

**St. Clairsville-Richland City School District
IRN 045997****Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children
2012-2013 Onsite Review Summary Report****Introduction**

The Ohio Department of Education's Office for Exceptional Children would like to extend appreciation to the district staff for their efforts, attention and time committed to the completion of the review processes.

The following report is a summary of the onsite review conducted on April 2-4, 2013 by the Ohio Department of Education's Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) and Office of Early Learning and School Readiness (OEL&SR) as part of its general supervision requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Am. Sub. HB1. The onsite visit consisted of the following reviews:

- IDEA Review (Special Education School Age, Special Education Early Childhood and Fiscal)
- Gifted Education Review

IDEA Review**Overview**

Educational consultants from the Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) conducted IDEA review activities on April 2-4, 2013. During the IDEA Review, OEC consultants monitor the LEA's implementation of IDEA to ensure compliance. The primary focus of the IDEA Review is to:

- Improve educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities; and
- Ensure that LEAs meet program requirements under Part B of IDEA, particularly those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.

OEC focused the review on the following areas:

- Child Find;
- Delivery of Services;
- Least Restrictive Environment;
- Data Verification

Data Sources

During the review, OEC considered information from the following sources:

1. Public Parent Meeting, Individual Parent Meetings and Written Comments

On March 1, 2013, the St. Clairsville-Richland City School District mailed 196 OEC approved letters to all families with students with disabilities in the district. OEC provided the district with a public meeting announcement for inclusion on its website or newsletter. The district posted the information regarding the meeting date on the school website and local newspaper.

On April 2, 2013, OEC consultants held a public meeting for parents and other interested parties. Public parent meeting dates for all districts selected for IDEA Reviews are posted on the ODE website. Ten parents and family members and two State Support Team (SST) Region 12 representatives attended the public meeting. Attendees could speak to OEC representatives publicly in the meeting or individually, provide written comments, or both. Eight attendees made comments during the public meeting. Written comment forms were available before, during and after the meeting. OEC received one written comment.

During the public meeting, parents were advised by OEC consultants of the formal complaint process under IDEA and that their public comments did not constitute a formal complaint. The participants were also informed that while the information they provided may be helpful to the review, it may not necessarily be acted upon as part of the review process. "Whose IDEA Is This?, Ohio's procedural safeguards notice, was available for participants who wanted a copy.

2. Pre-Onsite Data Analysis

OEC and SST consultants reviewed district, building and grade level data. District data analyzed included the Special Education Performance Profile, Local Report Cards, and Education Management Information System (EMIS) data. The data analysis assists OEC in determining potential growth areas and district strengths.

3. Record Review

On April 2-3, 2013, OEC consultants reviewed 36 records of school age students with disabilities. An OEL&SR consultant, on April 4, 2013, reviewed four records as part of the Early Childhood Special Education Review. OEC selected records of a variety of children with disabilities from three buildings.

Please note, not all records are reviewed for every component.

4. Staff/Administrative Interviews

On April 4, 2013, OEC consultants held four sessions of interviews with three administrators and 23 teachers, related services personnel and school psychologists. OEC interviews focused on the following review areas: Child Find; Delivery of Services; Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and IEP alignment.

Findings

A finding is made when noncompliance with a specific IDEA requirement is identified through the processes outlined above. All findings of noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of this report.

OEC provides separate written correspondence to the school district and the parent/guardian when action is required to correct findings of non-compliance for individual students.

Noncompliance that is identified in **30% or more** of the records reviewed by OEC and substantiated through other data sources must be included in a comprehensive corrective action plan (CAP) with action steps to address each of the noncompliance findings.

All noncompliance identified by OEC as part of the IDEA review, listed by subject area within this report in the *Review of Findings and District Required Actions* table, must be corrected as set forth below.

Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

The *Review of Findings and District Required Actions* identifies the noncompliance which must be addressed in the corrective action plan developed by the St. Clairsville-Richland City School District. An approved form for the corrective action plan will be provided by OEC or can be accessed on ODE's web site by using the keyword search "OEC Corrective Action Plan". The corrective action plan developed by the district must include the following:

- Improvement strategies to address all areas of identified non-compliance,
- Documentation/evidence of implementation of the strategies,
- Individuals responsible for implementing the strategies,
- Resources needed, and
- Completion dates.

