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| **SE Criterion # 3 - Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records indicated that district IEP Teams now consistently follow the required process of reviewing, completing, and placing within the student record the Specific Learning Disability (SLD) documentation forms required for eligibility determination for any student suspected of having a specific learning disability: 1) Historical Review and Educational Assessment (SLD 1); 2) Area of Concern and Evaluation Method (SLD 2);  3) Exclusionary Factors (SLD 3); and 4) Observation (SLD 4). (The district Student Support Services website includes a link to ESE’s *Memorandum on Specific Learning Disability-Eligibility Process/Forms* at [www.doe.mass.edu/sped/iep/sld/](http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/iep/sld/) .) |

| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Review of student records and staff interviews demonstrated that whenever an evaluation indicates that a student has a disability on the autism spectrum disorder (ASD), IEP Teams consider and specifically address the following areas: 1) the verbal and nonverbal communication needs of the student; 2) the need to develop social interaction skills and proficiencies; 3) the needs resulting from the student’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 student’s disability that impact progress in the general curriculum, including social and emotional development. Record review demonstrated that IEP Teams utilize a district ASD checklist to guide the IEP development, adding goals and services to the service delivery grid based upon the identified areas of student need. This checklist is maintained within the student record. |

| **SE Criterion # 4 - Reports of assessment results** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicated that evaluation reports now consistently contain, in educationally relevant and common terms, the student's needs, offering explicit means of meeting them. |

| **SE Criterion # 6 - Determination of transition services** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews with staff members and a review of student records indicated that the Team discusses transition annually at Team meetings, documents the discussions on the Transition Planning form and updates the form and IEP, as appropriate. |

| **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:** | | | |
| Although the district has a process in place to obtain consent at the age of majority, a review of records and staff interviews indicated that one year prior to the student reaching age 18, the district does not consistently inform students and their parents/guardians of the rights that will transfer from the parent/guardian to the student upon the student’s 18th birthday. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review the department’s requirements on age of majority at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/11_1.html> prior to developing the district's corrective actions.  Conduct a root cause analysis to determine why the district does not notify students and their parents of the transfer of educational decision-making rights one year prior to the student’s attainment of age 18. Upon identification of the cause(s), indicate the corrective actions to address the issue(s) of age of majority notification.    Conduct an internal review of a sample of student records for high school students age 17+ ensuring that at least one year prior to the student reaching age 18, the district is informing both the parent and the student of the transfer of decision-making rights that will occur. 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 the results of the district’s root cause analysis, including the corrective actions and the associated timelines by **September 25, 2015.**  Submit a report of the results of the internal reviews 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 by **January 25, 2016.** | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/25/2015 | 01/25/2016 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that copies of progress reports now consistently appear in the student records, informing parents on the student’s progress toward reaching the goals in the IEP as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students. |

| **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 parents are provided with summary notes and the service delivery grid at the conclusion of the Team meeting. The district does not always provide the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement, but rather only one copy upon issuance of the IEP to the parent. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Revise procedures and review with staff responsible to ensure that the district provides the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that parents are provided 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 8 records (2 at each grade level) to ensure that parents are provided with two (2) copies of the proposed 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 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 updated procedures, name(s) of staff responsible and date of implementation on the requirement to provide parents with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement by **September 25, 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 for the oversight of provision of two (2) complete copies of the IEP by **September 25, 2015**.  Submit a report of the results of an internal review of student records. Indicate the number of student records reviewed, the number of records in compliance, for any records not in compliance, determine the root cause(s) of the non-compliance and the district's plan to remedy any identified non-compliance by **January 25, 2016**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/25/2015 | 01/25/2016 |  |  |

| **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 demonstrated that written notices from the district do not meet all of the content requirements set forth in federal regulations. Specifically, the Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1) form did not consistently address what rejected options were considered and why those options were rejected. They did, however, include all other required content. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review the Department's example of an appropriately developed notice available at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/advisories/01_4sample.pdf>  prior to developing the district's corrective actions.  Provide training to appropriate special education Team Chairs regarding the required provision of written notice to parent(s), specifically illustrating the Team’s consideration of rejected options and why those options were rejected within the (N1) form.  Develop an internal system of periodic review for evidence of appropriately completed written (N1) forms. The system should include oversight and periodic reviews by the Director of Special Education to ensure ongoing compliance.  Conduct an internal administrative review of a sample of student records where Team meetings were held following implementation of all corrective actions for evidence of completion of the (N1) notice, specifically including illustration of the Team’s consideration of rejected options and why those options were rejected.  **\*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 evidence of staff training, including an agenda, training materials, and signed attendance sheets, indicating name and role of staff and name of presenter by  **September 25, 2015**.  Submit a description of the oversight system for monitoring the provision, completeness, and record maintenance of written (N1) forms, including the date of the system's implementation and the person responsible for the oversight by **September 25, 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 by **January 25, 2016**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| 09/25/2015 | 01/25/2016 |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records demonstrated that the district consistently obtains consent to the services proposed on a student's IEP before providing such services. The district also has a process in place to follow up on IEP plans that exceed 30 days without a parent signature. The student services secretary tracks, under the supervision of the Director of Student Services, the IEPs being sent home. In addition to phone calls home, the IEP goes home by certified mail. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews with staff members demonstrated that the district consistently ensures parent participation in meetings. The district documents rescheduling of meetings at a mutually agreed upon time and uses other methods such as conference calls, or video conferencing to ensure parent participation. |

| **SE Criterion # 29 - Communications are in English and primary language of home** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews with staff members and a review of student records indicated that the district provides notices orally or in some other mode of communication and consistently keeps written documentation when oral translations are used. |

| **SE Criterion # 43 - Behavioral interventions** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews with staff members indicated that the district conducts behavioral interventions including Functional Behavioral Assessments (FBAs) and Behavioral Intervention Plans (BIPs) for students subject to discipline procedures under IDEA 2004, in addition to other disabled students who present with emotional and behavioral needs. |

| **SE Criterion # 48 - Equal opportunity to participate in educational, nonacademic, extracurricular and ancillary programs, as well as participation in regular education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews with staff members indicated that special education students consistently have an equal opportunity to participate in and, if appropriate, receive credit for the vocational, supportive, or remedial services that may be available as part of the general education program. Specifically, the district's vocational mentoring program is open to all special education students without the need of a recommendation for participation from the Director of Special Education. |

| **SE Criterion # 54 - Professional development** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Interviews with staff members and a review of documents indicated that the district provides training for all staff on analyzing and accommodating diverse learning styles of all students and on methods of collaboration among teachers, paraprofessionals and teacher assistants to accommodate diverse learning styles of all students in the regular classroom. |

| **SE Criterion # 55 - Special education facilities and classrooms** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Observations and staff interviews indicated that while special education students formerly received counseling and speech therapy services in a common, open area within the special education office suite, students now receive counseling and speech therapy services in private rooms, minimizing stigmatization of such students. |