|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | ESE Logo | **COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW**  **MID-CYCLE REPORT**  **District:** **Springfield Public Schools**  **MCR Onsite Dates:** **12/20/2016 - 12/22/2016**  **Program Area: Special Education** |
|  |  | Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.  Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education |
| COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW **MID-CYCLE REPORT** | | |

| **SE Criterion # 2 - Required and optional assessments** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that the district consistently provides educational assessments, including a history of the student's educational progress in the general curriculum and teacher assessments that address attention skills, participation behaviors, communication skills, memory and social relations with groups, peers and adults. Student record review also confirmed that consent to evaluate forms consistently list assessments in the area of suspected disability. |

| **SE Criterion # 3 - Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that when a student suspected of having a specific learning disability (SLD) is evaluated, the district consistently completes the required written eligibility determination and the four components used to determine eligibility: Historical Review and Educational Assessment (SLD 1); Area of Concern and Evaluation Method (SLD 2); Exclusionary Factors (SLD 3); and Observation (SLD 4) for students at the secondary level. |

| **SE Criterion # 3A - Special requirements for students on the autism spectrum** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that whenever an evaluation shows that a student has a disability on the autism spectrum, IEP Teams consider and specifically address: 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 response 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.  IEP Teams use a checklist to guide the development of these required areas for students on the autism spectrum. Student record review demonstrated that 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:** |
| Student record review indicated that assessment reports consistently include procedures employed and diagnostic impressions. Student records also indicated that assessment summaries are consistently completed and available for parents two days prior to the Team meeting. |

| **SE Criterion # 6 - Determination of transition services** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that students ages 14 and older are consistently invited and encouraged to attend Team meetings where transition services are discussed or proposed. Student record review and interviews also demonstrated that Teams consistently review Transition Planning Forms annually and update information on the form and the 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:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that the notice informing parents and students of the transfer of educational decision-making rights from the parent/guardian to the student is consistently provided one year prior to students turning 18 years of age, and the district consistently obtains consent from the student at age 18 to continue special education services in the IEP. When students choose to share educational decision-making or delegate decision-making, the district consistently documents the decision in the student record. |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review indicated that required IEP Team members, including general education teachers and special education teachers, are not consistently attending Team meetings, and the parent and the district do not always agree in writing to excuse the Team member. Also, excused Team members are not providing written input to the parent and the IEP Team for the development of the IEP prior to the meeting.  Student record review also indicated that when transition services are being discussed, the IEP Teams do not consistently include parents or a representative of a public agency who may be responsible for providing or paying for such services. Students ages 14 and older are consistently invited to Team meetings. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review district procedures and provide training to Special Education Supervisors and Evaluation Team Leaders on the requirements of Team attendance and on the excusal process when a Team member is unable to attend.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure required Team members attend Team meetings and the excusal process is followed and documented. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.    Conduct a review of a sample of student records from across all grade levels and schools for students whose Team meetings were held after implementation of all corrective actions, for evidence that required Team members including parents and public agencies, when appropriate, are in attendance and excusal procedures are followed if a Team member is unable to attend.  **\* 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 with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Provide evidence of training (agenda, signed/dated attendance list with staff role and materials used) by **June 9, 2017**.  Provide a detailed description of the district's internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the results of the internal record review. Indicate the number of records reviewed at each level (preschool, elementary, middle and high school); the number found to be compliant; an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance; and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to address any identified non-compliance by **November 10, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that after the receipt of written parental consent to an initial evaluation or re-evaluation, the district consistently convenes a Team meeting to determine the student's eligibility and provides the parent with either a proposed IEP and placement or written explanation of the finding of no eligibility within forty-five school working days. |

| **SE Criterion # 10 - End of school year evaluations** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that when consent for an evaluation is received between 30 and 45 school working days before the end of the school year, the district consistently schedules a Team meeting to propose an IEP or issues a finding of no eligibility no later than 14 days after the end of the school year. |