State Performance Plan (SPP) results indicators may also be included in the corrective action plan to address improved performance for students with disabilities.

The district must submit the corrective action plan to Susan Rieger, OEC Lead Consultant at susan.rieger@education.ohio.gov within 30 school days from the date of this report. OEC will review the action plan submitted by the district for approval. If OEC deems that a revision(s) is necessary, the district will be required to revise and resubmit. The district will be contacted by the OEC Lead Consultant and notified when the action plan has been approved.

CAP Due Date: September 17, 2013

Individual Correction

The district has 60 school days of the issuance of the letter of findings to correct all identified findings of non-compliance for individual students, unless noted otherwise in the report.

Individual Correction Due Date: October 30, 2013

Systemic Correction

The district must correct any noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices identified through the onsite review. OEC will verify through follow-up review of new data that the noncompliant policies, procedures and/or practices have been revised and the district is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements of IDEA. The follow-up review of new data will include review of individual student records and may include parent/staff/administrative interviews, as needed.

Systemic Correction Due Date: May 9, 2014

For questions about specific components of this report please contact:

- **Special Education School Age:** Susan Rieger, OEC Lead Consultant, at (614) 995-9935, toll-free at (877) 644-6338, or by e-mail at susan.rieger@education.ohio.gov.
- **Special Education Early Childhood:** Connie Prairie, Educational Consultant, at (614) 995-9934, toll-free at (877) 644-6338, or by e-mail at connie.prairie@education.ohio.gov.
- **Fiscal:** Tom Main, Educational Consultant, at (614) 387-0156, toll-free at (877) 644-6338, or by e-mail at tom.main@education.ohio.gov.
- **Gifted Education:** Rosemary Pearson, Educational Consultant, at (614) 644-2641, toll-free at (877) 644-6338, or by e-mail at rosemary.pearson@education.ohio.gov.

Special Education School Age/Preschool Components, OEC's Review Findings, and District Required Actions

Component 1: Child Find

Each school district shall adopt and implement written policies and procedures approved by the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children, that ensure all children with disabilities residing within the district, regardless of the severity of their disability, and who are in need of special education and related services are identified, located, and evaluated as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 and Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. Part 300 pertaining to child find, including the regulations at 34 C.F.R. 300.111 and 300.646 and Rule 3301-51-03 of the Operating Standards for Ohio Educational Agencies serving Children with Disabilities.

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
CF-1	300.303(b)(2)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>All reevaluation records indicated that the child's reevaluation was completed within the three year timeline.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>None</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
CF-2	300.305(a)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>All preschool evaluation records of children transitioning from Part C, utilized child information from the Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) and other documentation provided by Help Me Grow in suspecting or when determining eligibility for Part B supports and services.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>None</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
CF-3	OAC 3301-51-06(2) and OAC 3301-51-06(4)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Three school age initial evaluations did not appropriately document interventions provided to resolve concerns for the child performing below grade-level standards.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>Staff and administrators indicated that they were addressing more interventions and were just beginning to include actual data in their reports this year. Administrators stated that they were continuing to work on staff documentation of interventions and felt it had improved.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>Staff needs to provide actual data from their interventions.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>OEC has verified that these students have a current IEP in place, so no additional individual correction is required.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The district must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices in place regarding documentation of intervention and supports provided prior to completion of the initial evaluation team report.</p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
CF-4	300.501(b)(1)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>One school age student record did not show evidence that the evaluation planning team included the parent.</p> <p>All preschool student records showed evidence that the evaluation planning team included the parent.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must provide evidence that the parent was involved or provided the opportunity to participate (three documented attempts) in the evaluation planning process.</p> <p>The evidence may include; evaluation planning form, prior written notice, parent invitation, referral form or communication log.</p> <p>If the district cannot provide documentation that the parent was involved or provided the opportunity to participate in the evaluation planning process, the district must conduct evaluation planning with the parent.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
CF-5	300.305(a)(1)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>One school age student evaluation did not provide evidence that the evaluation planning team reviewed existing data on the child.</p> <p>All preschool student evaluations provided evidence that the evaluation planning team reviewed existing data on the child.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must provide the evaluation planning form or evidence documenting existing data was reviewed during the evaluation planning process. If not, the IEP team must reconvene the ETR planning and ETR meeting.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
CF-6	300.305(a)(2)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>All school age and preschool student evaluations provided evidence that the evaluation planning team identified what additional data, if any, were needed.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>None</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA</p>

