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| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that progress reports are provided at least as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students and consistently address student progress towards IEP goals.  Topsfield Public Schools is a pre-K through grade six district and therefore does not have any students whose eligibility terminated because the student graduated from secondary school or exceeded the age of eligibility. |

| **SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records indicated that at least annually, on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, a Team meeting is 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. Staff interviews indicated that IEP Teams consistently review and revise IEPs to address any lack of expected student progress towards the annual goals and in the general curriculum. Record review and staff interviews also indicated that if the district and parent agree to make changes to a student’s IEP between annual IEP meetings, the IEP Team is reconvened to amend the IEP. Parents are advised that they may request a complete copy of the amended IEP. Record review and staff interviews indicated that the district has discontinued the practice of using amendments to extend the anniversary date of the IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that upon determining that the student is eligible for special education, IEP Teams develop the IEP, addressing all elements of the current IEP format provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Staff interviews indicated that the IEP is not changed outside of the Team meeting.  A review of student records also indicated 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. Record review indicated that IEP Teams document their considerations of the skills and proficiencies needed by students in the district’s Notices of Proposed School District Action (N1s), as well as in the Present Levels of Educational Performance (PLEP) B and the Additional Information sections of the IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that IEP Teams develop the IEP prior to determining the appropriate placement to deliver the student’s identified services and accommodations. Record review and staff 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. Record review also demonstrated that placements are based on the IEP, including the types of related services, types of settings, types of service providers and location where services are to be provided.  A review of student records and staff interviews also indicated that parents receive summary notes at the conclusion of the IEP Team meeting, which include a completed IEP service delivery grid describing the types and amounts of special education and related services proposed by the district and a statement of the major goal areas associated with these services. Records demonstrated that the district consistently sends two copies of the proposed IEP and placement within two calendar weeks of the Team meeting. |

| **SE Criterion # 19 - Extended evaluation** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the district uses the extended evaluation consent form to propose additional assessments when the IEP Team finds that evaluation information is insufficient to develop a full or partial IEP. The Team, with the parent's consent, then determines what evaluation time period is necessary and the types of information needed to develop an IEP. If, prior to the extended evaluation, the Team has sufficient information available to determine, in part, necessary goals and services, the Team writes a partial IEP to be implemented during the extended evaluation period. Record review and staff interviews indicated that extended evaluations are consistently completed within eight school weeks. |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that when a student is removed from the general education classroom, the Team states why the removal is considered critical to the student's program and 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. |

| **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:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that whenever the district proposes an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education, an IEP or amendment, a placement, or other action, the district uses the Department’s Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1) and Notice of School District Refusal to Act (N2). Record review demonstrated that notices consistently contain detailed narratives of the district’s proposed actions on page 2 of the form, specifically:   1. A description of the action the district proposed to take; 2. A description of why the district took the action; 3. A description of any other options that the district considered and the reasons why those options were rejected; 4. A description of each evaluation procedure, test, record, or report used as a basis for the proposed action; 5. A description of any other factors relevant to the district's decision; and 6. A description of next steps, if any, the district proposed to take. |

| **SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The district provided its special education student roster as requested by the Department. |

| **SE Criterion # 37 - Procedures for approved and unapproved out-of-district placements** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the district monitors the provision of services to and the programs of individual students placed in public and private out-of-district programs.  Record review demonstrated that documentation of monitoring plans and all actual monitoring is in the files of students who have been placed out-of-district. |