| **SE Criterion # 11 - School district response to parental request for independent educational evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that the district consistently convenes a Team meeting within 10 school days from the receipt of an Independent Educational Evaluation whether publicly or privately funded. |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review indicated that parents receive progress reports at least as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students. Student records also indicated that when a student's eligibility terminates because the student has graduated from secondary school or exceeded the age of eligibility, the district consistently provides the student with a summary of his or her academic achievement and functional performance, including recommendations on how to assist the student in meeting his or her postsecondary goals.  However, student record review indicated that progress reports do not consistently provide information specific to the student's progress toward each annual goal in the IEP. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review district procedures and provide training to Special Education Supervisors, Evaluation Team Leaders, special education teachers and related service providers on the procedures for providing information specific to each annual IEP goal.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to monitor the content of progress reports. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  Subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, conduct a review of a sample of student records across grade levels and schools to determine if the district is addressing students’ progress toward the annual goals in the IEP.  **\* 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 with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Provide evidence of training (agenda, signed/dated attendance list with staff role and materials used) by **June 9, 2017**.  Provide a detailed description of the district's internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the results of the internal record review. Indicate the number of records reviewed at each level (preschool, elementary, middle and high school); the number found to be compliant; an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance; and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to address any identified non-compliance by **November 10, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that at least annually, on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, a Team meeting is not consistently held to consider the student's progress and to review, revise, or develop a new IEP or refer the student for a re-evaluation, as appropriate.    Student record review and the interview with the Special Education Administrator indicated that the district does not amend the IEP between annual IEP meetings. Rather, if the district and parent agree to make changes to a student's IEP between annual IEP meetings, the IEP Team reconvenes to develop a new IEP. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review those records in which the annual review IEP Team meeting was due since the start of the 2016-2017 school year, but was not conducted on or before the anniversary date of the IEP. Analyze the information to determine the root cause(s) of the non-compliance. Based on this root cause analysis, indicate the specific corrective actions the district will take to remedy the non-compliance and a timeline for implementation of those corrective actions.  Subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, conduct a review of a sample of student records across grade levels and schools for students in which annual review IEP Team meetings were due to determine whether the Team meeting was held on or before the anniversary date of the IEP.  **\* 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 with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit the results of the root cause analysis that includes a description of the district's proposed corrective actions, the timeline for implementation, and the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the results of the internal record review. Indicate the number of records reviewed at each level (elementary, middle and high school); the number found to be compliant; an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance; and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to address any identified non-compliance by **November 10, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 17 - Initiation of services at age three and Early Intervention transition procedures** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that the district consistently develops an IEP for eligible children by their third birthday. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review indicated that upon determining that the student is eligible for special education, IEP Teams do not consistently address all elements of the current IEP format provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Specifically, the IEP service delivery grid is not always written to accurately reflect the services, types of settings, types of service providers, or locations where services are to be provided. In addition, student record review indicated that the goals outlined for a student in their IEP are not consistently represented on the service delivery grid. Staff interviews indicated that the IEP is not changed outside of the Team meeting.  Student record review confirmed that IEP Teams specifically address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing for students whose disability affects social skills development, when the student's disability makes him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment or teasing, and for students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum. The district includes a student specific bullying statement under the Additional Information section of the IEP and, if necessary, includes goals and services related to these skills. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Develop procedures to ensure that service delivery grids in the IEP accurately reflect the services students receive, the types of settings, the types of service providers and locations in which services are to be provided. Conduct training for Special Education Supervisors and Evaluation Team Leaders on these procedures.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system for ensuring service delivery grids in the IEP accurately reflect the services students receive, the types of settings, the types of service providers and locations in which services are to be provided. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure ongoing compliance.  For those students whose records were identified by the Department, reconvene the IEP Teams, ensuring that service delivery grids are being completed and accurately reflect services students are receiving.  Subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, conduct a review of a sample of student records across grade levels and schools for evidence that the IEP accurately reflects the services the student receives, the type of settings in which services are provided, and the location at which services are provided.  **\* 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 with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit the procedures and evidence of training (agenda, signed/dated attendance list with staff role and materials used) by **June 9, 2017**.  Provide a detailed description of the district's internal oversight and tracking system including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 9, 2017**.  For those student records identified by the Department, submit a copy of the IEP and the Team Meeting Attendance Sheet (N3A) indicating that the IEP Teams have reconvened. Submit this information by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the results of the internal record review. Indicate the number of records reviewed at each level (preschool, elementary, middle and high school); the number found to be compliant; an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance; and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to address any identified non-compliance by **November 10, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that IEP Teams develop the IEP prior to determining the appropriate placement to deliver the student's identified services and accommodations. Student record review and interviews demonstrated that Teams consistently ensure that students are educated in the school she or he would attend if the student did not require special education, unless otherwise required by the IEP.  Student record review also indicated that immediately following the development of the IEP, the district provides the parent with two copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement along with the required notice.  However, student record review confirmed that IEP Team decisions regarding placement, including the services, types of settings, types of service providers, or locations where services are to be provided are not consistently and accurately reflected in the service delivery grid. (See SE 18A) | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| See SE 18A | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| See SE 18A | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that the Non-participation Justification statement on a student's IEP is not specific to the student. Also, the statement does not consistently state why the removal is considered critical to the student's program and the basis for the Team's 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:** | | | |
| Review district procedures and provide training to Special Education Supervisors and Evaluation Team Leaders on writing the Non-participation Justification statement to ensure the statement is specific to the student and justifies why the removal from the general education classroom is necessary.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the Non-participation Justification statement is specific to the student and justifies why the removal from the general education classroom is necessary. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  Subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, conduct a review of sample of student records across all grade levels and schools to ensure that the Non-participation Justification statements in the IEP are specific to the student and justify why removal from the general education classroom is necessary for the student and the basis for the Team's conclusion.  **\* 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 with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Provide evidence of training (agenda, signed/date attendance list with staff role and materials used) by **June 9, 2017**.  Provide a detailed description of the internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the results of the internal review of student records. Indicate the number of records reviewed at each level (preschool, elementary, middle and high school); the number found to be compliant; an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance; and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to address any identified non-compliance by **November 10, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **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:** | | | |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that when a student is referred for special education eligibility, the district consistently provides a Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1) for an evaluation within five days of the referral. However, the N1 to propose an IEP is not individualized to the student. Specifically, the N1 contains identical language for multiple students and does not consistently include rejected options and the reason for the rejection, required information on the evaluation procedures, and other relevant factors for the school district's decisions. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review district procedures and provide training to Special Education Supervisors and Evaluation Team Leaders on writing N1s that are individualized to the actions proposed as a result of the student's IEP Team meeting.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the district responds to all questions of the N1 form and individualizes those responses for each student. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  Subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, conduct a review of a sample of student records across all grade levels and schools to determine whether the N1 forms are individualized to the student and contain all required content.  **\* 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 with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Provide evidence of training (agenda, signed/dated attendance list with staff role and materials used) by **June 9, 2017**.  Provide a detailed description of the district's internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the results of the internal review of student records. Indicate the number of records reviewed at each level (preschool, elementary, middle and high school); the number found to be compliant; an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance; and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to address any identified non-compliance by **November 10, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 25 - Parental consent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that the district consistently documents multiple attempts using a variety of methods to secure consent from parents or students with educational decision-making rights. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review indicated that parents do not consistently attend and participate in IEP Team meeting discussions and decisions, and the district does not document attempts to ensure parent participation through multiple attempts using a variety of methods, including letters, written notices sent by certified mail, electronic mail (e-mail), video conferencing, or telephone calls. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review district procedures and provide training to Special Education Supervisors, Evaluation Team Leaders and special education staff on documenting attempts to ensure parent participation through multiple attempts using a variety of methods.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure parent participation in IEP Team meeting discussions and decisions. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  Subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, conduct a review of sample of student records across all grade levels and schools to ensure parent participation in IEP Team meetings through multiple attempts using a variety of methods.  **\* 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 with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Provide evidence of training (agenda, signed/dated attendance list with staff role and materials used) by **June 9, 2017**.  Provide a detailed description of the internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the results of the internal record review. Indicate the number of records reviewed at each level (preschool, elementary, middle and high school); the number found to be compliant; an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance; and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to address any identified non-compliance by **November 10, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 27 - Content of Team meeting notice to parents** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that the Team meeting purpose, time and location of the meeting, as well as who will be in attendance is consistently stated on the Team meeting invitation notice. |