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction		Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions		
CF-7	300.304(c)(4); OAC 3301-51-01; and OAC 3301-51-06	<u>Record Review</u> Two school age student evaluations did not provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability. All preschool student evaluations provided evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability.	<u>Individual Correction</u> The district will convene the ETR team to conduct a reevaluation and provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability. <u>Systemic Correction</u> OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.	
CF-8	300.306(a)(1)	<u>Record Review</u> All school age and preschool student records showed evidence that the parent of the child was involved in determining whether the child is a child with a disability.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	
CF-9	300.306(a)(1)	<u>Record Review</u> All school age and preschool student initial evaluations showed evidence that a group of qualified professionals as appropriate to the suspected disability were involved in determining whether the child is a child with a disability.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	
CF-10	300.306(a)(1); 300.305(a); and 3301-51-01 (B)(21)	<u>Record Review</u> All school age reevaluations showed evidence that a group of qualified professionals as appropriate to the suspected disability were involved in determining whether the child is a child with a disability.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	

Component 2: Delivery of Services

Each school district shall have policies, procedures and practices to ensure that each child with a disability has an IEP that is developed, reviewed, and revised in a meeting and implemented in accordance with 300.320 through 300.324.

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
DS-1	300.320(a)(1)(i)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Five school age student IEPs did not address how the child's disability affects his/her involvement and progress in the general education curriculum.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs addressed how the child's disability affects his/her involvement and progress in the general education curriculum.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>Staff stated that they provide as much inclusion in the general education classroom as possible and also utilized the extended standards. However, the district's report card shows that students with disabilities (SWD) did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) and there were significant discrepancies in passing rates between SWD and their nondisabled peers.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>Some parents indicated that they would like their students included in the general education classroom in order to receive more focus on core academic subjects.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the five IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the IEP to include a statement of how the child's disability affects the child's participation in appropriate activities to access, participate and progress in the general education curriculum.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
DS-2	300.320(a)(1)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Twelve (12) school age student IEPs did not contain Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLOP) that addressed the needs of the student.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs contained Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLOP) that addressed the needs of the student.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>Staff did not clearly articulate what needs to be in the PLOP. They described using ETR data; however, it was often two or three years old.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the 12 IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the PLOP related to each goal to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summary of current daily academic/behavior and/or functional performance (strengths and needs); • Baseline data provided for developing a measurable goal. • For preschool, the PLOP should relate to the child's developmental domains, functional performance and pre-academic skills. <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The district must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices in place regarding the review of current academic/functional data when writing IEPs.</p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.
DS-3	300.320 (a)(2)(i)(A)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Two school age student IEPs did not contain annual goals that address the child's academic area(s) of need.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs contained annual goals that address the child's academic area(s) of need.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the two IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the IEP to include annual goals that address the academic needs that were identified in the IEP or provide evidence that the IEP team, based on the severity of the needs of the child, decided to prioritize addressing the needs.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
DS-4	300.320(a)(2)(i) (A)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>One school age student IEP did not contain annual goals that address the child's functional area(s) of need.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs contained annual goals that address the child's functional area(s) of need.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP team of the one IEP identified as noncompliant to review and amend the IEP to include annual goals that address the functional needs that were identified in the IEP or provide evidence that the IEP team, based on the severity of the needs of the child, decided to prioritize addressing the needs</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
DS-5	300.320(a)(2)(i)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Thirteen (13) school age and three preschool student IEPs did not contain measurable annual goals.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the 16 IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend annual goals to contain the following six critical elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who? 2. Will Do What? 3. To What Level or Degree? 4. Under What Conditions? 5. In What Length of Time? 6. How Will Progress Be Measured? <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The district must implement new procedures to ensure that annual goals written subsequent to this report will include the following six critical elements to demonstrate correction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who? 2. Will Do What? 3. To What Level or Degree? 4. Under What Conditions? 5. In What Length of Time? 6. How Will Progress Be Measured? <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.</p>

