

**New London Local School District
IRN: 047720****Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children
2018-2019 IDEA Monitoring Review Summary Report****Introduction**

The Ohio Department of Education's Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) would like to extend appreciation to the New London Local School District staff for their efforts, attention and time committed to the completion of the review process.

The following report is a summary of the onsite review conducted by OEC on April 9, 2019, as part of its general supervision requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Am. Sub. HB1.

Overview

During the onsite review, OEC consultants monitor the educational agency's implementation of IDEA to ensure compliance and positive results for students with disabilities. The primary focus of the review is to:

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

Onsite reviews are targeted to include the following specific areas:

- Child Find;
- Delivery of Services;
- Least Restrictive Environment;
- IEP Verification of delivery of services;
- Parent Input; and
- Teacher and Administrator Interviews.

Data Sources

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

1. Public Parent Meeting and Written Comments

New London Local School District mailed 156 OEC approved letters to all families with students with disabilities in the educational agency. OEC provided the educational agency with a public meeting announcement to post on the district website. Public parent meeting dates for all educational agencies selected for onsite reviews are also posted on the ODE website.

On April 9, 2019, OEC consultants held a public meeting for parents and other interested parties two parents and family members and one State Support Team (SST) Region 2 representative attended the public meeting. Attendees could speak to OEC representatives publicly in the meeting, speak to OEC representatives individually, provide written comments or both. Two attendees made comments during the public meeting. Written comment forms were available before, during and after the meeting. OEC did not receive any written comments.

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. Ohio's procedural safeguards notice was available for participants who wanted a copy.

2. Pre-Onsite Data Analysis

OEC conducted a comprehensive review which included district, building and grade level data; Special Education Performance Profile; Local Report Cards; Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP); and Education Management Information System (EMIS) data. The data analysis assisted OEC in determining potential growth areas and educational agency strengths.

3. Record Review/IEP Verification

Prior to the onsite visit, OEC consultants reviewed 10 records of students with disabilities. OEC selected records of students with disabilities from a variety of disability categories and ages. Three student records were selected for IEP verification in the classroom setting.

4. Staff/Administrative Interviews

On April 9, 2019, OEC consultants held six sessions of interviews with five administrators and 26 teachers, eight paraprofessionals, five 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 and Discipline.

Findings of Noncompliance

A finding is made when noncompliance is identified with evaluation team report (ETR) and/or individualized education program (IEP) requirements. Noncompliance that is systemic in nature or 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 review (listed by subject area in the *OEC's Review Findings and Educational Agency Required Actions Table*) must be corrected as indicated in the *Evidence of Correction/Required Actions* column.

OEC provides separate written correspondence to the parent/guardian when action is required to correct findings of noncompliance for individual students. The educational agency will receive copies of this correspondence.

Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

The educational agency will develop a CAP to address any items identified in this summary report. An approved form for the CAP will be provided by OEC or can be accessed on ODE's website by using the keyword search "Monitoring." The CAP developed by the educational agency must include the following:

- Activities to address all areas identified in this summary report;
- Documentation/evidence of implementation of the activities;
- Individuals responsible for implementing the activities;
- Resources needed;
- Completion dates; and
- Continued Plan for Improvement and/or Compliance.

The educational agency must submit the CAP by email to Raymond.mccain@education.ohio.gov within 30 school days from the date of this report. OEC will review the action plan submitted by the educational agency for approval. If OEC deems that a revision(s) is necessary, the educational agency will be required to revise and resubmit. The educational agency will be contacted by OEC and notified when the action plan has been approved.

CAP Due Date: September 25, 2019

OEC Trainings

As part of the OEC monitoring process, New London Local School District personnel, as identified by OEC, are required to complete the Special Education Essentials 2018-19 training modules within the Learning Management System (LMS). OEC will provide specific instructions on completing these training modules during the Summary Report presentation. Participants must achieve a 75% or more on each quiz. Participants who do not achieve at least 75% will be contacted by the State Support Team (SST) for additional training.

*Completion of LMS Training Modules Due Date: **September 25, 2019***

Individual Correction

The educational agency has **60 school days** from the date of this summary report to correct all identified findings of noncompliance for individual students, unless noted otherwise in the report. Detailed information on individual findings are provided in a separate report.

*Individual Correction Due Date: **November 7, 2019, 2019***

Systemic Correction

The educational agency will provide OEC with documentation verifying the educational agency's completion of all CAP activities. OEC will verify systemic correction through the review of this documentation. If needed, OEC may request additional student records to review.

*Completion of Systemic Correction Due Date: **February 7, 2020***

Once the educational agency has completed all action plan activities, the educational agency will use OEC's monitoring process to create and implement a Strategic Improvement Plan with OEC and SST assistance.

For questions regarding the review, please contact: Raymond McCain, OEC Contact Consultant, at (614) 752-1398, toll-free at (877) 644-6338, or by e-mail at Raymond.mccain@education.ohio.gov.

