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| **SE Criterion # 3 - Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that when a student suspected of having a specific learning disability is evaluated, the Team does not always create a written determination as to whether or not he or she has a specific learning disability, which is signed by all members of the Team. If one or more members are in disagreement as to the determination, the Team does not consistently document their disagreement. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Provide training to Team Chairpersons on addressing the requirements when a student is suspected of having a specific learning disability. Please see Memorandum on Specific Learning Disability - Eligibility Process/Forms at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/iep/sld/>. Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that all required components of the specific learning disability determination process are completed. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  Conduct an internal review of a sample of Team meetings held after implementation of all corrective actions for students who were suspected of having a specific learning disability to determine if the Team creates a written determination as to whether or not the student has a specific learning disability, which is signed by all members of the Team, or if there is disagreement as to the determination, one or more Team members document their disagreement.  **\* 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; and**  **c) name of person(s) who conducted the review with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit evidence of training (agenda, materials, sign-in sheet with staff name, role and signature) by **June 2, 2017.**  Provide a description of the internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 2, 2017.**  Submit the results of the internal review of student records and include the following:  1. the number of records reviewed;  2. the number of records in compliance;  3. for any records not in compliance, determine the root cause; and  4. the specific corrective actions taken to remedy the non-compliance.  Please submit the above information by **October 27, 2017.** | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/02/2017** | **10/27/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 8 - IEP Team composition and attendance** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating:** | | | |
| Partially Implemented | | | |
| **Basis for Findings:** | | | |
| A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that required Team members are in attendance at Team meetings; however, when invited Team members are unable to attend, and their attendance is not necessary because their area of the curriculum or related services is not being modified or discussed, the parent and the district do not always agree in writing to excuse the Team member. | | | |
| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | | | |
| Provide training to Team chairpersons on the requirements for IEP Team member attendance and excusal procedures.  Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that when invited Team members are not in attendance, the parent and district agree to excuse the member in writing. The tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure continuing compliance.  Conduct a review of a sample of student records across all grade levels and schools for students whose Team meetings were held after implementation of all corrective actions for evidence that when Team members were invited but not in attendance, appropriate excusal procedures were followed.  **\* 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; and**  **c) name of person(s) who conducted the review with their role(s) and signature(s).** | | | |
| **Required Elements of Progress Reports:** | | | |
| Submit evidence of training (agenda, materials, sign-in sheet with staff name, role and signature) by **June 2, 2017.**  Provide a description of the internal oversight and tracking system, including the name and role of the person designated for oversight by **June 2, 2017.**  Submit the results of the internal review of student records and include the following:  1. the number of records reviewed;  2. the number of records in compliance;  3. for any records not in compliance, determine the root cause; and  4. the specific corrective actions taken to remedy the non-compliance.  Please submit the above information by **October 27, 2017**. | | | |
| **Progress Report Due Date(s):** | | | |
| **06/02/2017** | **10/27/2017** |  |  |

| **SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records 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.  A review of student records also indicated that students whose eligibility terminated because the student graduated or exceeded the age of eligibility are provided with a summary of academic achievement and functional performance, including recommendations on how to assist the student in meeting his or her postsecondary goals. |

| **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. |

| **SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| A review of student records 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 Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1), 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 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 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 # 26 - Parent participation in meetings** |
| --- |
| **Rating:** |
| Implemented |
| **Basis for Findings:** |
| The district provided its special education student roster as requested by the Department. |