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
DS-6	300.320(a)(4)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Ten (10) school age and three preschool student IEPs did not contain a statement of specially designed instruction that addresses the needs of the child and supports annual goals.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the 13 IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the specially designed instruction to describe the adaption of, as appropriate to the needs of the child, the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The district must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices in place regarding the IEP process of determining specially designed instruction.</p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.</p>
DS-7	300.320(a)(7)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Four school age and four preschool student IEPs did not indicate the location where the specially designed instruction will be provided.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the eight IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the location where the specially designed instruction will be provided.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
DS-8	300.320(a)(7)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Seven school age and four preschool student IEPs did not indicate the amount of time and frequency of the specially designed instruction.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the 11 IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the amount of time and frequency of the specially designed instruction.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
DS-9	300.320(a)(4)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Eleven (11) school age student IEPs did not identify related services that address the needs of the child and support the annual goals.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs identified related services that address the needs of the child and support the annual goals.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the 11 IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the IEP to include related services that were identified as needed in the IEP.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The district must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices in place regarding the IEP process of addressing identified related service needs.</p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.</p>
DS-10	300.320(a)(7)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Eight school age and three preschool student IEPs did not indicate the location where the related services will be provided.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the 11 IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the IEP to include the location where the related services will be provided.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The district must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices in place regarding the IEP process of determining the location where related services will occur.</p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.</p>
DS-11	300.320(a)(7)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Two school age and one preschool student IEPs did not indicate the amount of time and frequency of the related services to be provided.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the three IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend on the IEP the amount of time and frequency of the related services to be provided.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Component 3: Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and IEP Alignment

Each school district shall ensure that to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities, including children in public or nonpublic institutions or other care facilities, are educated with children who are nondisabled; and that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related services.

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
LRE-1	300.324(a)(2)(v)	<p><u>Record Review</u> Five school age student IEPs did not identify assistive technology to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs identified assistive technology to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the five IEPs identified as noncompliant to review assistive technology and/or services that would directly assist the child with a disability to increase, maintain, or improve their functional capabilities and include them on the IEP.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The district must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices in place regarding assistive technology. OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.</p>
LRE-2	300.320(a)(6)(i)	<p><u>Record Review</u> Three school age student IEPs did not identify accommodations provided to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs identified accommodations provided to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u> Staff reported that they would speak with any teacher who wasn't providing the required accommodations and if necessary take it to administration. Administrators stated that they would most definitely address the situation with the staff member.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u> Some parents stated that it took a number of weeks at the beginning of the year to implement the accommodations identified on the IEP.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the three IEPs identified as noncompliant to review the accommodations that would directly assist the child to access the course content without altering the amount or complexity of the information taught and include them on the IEP.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
LRE-3	300.320(a)(4)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Nine school age student IEPs did not identify modifications to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs identified modifications to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>Staff could not clearly delineate the difference between a modification and an accommodation.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the nine IEPs identified as noncompliant to review the modifications that would alter the amount or complexity of materials or the performance expected of the child from grade level curriculum expectations and include them on the IEP.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The district must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices in place regarding modifications.</p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.</p>
LRE-4	300.320(a)(4)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Three school age student IEPs did not identify supports for school personnel to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs identified supports for school personnel to enable the child to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the three IEPs identified as noncompliant to review the supports for school personnel that were identified by the IEP team and define on the IEP the support, who will provide it and when the support will take place.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
LRE-5	300.320(a)(5)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Eleven (11) school age and four preschool student IEPs did not include an explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the regular education classroom.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>Staff could not sufficiently describe the reasons why students were not receiving services in the general education classroom.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The district must reconvene the IEP teams of the 15 IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and include a justification for why the child was removed from the regular education classroom.</p> <p>The justification should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be based on the needs of the child, not the disability. • Reflect that the team has given adequate consideration to meeting the student's needs in the regular classroom with supplementary aids and services. • Document that the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular education classes, even with the use of supplementary aids and services, cannot be achieved satisfactorily. • Describe potential harmful effects to the child or others, if applicable. <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The district must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices in place regarding the least restrictive environment placement decision process.</p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.</p>