OEC's Review Findings and Educational Agency Required Actions

Component 1: Child Find

Each educational agency 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 educational agency, 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 Ohio Operating Standards 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	300.305(a) and 3301-51-11 (c)(1)(a)	<u>Record Review</u> Preschool records were not reviewed.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
CF-2	3301-51-06	<u>Record Review</u> All evaluations reviewed appropriately documented interventions provided to resolve concerns for the child performing below grade-level standards.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
CF-3	300.501(b)(1) 3301-51-06 (E)(2)(a)	<u>Record Review</u> All student records showed evidence that the parent was afforded the opportunity to participate in the evaluation team planning meeting.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
CF-4	300.300	<u>Record Review</u> All student records provided evidence of parental consent obtained prior to new testing.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<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	
CF-5	300.304(c)(4) 3301-51-01 3301-51-06 (E)(2)(a)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Three evaluations did not provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>New London City Schools must develop an internal monitoring process which contains procedures to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active team participation in the ETR planning process and; • Appropriate evaluation data is available. <p>In several cases, assessments included on the planning form were not presented in Part 1 of the ETR, and, in other cases, assessments were reported in Part 1 that were not included on the planning form.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency will convene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
CF-6	300.306(c)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Six evaluations did not show evidence of clearly stating the summary of assessment results.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>The information from Part 1 was not summarized in a clear and concise manner in Part 2. In some instances, the information was entirely omitted. Information in Part 1 must be brought forward to Part 2 in a manner that can be clearly understood by the parent and used by the IEP team to develop meaningful goals and services.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency will reconvene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide a clear and concise summary of the data and assessment conducted that meets the requirements of 3301-51-06 (G) (Summary of information). The IEP team must consider the results of this reevaluation.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding summary of data and assessment results.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <p>The educational agency needs 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	
CF-7	300.306(c)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Five evaluation team reports did not contain a clear and succinct description of educational needs.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>The description of educational needs for the ETRs were not summarized, but instead contained a lot of information that was not specific to the student's individual educational needs. These did not provide sufficient information to IEP teams needed to develop effective IEPs. Some descriptions left out relevant information related to the reported assessments.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency will reconvene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide a clear and succinct description of the student's educational needs. The IEP team must consider the results of this reevaluation.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding description of educational needs.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
CF-8	300.306(c)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Seven evaluation team reports did not contain specific implications for instruction and progress monitoring.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>Records reviewed were missing implications for progress monitoring. This would provide the parents with an understanding of where their child is regarding their academic growth. Often the implications portion was written in predetermination language or it was not summarized. .</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency will reconvene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide a clear description of specific implications for instruction and progress monitoring. The IEP team must consider the results of this reevaluation.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding implications for instruction and progress monitoring.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
CF-9	300.306(a)(1) 3301-51-01 (B)(21)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>One evaluation did not show 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 as well as the child's educational needs.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must provide evidence that the ETR team and other qualified professionals, as appropriate, participated in the determination of eligibility and educational needs. If not, the ETR team must reconvene and provide OEC evidence of group participation.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding the eligibility determination process.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Component 2: Delivery of Services

