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| **SE Criterion # 2 - Required and optional assessments** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated that the charter school consistently completes educational assessments, specifically, a history of the student's educational progress in the general education curriculum and teacher assessments that address attention skills, participation behaviors, communication skills, memory and social relations with groups, peers and adults. |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated that required IEP Team members, including related service providers, are consistently excused in writing by parents in advance of IEP Team meetings. A review of student records also demonstrated that excused required Team members provide written input, in advance, to the IEP Team and parents for development of the IEP. |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated the charter school consistently sends to parents progress reports that include written information on the student’s progress towards the annual goals of the IEP at least as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students.  Bridge Boston Charter School serves students in pre-kindergarten through grade five and 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. 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. A review of student records and interviews also indicated that, if the charter school and parent agree to make changes to the 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. |

| **SE Criterion # 15 - Outreach by the School District (Student Find)** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and interviews indicated that the charter school has established a method of outreach to parents or guardians to inform them of the process to refer students for a special education evaluation. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated that, upon determining 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. Interviews indicated that the IEP is not changed outside of the Team meeting.  A review of student records 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. A review of student records indicated that IEP Teams document their consideration of the skills and proficiencies needed by students in the Present Levels of Educational Performance (PLEP) A and B and goals 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 interviews indicated that IEP Teams develop the IEP prior to determining the appropriate placement to deliver the student's identified services and accommodations. A review of student records also indicated 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 interviews indicated that the charter school consistently sends two copies of the proposed IEP and placement to the parents within two calendar weeks of the Team meeting. |

| **SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records and interviews indicated that the IEP Non-participation Justification statement consistently explains why the student's removal from the general education classroom 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. |

| **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 indicated that the Notices of Proposed School District Action (N1) consistently include the following components: 1) an explanation of why the agency proposed or refused to take action; 2) a description of any other options that the agency considered and the reasons why those options were rejected; 3) a description of each evaluation procedure, test, record or report the agency used as a basis for the proposed or refused action; and  4) what next steps, if any, are recommended. |

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

| **SE Criterion # 32 - Parent advisory council for special education** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and interviews indicated that the charter school conducts at least one workshop annually on the rights of students and their parents and guardians under the state and federal special education laws. A review of documents also demonstrated that the parent advisory council for special education has established written by-laws regarding officers and operational procedures. |

| **SE Criterion # 54 - Professional development** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of documents and interviews indicated that the school conducts professional development on state and federal special education requirements and related local special education policies and procedures for all its employees, including contracted related service providers such as occupational therapists and speech pathologists. |