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
LRE-6	300.321(1)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>One school age student IEPs did not indicate that the IEP Team included a parent.</p> <p>All preschool student IEPs indicated that the IEP Team included a parent.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>For the one IEP identified as noncompliant, the district must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence of parent participation at the IEP meeting, or • Provide documentation of at least three attempts made by the district to ensure parent participation, or • Reconvene the IEP team to review the IEP with the parent. <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
LRE-7	300.321(2)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>All school age student IEPs indicated that the IEP Team included a regular education teacher.</p> <p>One preschool student IEP did not indicate that the IEP Team included a regular education teacher.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>For the one IEP identified as noncompliant, the district must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide documentation that the parent was informed prior to the IEP meeting that the regular education teacher would not participate in the meeting, and • Provide a written excuse signed by the parents and the district that allowed the regular education teacher not to be in attendance at the IEP meeting, or • Reconvene the IEP team to review the IEP with all required members present. <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The district does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
LRE-8	300.321(3)	<u>Record Review</u> All school age and preschool student IEPs indicated that the IEP Team included a special education teacher.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
LRE-9	300.321(4)	<u>Record Review</u> All school age and preschool student IEPs indicated that the IEP Team included an LEA representative.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
LRE-10	300.321(5)	<u>Record Review</u> All school age and preschool student IEPs indicate that the IEP Team included a person qualified to interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 4: Data Verification

Each school district shall report timely and accurate special education event records for students with disabilities; have in effect an Individualized Education program for each child with a disability with the LEA's jurisdiction and in place on or before Dec. 1, 2009; conduct initial evaluations within 60 days of receiving parental consent for evaluation; have an IEP in place for three-year olds transitioning from Early Intervention Programs on or before the child's third birthday; and have a secondary transition place in place that meets all required elements for IDEA.

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
DV-1	300.645 R.C. 3301.07.14	<u>Record Review</u> All school age and preschool student IEPs indicated that the child had an IEP in effect as reported on the LEA's December 1, 2011 Child Count Report.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DV-2	300.645 R.C. 3301.07.14	<u>Record Review</u> All school age and preschool student ETRs indicated that the child had an ETR in effect as reported on the LEA's December 1, 2011 Child Count Report.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DV-3	SPP Indicator 20: Accurate and Timely Reporting of Special Education Event Record	<u>Record Review</u> All school age and preschool student records had accurate student data reported by the LEA through the Education Management Information System (EMIS) specifically in the following area(s): a) DOB b) IEP date (IIEP, RIEP, TIEP, CIEP, or FIEP events) c) ETR dates (IETR, RETR, TETR) d) Referral date e) Consent date f) Disability category as indicated as an outcome of ETR g) Admission date h) Withdrawal date i) Non-compliance reason for ETR or IEP date.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Record Review Item	Regulation 34 CFR or OAC	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
			Required Actions	
DV-4	SPP Indicator 11 300.301(c)(1)(i)	<u>Record Review</u> All school age and preschool student initial evaluations reported as being conducted within 60 days of the district receiving parental consent for the evaluation were conducted within the required timeline.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
DV-5	SPP Indicator 12 300.124	<u>Record Review</u> All preschool IEPs showed evidence that an IEP was in place for 3 year olds transitioning from Early Intervention Programs (0-3 years) on or before the child's third birthday.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DV-6 A/B	SPP Indicator 20 for Secondary Transition Plans	<u>Record Review</u> Three school age IEPs did not show evidence that the secondary transition plan reported in EMIS during 2010-2011 was in place that meets all 8 required elements of IDEA for the student, specifically in the following area(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are appropriate measurable postsecondary goal(s). 2. The postsecondary goals are updated annually. 3. The postsecondary goals were based on age appropriate transition assessment. 4. There are transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goal(s). 5. The transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goal(s). 6. The annual goal(s) are related to the student's transition service needs. 7. There is evidence the student was invited to the IEP Team Meeting where transition services were discussed. 8. When appropriate, there is evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team Meeting. 	<u>Individual Correction</u> Three current IEPs did not contain transition plans that meet all 8 required elements of IDEA. The district must reconvene the IEP teams to review and correct the secondary transition plan for the three records identified as still noncompliant or provide documentation of the student's withdrawal date. <u>Systemic Correction</u> The district must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices in place regarding data reporting. OEC will contact the district for submission of new records and review these records to determine compliance with this regulation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes A Corrective Action Plan is required due to meeting the 30% threshold of non-compliance.