Each educational agency 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	SPP Indicator 13 300.320 (b) 3301-51-07 (H)(2)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Two IEPs did not show evidence that the postsecondary transition plan met all eight required elements of the IDEA for the student, specifically in the following area(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are appropriate measurable postsecondary goal(s). 2. The postsecondary goal(s) are updated annually. 3. The postsecondary goal(s) were based on age appropriate transition assessment (AATA). 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 <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>Training must be provided to all ETR and IEP members responsible for assessing and writing transition plans to ensure they are compliant and beneficial to the student.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the teams to review and correct the postsecondary transition plan for the IEPs identified as noncompliant or provide documentation of the student's withdrawal date from the educational agency.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding transition services.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency 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	
		In addition, transition services were often generic in nature and not developed to address individual student needs as identified in the AATA. The phrase “provided an opportunity for” is not appropriate for transition services.		
DS-2	300.320(a)(1)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Nine IEPs did not contain Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance that addressed the needs of the student.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>The present levels in the IEPs reviewed were inconsistent in quality and content. Measurable baseline data were missing in many cases. Often, the present levels of performance (PLOP) did not relate to the annual goal and were missing grade level expectations. An internal monitoring and review system would be very helpful to promote compliance in present levels.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the IEP teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the PLOP related to each goal to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of current daily academic/ behavioral and/or functional performance (strengths and needs) compared to expected grade level standards in order to provide a frame of reference; • Baseline data provided for developing a measurable goal. <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding the review of current academic/functional data when writing IEPs.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
DS-3	300.320(a)(2)(i)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>All IEPs contained annual goals that address the child’s academic area(s) of need.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p>	<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	
DS-4	300.320(a)(2)(i)	<u>Record Review</u> All IEPs contained annual goals that address the child's functional area(s) of need.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-5	300.320(a)(2)(i)	<u>Record Review</u> Nine IEPs did not contain measurable annual goals. <u>Other Considerations</u> Measurable goals in the IEPs reviewed were inconsistent in quality and content. Often one or more required elements were missing. An internal monitoring and review system would be very helpful to promote compliance in annual IEP goals.	<u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend annual goals to contain the following critical elements: 1. <u>Clearly defined behavior</u> : the specific action the child will be expected to perform. 2. The <u>condition</u> (situation, setting or given material) under which the behavior is to be performed. 3. <u>Performance criteria</u> desired: the level the child must demonstrate for mastery and the number of times the child must demonstrate the skill or behavior. <u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding the development of measurable annual IEP goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
DS-6	3301-51-07(B) and (C) 3301-51-07(L) 3301-51-07(H)(1)(d)	<u>Record Review</u> All IEPs did show evidence that data were collected and analyzed to monitor performance on each goal and objective.	<u>Individual Correction</u> None <u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices that the data were collected and analyzed to determine the present levels of academic and functional performance the student made on each goal and objective.	<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	
DS-7	300.320(a)(4) 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e)(i)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Four IEPs did not contain a statement of specially designed instruction that addresses the individual needs of the child and supports the annual goals.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>Intervention specialists stated that they do not have a good grasp on the concept of specially designed instruction (SDI).</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>Training on writing compliant SDIs will be beneficial to the intervention specialist staff at New London. Some SDIs were either simply a list of accommodations or not specific to the student's needs.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the specially designed instruction, as appropriate, to address the needs of the child.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of determining specially designed instruction.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
DS-8	3301-51-07(L)(2)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>All IEPs contained measurable annual goals and services/placement consistent with progress made.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-9	300.320(a)(7) 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>One IEP did not indicate the location where the specially designed instruction will be provided.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the team of the IEP 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>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of determining the location where specially designed instruction will occur.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <p>The educational agency 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-10	300.320(a)(7) 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i)	<u>Record Review</u> One IEP did not indicate the amount of time and frequency of the specially designed instruction.	<u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency must reconvene the team of the IEP identified as noncompliant to review and amend the amount of time and frequency of the specially designed instruction. <u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of determining the amount and frequency of specially designed instruction to be provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
DS-11	300.320(a)(4) 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e)	<u>Record Review</u> All IEPs identified related services that address the needs of the child and support the annual goals.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-12	300.320(a)(7) 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i)	<u>Record Review</u> All IEPs indicated the location where the related services will be provided.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-13	300.320(a)(7) 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i)	<u>Record Review</u> All IEPs indicated the amount of time, duration and frequency of the related services to be provided.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<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	
DS-14	3301-51-07	<u>IEP Verification</u> Of the 10 IEPs reviewed, OEC conducted three IEP Verifications in the classroom setting. The verification visits provided evidence that the IEPs are being implemented as written.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-15	3301-51-07(L)	<u>Record Review</u> All IEPs showed evidence that revisions were made based on data indicating changes in student needs or abilities.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-16	300.324(a)(2)(v) 3301-51-01(B)(3)	<u>Record Review</u> All IEPs identified assistive technology to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.	<u>Individual Correction</u> NA <u>Systemic Correction</u> NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-17	300.320(a)(6)(i) 3301-51-07(H)(1)(g)	<u>Record Review</u> Five IEPs did not identify accommodations provided to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum. <u>Other Considerations</u> IEP accommodations listed were not explained regarding conditions and extent of the accommodation. Words like “as needed” and “may need” are not acceptable in describing accommodations.	<u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review the accommodations that would directly assist the child to access the course content without altering the scope or complexity of the information taught and include them on the IEP. <u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding accommodations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs 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-18	300.320(a)(4) 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Three IEPs did not identify modifications to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>The extent of modifications must be specific and clearly explained.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review the modifications that would alter the amount or complexity of grade-level materials and would enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum and include them in the IEP</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding modifications.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
DS-19	3301-51-07 (H)(1)(h)(ii)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>One student record did not provide evidence that the IEP team used the AASCD Participation Criteria form when deciding if the alternate assessment is appropriate for the student.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the team of the IEP identified as noncompliant to review and complete the AASCD Participation Criteria form. The team must decide if the alternate assessment is appropriate for the student.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding the use and completion of the AASCD Participation Criteria form.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
DS-20	300.320(a)(4) 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>All IEPs identified supports for school personnel to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p>	<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	
DS-21	300.321(5) 3301-51-07(I)	<u>Record Review</u> One IEP did not indicate that the IEP Team included a group of qualified professionals.	<u>Individual Correction</u> For the IEP identified as noncompliant, the educational agency must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide documentation that the parent was informed prior to the IEP meeting that the person qualified to interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results would not participate in the meeting, and • Provide a written excuse signed by the parents and the educational agency that allowed the person qualified to interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results not to be in attendance at the IEP meeting, or • Reconvene the IEP team to review the IEP with all required members present. <u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding the involvement of people qualified to interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results in the IEP process.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.

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

Each educational agency 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	300.114 300.320(a)(5) 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(f)	<p><u>Record Review</u></p> <p>Five IEPs did not include an explanation of the extent to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the general education classroom.</p> <p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <p>“May receive services in special areas or outside the general education setting.” LREs need to be specific, precise and clear about why the student is removed and when they are removed from the general education setting.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and include a justification as to why the child was removed from the general 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 general classroom with supplementary aids and services. • Document that the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in general 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 educational agency must submit evidence to OEC of written procedures and practices regarding the least restrictive environment placement decision process.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>