| **SE Criterion # 29 - Communications are in English and primary language of home** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interviews indicated important special education documents that include Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), notices, and assessment summaries are not consistently provided to parents in both English and the primary language of the home if the parent's primary language is other than English. In addition, student record review indicated that interpreters are not consistently present at Team meetings where the primary language of the home is other than English. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review district procedures for translating special education documents. Provide training to Special Education Supervisors, Evaluation Team Leaders and other staff members identified as responsible for translations on these procedures.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that all important special education documents are translated and that interpreters are present at Team meetings where parents require interpreting services. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  For those student records identified by the Department, translate the IEPs, notices and assessment summaries, and provide evidence that the Team has reconvened with an interpreter present, if necessary.  Subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, conduct an internal review of a sample of student records across all grade levels and schools in which communications with the home are in a language other than English and who require interpretation at Team meetings to ensure that special education documents have been translated and that interpreters are present at Team meetings.  **\* 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 with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Provide evidence of training (agenda, signed/dated attendance list with staff role and materials used) by **June 9, 2017**.  Provide a detailed description of the district's internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 9, 2017**.  For those records identified by the Department, submit the translated IEPs, notices, assessment summaries, Team Meeting Invitations (N3) and Team Meeting Attendance Sheets (N3A) by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the results of the internal record review. Indicate the number of records reviewed at each level (preschool, elementary, middle and high school); the number found to be compliant; an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance; and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to address any identified non-compliance by **November 10, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 32 - Parent advisory council for special education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and interviews indicated that the district has established a district-wide parent advisory council (PAC) on special education with by-laws regarding officers and operational procedures. The PAC meets regularly with district officials to advise the district on matters that pertain to the education and safety of students with disabilities and to participate in the planning, development and evaluation of school’s district programs. Also, the district conducts a workshop annually on the rights of students and their parents/guardians under the state and federal special education laws. |