Other Considerations

Two significant issues were identified during the onsite review and were addressed with administration:

- 1.) **Bullying:** Parents almost unanimously agreed that their children with disabilities had been bullied while at school. They reported that other students throw things at their students, spit on them, push them in the hallways and make fun of them. Parents believed that teachers didn't address the situation. In some cases, parents reported that their children did not want to go to school. During staff and administrator interviews, some staff described a variety of strategies their building was implementing to address bullying: a buddy program, assemblies on the topic, speakers, counselor working with individual students, and character education. However, a description such as this was not provided at all levels. Administrators contended that if they knew about the bullying they addressed it. For the district, this would be an opportunity to more formally implement some of the strategies already undertaken in some buildings at all levels. The district may also need to review their bullying policy to assure that all staff and administrators are well-acquainted with the policy and understood its intent. Additionally, since some IEP profiles noted an attendance problem, the district could review attendance data of some students with disabilities to determine if there is a connection.
- 2.) **Intervention Specialists not being in the resource room:** Parents expressed a concern that at the high school level an intervention specialist was not consistently in the classroom with students. They said that there were two intervention specialists assigned to be in the resource room, but only one teacher was present and was usually working with general education students. Some staff said that they, also, had heard from a number of parents that an intervention specialist wasn't in the classroom and had notified administration. As a follow-up, administration stated that they addressed the issue with staff and emphasized the seriousness of students with disabilities not receiving their services. They have taken steps to outline a plan to monitor the situation.

Fiscal Components, OEC’s Review Findings, and District Required Actions

Component 1: Statement of Accounts

The district/school has submitted its FY12 FERs for IDEA Part B and Early Childhood IDEA. The district’s financial detail (FINDET) report projects to match the current year budget in the CCIP by subtotaling FINDET transactions according to object codes (100, 200, 400, 500, 600 & 800) for the year to date. The year to date expenditures will be reviewed for coding accuracy. *The fiscal reports are evidence that ensure that district children with disabilities have available to them a free appropriate public education (FAPE) that emphasizes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs.*

Findings Citation	Evidence	Evidence of Correction		Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	Date Due	
300.202	<p>After a CCIP review, the St. Clairsville-Richland City has submitted its FY12 FERs for IDEA Part B and Early Childhood IDEA.</p> <p>St. Clairsville-Richland City did not comply with Code of Federal Regulations section 300.206 when it chose to participate in school-wide pooling. This section in part states, “the maximum amount allowed in a school-wide pool is determined by the amount received by the LEA under Part B for that fiscal year divided by the number of children with Disabilities in the jurisdiction of the LEA and multiplied by the number of students with disabilities participating in the program”. The district elected to use all the IDEA funds it received that were not in non-public set aside funds.</p> <p>The district was asked to come into compliance with the Code of Federal Regulations 300.206. It presented a plan that included removing all the IDEA funds from the school-wide pool. This was deemed necessary to avoid future issues with supplanting. The district implemented the plan and now is in compliance with the Code of Federal Regulations.</p> <p>The 516 and 587 funds match the current year budget in the CCIP.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>None</p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 2: Payroll Expenditures

The district/school is able to document that the 516 and 587 funds were expended in FY13 for an appropriate purpose; payroll expenditures are supported by Personal Activity Reports (PAR) showing the Time and Effort or Semi-Annual Certification; expense were properly coded to the correct function and object code; all staff in certified positions have appropriate licensure; all funded positions have position descriptions; district's ACCRPTs and budget are in agreement.

Findings Citation	Evidence	Evidence of Correction		Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	Date Due	
300.202	At the time of the review there were no payroll funds budgeted in 516 or 587 funds.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 3: Non-Payroll Expenditures

The district/school is able to document that the 516 and 587 funds that were expended in FY13 for an appropriate purpose and reasonable for the program; that fiscal coding is appropriate and the funds were charged to the proper fund, function and object; that the district is able to document the expenditure with a purchase order, receipt statement or invoice.

Findings Citation	Evidence	Evidence of Correction		Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	Date Due	
300.202	Twenty-nine 516 Non-Payroll Expenditures were reviewed. All FY13 expenditures were for an appropriate purpose and reasonable for the program; the fiscal coding is appropriate and the funds were charged to the proper fund, function and object; and the district is able to document the expenditure with a purchase order, receipt, statement or invoice. There were no 587 expenditures year to date.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

4: Use of funds for Capital Outlay and equipment purchase

If the district/school expended FY13 516 and 587 funds for Capital Outlay and/or equipment, the district/school evidences that it has followed the board adopted procurement policy. The district must ensure that equipment and supplies placed in the non-public school are used for IDEA purposes only and can be removed from the non-public school without remodeling the school facility.

