation required by the Department. |