| **SE Criterion # 37 - Procedures for approved and unapproved out-of-district placements** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Student record review and interviews indicated that documentation of monitoring for the provision of services for students placed in out-of-district programs is consistently maintained in student records.  Student record review and an interview with the Special Education Administrator indicated that the non-discrimination statement in written contracts with out-of-district placements does not include the protected category of gender identity and these contracts are not signed by the public and private out-of-district programs. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Update the non-discrimination statement in contracts to include the protected category of gender identity.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the district has signed written contracts with all out-of-district placements. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  Subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, conduct a record review of students placed in out-of-district programs for evidence that the non-discrimination statement in out-of-district contracts includes the protected category of gender identity and such contracts are signed by the public and private out-of-district programs.  **\* 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 with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit a copy of the updated contract that includes gender identity in the nondiscrimination statement by **June 9, 2017**.    Provide a detailed description of the district's internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 9, 2017**.    Submit the results of a review of records for students placed in out-of-district programs. Indicate the number of records reviewed; the number found to be compliant; an explanation of the root cause(s) for any continued non-compliance; and a description of additional corrective actions taken by the district to address any identified non-compliance by **November 10, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **11/10/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 40 - Instructional grouping requirements for students aged five and older** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and an interview with the Special Education Administrator indicated that the instructional groupings identified during the 2013-2014 Coordinated Program Review (CPR) are no longer out of compliance. Some classrooms are no longer in existence and others have been converted to inclusion classrooms. Some classrooms now conform to class size requirements for eligible students receiving services outside of the general education classroom. Specifically, the instructional groupings previously identified at the: 1) Central High School; 2) High School of Science and Technology; 3) Putnam Vocational Technical School;  4) Pottenger Elementary School; 5) Rebecca Johnson Middle School; 6) Duggan Middle School; 7) Beal Elementary; 8) Springfield Public Day High School; and 9) Springfield High School are now in compliance.  Document review also indicated that the instructional groupings submitted by the district for this review conform to class size requirements for eligible students receiving services outside of the general education classroom. |

| **SE Criterion # 41 - Age span requirements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and an interview with the Special Education Administrator indicated that the instructional groupings where the ages of the youngest and oldest student differed by more than 48 months, as identified during the 2013-2014 CPR, are no longer out of compliance. Specifically, age spans previously found to be out of compliance at the: 1) High School of Science and Technology; 2) Putnam Vocational Technical School; 3) Rebecca Johnson Middle School; 4) Springfield Public Day Elementary School; and 5) Central High School are now in compliance.    Document review also indicated that the age span of the youngest and oldest student did not differ by more than 48 months in the instructional groupings submitted by the district for this review. |

| **SE Criterion # 43 - Behavioral interventions** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review indicated that the district consistently considers positive behavioral interventions or the need for a functional behavioral assessment for students whose behavior repeatedly impedes learning. |

| **SE Criterion # 45 - Procedures for suspension up to 10 days and after 10 days: General requirements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and an interview with the Special Education Administrator indicated that the district consistently provides due process and additional procedural safeguards for students with disabilities prior to any suspension beyond 10 consecutive days or more than 10 cumulative days. |

| **SE Criterion # 46 - Procedures for suspension of students with disabilities when suspensions exceed 10 consecutive school days or a pattern has developed for suspensions exceeding 10 cumulative days; responsibilities of the Team; responsibilities of the district** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Student record review and an interview with the Special Education Administrator indicated that parents are consistently provided with notice of procedural safeguards during the suspension process, and students are consistently provided with consented-to IEP services or access to the general education curriculum. Student record review also indicated that the district considers functional behavioral assessments or behavioral interventions, services or modifications to address the behavior so that it does not re-occur. |

| **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:** |
| Document review indicated that the students in alternative programs (Balliet Middle School, Springfield High School, Springfield Public Day Middle School and Springfield Public Day High School) have equal opportunity to participate in vocational, nonacademic and extracurricular programs. |

| **SE Criterion # 51 - Appropriate special education teacher licensure** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Document review indicated that special education teachers who were identified during the 2013-2014 CPR as not being appropriately licensed are either no longer special education teachers, have left the district, or are now appropriately licensed. However, a review of documentation submitted for this review indicated that twenty-six staff identified as designing and/or providing direct special education services to special education students are not licensed or teaching with approved waivers. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review the district's process for monitoring special education teachers' licensure or approved waivers from the Department.  Develop a system for tracking and notifying staff whose license is due for renewal, including periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  Provide current licensure information for the 26 special education staff identified at the time of the review.  Provide the licensure information for all special education teachers for the 2017-2018 school year. | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Provide a description of the tracking system to monitor and notify special education teachers when their licenses are due for renewal by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit current licensure, approved waiver, or notice of non-renewal of their teaching position for the 26 special education staff by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the 2017-2018 licensure information for all special education teachers by  **September 15, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **09/15/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 52 - Appropriate certifications/licenses or other credentials -- related service providers** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Document review demonstrated that the two related service providers who were identified during the 2013-2014 CPR have current licensure. However, a review of documentation submitted for this review indicated that two speech and language pathologists do not have current licensure. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Review the district's process for monitoring related service providers' certification or licensure.  Develop a system for tracking and notifying staff whose certification or license is due for renewal, including periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  Provide current licensure information for the two speech and language pathologists identified at the time of the review.  Provide the licensure information for all related service providers for the 2017-2018 school year. | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Provide a description of the tracking system to monitor and notify related service providers when their licenses or certifications are due for renewal by **June 9, 2017**.  Submit current licensure information for the 2 speech and language pathologists by  **June 9, 2017**.  Submit the 2017-2018 licensure information for all related service providers by  **September 15, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **09/15/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 54 - Professional development** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| Document review and interviews indicated that the district provides training on the required special education topics to all professional staff, including general education teachers. This training includes state and federal special education requirements and local special education policies and procedures; analyzing and accommodating diverse student learning styles for inclusion of students; and collaboration methods among teachers and paraprofessional staff to accommodate all students with diverse learning styles in the general education classroom.  Document review and interviews also demonstrated that the district provides in-service training for all locally hired and contracted transportation providers, which includes training on specific needs for particular students who require specialized transportation. |

| **SE Criterion # 55 - Special education facilities and classrooms** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| Classroom observations indicated that the special education facilities and classroom issues identified during the 2013-2014 CPR have been resolved at the following schools:  Boland Elementary School: The previously identified area (rooms D107, D114, and D115, sub-separate classrooms for the LINKS program) continues to have three LINKS classrooms that share a hallway with 2 general education classrooms; however, observation by the MCR team confirms that although the three LINKS classrooms are together in this hallway, the space allows for the integration of general education and special education students in this area.  Bowles Elementary School: Speech and language services are now provided in a classroom rather than the hallway, and occupational therapy and physical therapy are no longer provided concurrently in a shared space.  Harris Elementary School: Occupational therapy services are now provided in a classroom space that ensures privacy and confidentiality for students receiving those services.  Springfield Public Day Middle School (Please note: at the time of the CPR, Springfield Public Day High School was identified as the school in the finding. This was an error. The school not in compliance was the Public Day Middle School): The room was moved to the first floor to ensure accessibility.  Central High School: The LINKS program originally identified in room 123 is now located in a classroom large enough for the number of students and adults in the classroom. The Developmental Program in room 126 at the time of the CPR moved to a different school building and is integrated among general education classrooms. Rooms 109 and 111 identified at the time of the CPR are no longer sub-separate classrooms and serve as homerooms only for Social Emotional Behavioral Supports program (SEBS) students. The additional cluster of classrooms identified through progress reporting (rooms 117, 119 and 120) has been resolved. Room 117 is now a general education classroom and the Life Skills program formerly in that space has been integrated among general education classrooms.  High School of Science and Technology: The sub-separate autism (LINKS) program is no longer labeled with an autism poster.  Van Sickle Middle School: Since the 2013-2014 CPR, Van Sickle Middle School has been divided into three separate schools with three separate principals. The special education facilities and classroom issues identified during the CPR have been resolved at the following schools:  Van Sickle IB (located on the first floor) - The three Life Skills program classrooms are appropriately integrated with the general education classrooms.  b) Van Sickle Academy (second floor) - The SEBS program classrooms are no longer clustered. The classrooms have been placed among the general education classrooms.  Classroom observations indicated the following special education facilities and classroom issues have reverted to, or remain in, noncompliance since the 2013-2014 CPR:  Glickman Elementary School: The classrooms identified as a cluster during the  2013-2014 CPR (rooms 17, 18, 19 and 20) are now integrated among the general education classrooms. However, rooms 25 and 26, which were identified and subsequently corrected through the progress reporting process, are once again out of compliance. Room 25, the LLD program, a sub-separate special education classroom, and room 26, a special education resource room utilized for pull-out services, are isolated at the end of the corridor on the first floor, which does not maximize the students' inclusion into the life of the school.  Rebecca Johnson Elementary School: The facilities issue identified at the time of the  2013-2014 CPR specific to the clustering of rooms 130 and 131, sub-separate classrooms for students with developmental disabilities, was resolved by moving one of the classrooms to an area among general education classrooms. However, room 130, serving students in grades  3 through 5, continues to be located in the hallway serving pre-K through grade 1 students. Through the CPR progress report of August 2016, the Department approved the continuation of the program for the 2016-2017 school year with the stipulation that the parents of the students in the classroom were notified of the non-compliance, and given the opportunity to reconvene their child's Team, if so desired. As part of the Mid-cycle progress reporting, the district is required to bring this issue into compliance before the start of the 2017-2018 school year.  Duggan Middle School: Though the district addressed the noncompliance identified during the CPR by integrating the sub-separate classrooms for the LINKS program (rooms 107, 108,110, 112 and 113) among the general education classrooms, the district once again has a cluster of LINKS classrooms in a hallway separate from the general education population (rooms 113, 114, 115 and 116).  Van Sickle Middle School: Van Sickle Rise (lower level) -The clustering of special education classrooms identified during the CPR, and corrected through the progress reporting period, once again is a cluster of sub-separate special education classrooms (rooms 21, 22 and 23) at one end of the hallway. The Department was advised that the Van Sickle Rise program is moving to another location in the building for the 2017-2018 school year.  Classroom observations indicated the following special education facilities and classroom issue as identified during the 2016-2017 Mid-cycle Review:  Boland Elementary School: Three sub-separate classrooms (rooms D145, C153, and C149) are clustered in a hallway serving students in grades pre-K through grade 1 and grades 3 through 5. Additionally, room 123, a sub-separate LINKS classroom serving students in grades 3 through 5, is isolated in a corner of the first floor with the boiler room, related service providers and the ETL office. These classroom locations do not maximize the inclusion of the students into the life of the school. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Develop a plan for the 2017-2018 school year to reconfigure the classroom spaces at  1) Glickman Elementary; 2) Boland Elementary; 3) Rebecca Johnson Elementary; 4) Duggan Middle; and 5) Van Sickle Rise to maximize the inclusion of the students into the life of the school. | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit the proposed floor plans for the reconfigured spaces for the 2017-2018 school year at 1) Glickman Elementary; 2) Boland Elementary; 3) Rebecca Johnson Elementary; 4) Duggan Middle; and 5) Van Sickle Rise by **June 9, 2017**.  Schedule a date with the Department to conduct an onsite visit prior to the  **September 15, 2017** progress report due date. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/09/2017** | **09/15/2017** |  |  |