Findings Citation	Evidence	Evidence of Correction		Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	Date Due	
300.202	The district expended FY13 516 funds for Capital Outlay and/or equipment that was allocable to the budget and the grant. The district followed its board adopted procurement policy. St. Clairsville-Richland City had not expended any 587 funds for Capital Outlay in FY13.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 5: Equipment inventory policy and procedures

The district/school retains control and administration of FY13 516 and 587 funds used to purchase materials, equipment and property (i.e. bus) purchased with those funds for the uses and purposes provided in the IDEA. The district is properly identifying equipment purchased with IDEA funds and is complying with Board Policy in cataloguing and inventorying the equipment. The district master list of equipment purchased with IDEA funds was updated within the last two years; the district has an equipment disposal policy; the district requested disposition instructions from ODE prior to disposing of assets with at fair market value of more than \$5,000.00, and sale proceeds were deposited back into the original grant.

Findings Citation	Evidence	Evidence of Correction		Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	Date Due	
300.202	St. Clairsville-Richland City provided a copy of its Purchasing Policy, Inventory Policy and Disposal Policy. The district master list of equipment purchased with IDEA was current and followed the district policy. A list of 25 items was provided and 13 were selected to be located and verified. The district had followed all of its policies.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 6: Non-Public Count and Proportionate Share

The district provides **child find** and ensures equitable participation. The district maintains in its records and provides to the SEA the following information related to parentally-placed private school children covered under 34 CFR 300.130 through 300.144: the number of children evaluated; the number of children determined to be children with disabilities; and the number of children served.

The district has timely and meaningful consultation with representatives of parentally-placed private school children with disabilities (consistent with 34 CFR 300.134); conducts a thorough and complete child find process to determine the number of parentally-placed private school children with disabilities attending private schools located in the school district.

Findings Citation	Evidence	Evidence of Correction		Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	Date Due	
300.130 through 300.144	The district provided child find and ensured equitable participation. The district maintains records and provided the number of children evaluated; the number of children determined to be children with disabilities; and the number of children served. The district had timely and meaningful consultation with representatives of parentally-placed private school children with disabilities; and conducted a thorough and complete child find process to determine the number of parentally-placed private school children with disabilities attending private schools located in the school district.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 7: Notification of Public Participation

In accordance with 34 CFR 300.165, the district/school provided a public hearing, adequate notice of the hearings and an opportunity for comment available to the general public including individuals with disabilities and parents of children with disabilities in planning the use of IDEA Part B funds.

Findings Citation	Evidence	Evidence of Correction		Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	Date Due	
300.165 and Part 300.201	The district placed a notice in the local paper and allowed for public comment. They were able to provide a sign in sheet and agenda.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 8: Redirection of funds

If the district/school has redirected funds for CEIS, it is able to document the expenditures related to CEIS and to validate that the percent of the IDEA funds used for CEIS is 15% (or less if voluntary) of total allocation, to document the number of students who were served and are able to track and report on the number of students who subsequently received special education services. The district has developed a means through which to track the expenditure of Part B funds for CEIS in its financial system and is able to create a report showing the expenditure of funds for CEIS. The district has a plan in place to utilize the funds for CEIS.

If the district/school reduced its local expenditure, it was by no more than 1/2 of its additional allocation amount and the district can document the expenditures/reduction and the amount is shown in the CCIP.

Findings Citation	Evidence	Evidence of Correction		Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	Date Due	
300.205	The district did not budget funds for the purpose of reduction of local expenditures or for Comprehensive Early Intervening Services in FY13. There was not information to review in this section.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Gifted Components, OEC’s Review Findings, and District Required Actions

Component 1: Gifted Budget

- A. Based on Section 267.30.50 in Am. Sub. HB 153, did the district spend for services to identified gifted students at least the same amount of state funding that it received in fiscal year 2009 through unit funding?
- B. If the district in fiscal year 2009 received gifted student services from an ESC, and the ESC received gifted unit funding in fiscal year 2009, did the district either (a) obtain gifted student services from an ESC that are comparable to the gifted student services provided to the district with gifted unit funding in fiscal year 2009 by an ESC or (b) spend for services to identified gifted students an amount not less than the amount of gifted unit funding expended by an ESC in fiscal year 2009 for the district's students?
- C. Did the district spend no less than their FY09 supplemental identification amount on gifted identification?

Citation	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	
Section 267.30.50, Am. Sub. HB 153	<p>Expenditure reports were provided by the district to demonstrate that fiscal year 2012 gifted spending was equal to or more than fiscal year 2009 unit funding.</p> <p>OEC reviewed expenditure reports for identification. The district did not spend the required amount on gifted identification in FY12 but they have spent the required amount in FY13 and already project sufficient spending in FY14.</p> <p>The district maintains the FTE received from the ESC in 2009.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>None</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 2: Gifted Identification

Per Ohio Revised Code 3324.04(B)(2), how does the district assure inclusion in screening and assessment procedures for minority and disadvantaged students, children with disabilities and children for whom English is a second language?

Citation	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	
ORC 3324.04(B)(2)	<p>OEC reviewed identification procedures. The district provided evidence to document that there are provisions in place to insure inclusion in screening and assessment procedures for minority and disadvantaged students, children with disabilities and children for whom English is a second language. Whole grade screening is provided for students in grade four.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>None</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 3: Roster and Written Education Plans and Attestation

Per Ohio Administrative Code 3301-51-15 (D)(4), does the district have a current written education plan (WEP) for each student reported as served? Does each WEP include the following components?

- Goals for the students for each service to be provided;
- Specified methods for evaluating progress toward goals;
- Method and schedule for reporting progress to parents;
- Staff responsible for ensuring delivery of each service prescribed;
- Policies regarding waiver of assignments and rescheduling of tests;
- Deadline for next review of WEP; and
- Copy of WEP to parents and staff responsible for providing service listed?

Citation	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	
OAC 3301-51-15(D)(4)	WEPs for ten students were provided and reviewed. All required attributes were present on all WEPs.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 4: Equitable Services and Attestation

Are all district students who meet the written criteria for a gifted service provided an equal opportunity to receive that service? Each gifted service offered in the district must be available to all eligible students in each building in the district at that grade level.

Citation	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	
ORC 3324.06(D)	Each gifted service offered in the district is available to all eligible students in each building in the district at that grade level. Students are served in language arts classes in grades 6-8.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 5: Acceleration and Attestation

Did the district provide evidence that they are implementing their acceleration policy?

Citation	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	
ORC 3324.10	The district provided evidence that they are implementing their acceleration policy. OEC reviewed district acceleration policies and procedures. Acceleration is described in the gifted brochure and articles appear in the ESC's gifted newsletter. The district will use the IAS.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 6: Gifted Intervention Specialists and Attestation

Do gifted intervention specialists (GIS) spend at least 75 percent of their time providing instruction directly to gifted students? Is the remainder of their time spent on other duties related to gifted education?

Citation	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	
OAC 3301-51-15(E)(2)	The schedule for the gifted intervention specialist was reviewed. The gifted intervention specialist spends at least 75% of the time providing instruction directly to gifted students and the remainder of the time on other duties related to gifted education.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 7: Requirement for Minutes of Service Attestation

Are all students receiving service from a GIS receiving at least 225 minutes of instruction per week (kindergarten through grade 5) or 240 minutes of instruction per week (grades 6-12) from the GIS?

Citation	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	
OAC 3301-51-15(E)	The schedule for the gifted intervention specialist was reviewed. The students receive 44 minutes of service per day; the district has an approved bell schedule waiver on file.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 8: Licensure

Do all staff members assigned as gifted coordinators or GIS have gifted licensure, gifted endorsement or a gifted supplemental license?

Citation	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	
OAC 3301-51-15(E)(3), OAC 3301-51-15(E)(6)	Licenses for gifted personnel were reviewed. The gifted coordinator and gifted intervention specialist hold the appropriate licensure or endorsement.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Component 9: Requirement for Regular Education Teacher Professional Development and Attestation

Are all general education teachers providing gifted services receiving professional development in teaching gifted students and ongoing assistance with curriculum development and instruction from a gifted specialist and is curriculum related to gifted services differentiated?

Citation	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction	Must be addressed in CAP
		Required Actions	
OAC 3301-51-15(D)(3)(b)(i)	The district does not report any service in the regular classroom so this component does not apply.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> None	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA