



August 10, 2023

**Adams County Ohio Valley School District
IRN: 061903**

**Ohio the Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children
2022-2023 IDEA Monitoring Review Summary Report**

Introduction

The Ohio Department of Education's Office for Exceptional Children would like to extend appreciation to the Adams County Ohio Valley School District staff for their efforts, attention and time committed to the completion of the review process.

Definition of terms in this document:

Individual Corrections or Record Corrections refers to the correction of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs), Evaluation Team Reports (ETRs) and other special education records that were reviewed by the Department and found to be noncompliant.

Systemic Corrections refers to noncompliance within the larger systems at work to implement IDEA within the district. This includes but is not limited to Systemic Correction of records and special education procedures and practices to document ongoing compliance with IDEA requirements.

Overview

The following report is a summary of the onsite review conducted by the Department on February 28 through March 2, 2023, and April 13, 2023 as part of its general supervision requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

During the onsite review, the Department monitors 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, Special Education Service Providers and Administrator Interviews.

Data Sources

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

1. Parent Input

Adams County Ohio Valley School Districts Mailed 1195 letters of the Department's notification of review to all families with students with disabilities in the educational agency. The educational agency posted the notification of review on its website which included a link to a recorded presentation from the Department providing an overview of the monitoring review process. The presentation also provides contact information and requests parents to provide comments to the Department regarding the special education program in their school. The notification of review was also posted on the Department's website.

The Department received 3 comments.



2. Pre-Onsite Data Analysis

The Department conducted a comprehensive review which included district, building and grade level data; Special Education Profile; Ohio School Report Cards; Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP) and/or OnePlan; and Education Management Information System (EMIS) data. The data analysis assisted the Department in determining potential growth areas for improvement and educational agency strengths.

3. Record Review/IEP Verification

Prior to the onsite visit, the Department consultants reviewed 41 records of school-age students with disabilities. The Department consultants selected records of students with disabilities from a variety of disability categories and ages. 10 student records were selected for IEP verification in the classroom setting. Overall, what was listed in the students' IEPs were seen being delivered in the appropriate specially designed instruction (SDI) locations with accommodations being utilized. Progress monitoring was being collected on students using different formats. Progress on the goals were not provided, but instead progress on the student's objectives were being collected. It is highly suggested that Adams County Ohio Valley School District create and implement a universal system for gathering data on student progress toward goal mastery.

4. Staff/Administrative Interviews

On February 28th, the Department consultants held 16 sessions of interviews with 16 administrators and 115 teachers, school counselors, related services personnel, school psychologists, and paraprofessionals. The Department interviews focused on the following review areas: Child Find; Delivery of Services; Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) and IEP alignment and Discipline.

On April 13th, the Department returned to Adams County Ohio Valley School District to conduct interviews and IEP verifications at both the Oliver and Career Technical Center locations.

Strengths/Commendations:

Adams County Ohio Valley School District is divided into three different attendance areas. Each area has its share of unique strengths:

Peebles has staff who go above and beyond what is needed to ensure SDI minutes are being delivered. Intervention Specialists utilize their planning and lunch time to work with students with disabilities on SDI as well as any other needs they might have.

West Union has staff who have seamlessly integrated the IXL program into their special education classes so that every student is receiving up to date progress on mastery of goals and objectives as well as receiving immediate feedback on specific areas of academic deficits.

North Adams has a universal Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) program that allows for everyone to be successful both academically and behaviorally. They also have exemplary co-teaching going on at the 4th and 10th grade levels.

As a whole, within all three attendance areas, Adams County Ohio Valley School District has great things going on. Each attendance area could benefit from uniformly incorporating these individual strengths into each of their buildings.



Findings of Noncompliance/Required Actions

A finding is made when noncompliance is identified by the Department with IDEA and Ohio Operating Standards requirements. Findings are also made when noncompliance is identified in relation to the evaluation team report (ETR) and/or individualized education program (IEP) requirements. For a noncompliance level of 30% or greater in any single area or for identified areas of concern that did not reach 30% or greater, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) will be developed to address those areas. All noncompliance identified by the Department as part of the review (listed by subject area in the *Department's Review Findings and Educational Agency Required Actions Table*) must be corrected as indicated in the *Evidence of Correction/Recommendations* column.

Refer to the details of requirements in the [Evidence of Findings and Evidence of Correction/Recommendations table below](#), and the attached [Individual Record Review Comment Sheets for specific individual record corrections](#).

The Department 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 the Department or can be accessed on the Department's website by using the keyword search "Monitoring". The CAP developed by the educational agency with SST assistance 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. The Department will review the corrective action plan submitted by the educational agency for approval. If the Department determines that a revision(s) is necessary, the educational agency will be required to revise and resubmit. The educational agency will be contacted by the Department and notified when the action plan has been approved.

CAP Due Date: September 29, 2023

Department Trainings

As part of the Department monitoring process, Adams County Ohio Valley School District personnel, as identified by the Department, are required to complete the OEC Required Special Education Process training modules within the Learning Management System (LMS). The Department will provide specific instructions on completing these training modules during the Summary Report presentation. Participants must achieve 80% or more on each quiz. Participants who do not achieve at least 80% will be contacted by the State Support Team (SST) for additional training.

Completion of LMS Training Modules Due Date: September 29, 2023

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 whose records were selected and reviewed by the Department during the onsite review unless noted otherwise in the report. Detailed information on individual findings is provided in a separate report.

Individual Correction Due Date: November 14, 2023



CAP Activities and Systemic Correction

The educational agency will provide the Department with documentation verifying the educational agency's completion of all CAP activities and all systemic corrections noted in this summary report. The Department will verify systemic correction through the review of this documentation and a review of additional student records.

*Completion of CAP Activities and Systemic Correction Due Date: **April 12, 2024***

Once the educational agency has completed all action plan activities, the educational agency will plan for continuous improvement through the One Needs Assessment and One Plan with Department and SST assistance.

For questions regarding the review, please contact: Raymond McCain, the Department's IDEA Monitoring Contact, at 614-593-5477, toll-free at 877-644-6338, or by e-mail at raymond.mccain@education.ohio.gov.



The Department’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 | Evidence of Findings | Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|---|---|---|
| CF-1 | <p>Record Review</p> <p>34 CFR 300.305(a) [Review of Existing evaluation data] and OAC 3301-51-11 (c)(1)(a) [Preschool children eligible for special education]</p> <p>Preschool records were not reviewed.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA</p> |
| CF-2 | <p>Record Review</p> <p>OAC 3301-51-06 [Evaluations]</p> <p>Twenty-one (21) out of 41, or 51%, evaluations reviewed did not appropriately document interventions provided to resolve concerns for the child performing below grade-level standards.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The Department has verified that these students have a current ETR in place, so no additional individual correction is required.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding documentation of intervention and supports provided prior to completion of the initial and reevaluation team report.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | <p>Interviews/Public Comments</p> <p>Interview participants confirmed that, although interventions are provided through various processes across the district, the results are not uniformly documented in ETRs.</p> <p>Through interviews, it appears that some teachers and other staff collect intervention data. However, it did not appear that there was a standard process of initiating interventions and making referrals for evaluation.</p> | <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>It is recommended Adams County Ohio Valley School District develop a procedure of checks and balances to ensure interventions that are being provided to students are correctly documented within the ETR as well as in the Part 2 Summary of Interventions.</p> | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---|--|---|
| | Concerns Noted | Frequently, the district's initial ETRs did not contain a Summary of Interventions to include description, intensity, time and results. The district must provide a summary of actual interventions and not a list of possible accommodations. For reevaluations, if no additional interventions were provided, it should be noted that the team agreed the current IEP supports and services are suitable to meet the student's needs. | | |
| CF-3 | Record Review | <p><i>34 CFR 300.501(b) [Parent participation in meetings] and OAC 3301-51-06 (E)(2)(a) [Evaluation procedures].</i></p> <p>Twelve (12) out of 41, or 29%, student records reviewed did not show evidence that the parent was afforded the opportunity to participate in the evaluation team planning meeting.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must provide evidence that the parent was involved or provided the opportunity to participate in the evaluation planning process. The evidence may include evaluation planning form, prior written notice, parent invitation, referral form or communication log.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices that include the parent in the evaluation planning 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> |
| CF-4 | Record Review | <p><i>34 CFR 300.300 [Parental Consent]</i></p> <p>Eight out of 21, or 38%, student records reviewed did not provide evidence of parental consent obtained prior to evaluation.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must provide evidence that the parent provided informed, written consent for evaluation, based upon the planning form. Or the agency must show documented repeated attempts to obtain informed, written consent to which the parent did not respond.</p> <p>The evidence may include, prior written notice, parent invitation, communication log, or other documented attempts to obtain parental informed, written consent.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Concerns Noted | Informed Parental Consent is required for any evaluations. This area is an opportunity for the district to strengthen the policies and practices on obtaining written, informed consent for evaluations. | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>If the educational agency cannot provide documentation that the parent provided informed, written consent for evaluation, or did not respond to repeated attempts to obtain consent, the agency must conduct a reevaluation including documentation of parental consent.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices for obtaining informed parental consent.</p> | |
| CF-5 | <p>Record Review</p> | <p>34 CFR 300.304(c)(4) [Other evaluation procedures] OAC 3301-51-01 [Applicability of requirements and definitions] and 3301-51-06 (E)(2)(a) [Evaluation procedures]</p> <p>All 41 evaluations reviewed, or 100%, did not provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u> 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> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices to provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> Adams County Ohio Valley School District 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. • Appropriate evaluation data is available. • Assessments identified on the planning form are being completed and represented in a Part 1. | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | <p>Interviews/Public Comments</p> | <p>Some respondents described difficulty in obtaining responses for Part 1 from the individuals listed on the planning form.</p> <p>Staff members stated that a lack of guidance has been provided regarding completing the Part 1 compliantly, which they were assigned to complete by the school psychologist.</p> <p>Staff requested Professional Development in order to be more confident when asked to complete a Part 1.</p> | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| | <p>Concerns Noted</p> <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. All assessments and data listed for evaluation on the ETR planning form, and agreed upon by the parent, must appear – in some form – in a Part 1 individual evaluator’s assessment.</p> <p>Observations were either not completed or they were conducted during assessments.</p> <p>Part 1’s completed on modified forms were missing implications for instruction and educational needs.</p> <p>More than one person was listed on the planning form as responsible for the same Part 1, however, only one person completed it.</p> <p>The person completing the Part 1 was not the same person listed on the planning form as being responsible for its completion.</p> <p>Part 1 referenced a different student than the one who was provide the assessment.</p> <p>Ninety percenter (90%) of the ETRs reviewed did not contain any new testing. Some ETRs contained data that was over six years old, making it difficult for an intervention specialist to write realistic goals that would better benefit the students’ needs.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified Part 1s contain the required components. • Persons responsible for completing a Part 1 is the correctly identified staff. • Questionnaires and checklist data are summarized and contain needs and implications. | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|--|---|
| CF-6 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</p> <p>Twenty-nine (29) out of 41, or 71%, evaluations reviewed did not show evidence of clearly stating the summary of assessment results.</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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Concerns Noted | <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>It is important that the summary of assessments in Part 2 of the ETR be clear to parents and address data from all evaluators in Part 1. In many cases, only the school psychologist's evaluation was represented, and in other cases, related service providers or other evaluators were omitted from the summary.</p> <p>The information in Part 2 of the ETR must be clear and concise and not be a copy and paste of information from Part 1. The language should be written in terms that parents, as well as involved professionals, can understand and use to create goals and services in the IEP. All areas addressed in Part 1 must be summarized in Part 2. In multiple instances, all areas were not summarized and/or information was not included that could be used to create meaningful goals and services within the IEP.</p> | <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding summary of data and assessment results.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Adams County Ohio Valley School District must develop an internal monitoring process which contains procedures to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active team participation in the ETR process • Assessments identified on the planning form are being completed and represented in a Part 1 and are summarized within the Part 2 in parent friendly language. <p>Professional development should be provided to all identified staff members regarding participation and completion of required ETR forms thus allowing them to be an active member in the development of ETR.</p> | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| CF-7 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</p> <p>Twenty-six (26) out of 41, or 63%, evaluation team reports reviewed did not contain a clear and succinct description of educational needs.</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 the Department of written procedures and practices regarding description of educational needs.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Providing professional development on how to write purposeful educational needs to all staff members, who might be requested to complete a Part 1, is recommended for Adams County Ohio Valley School District.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>Interviewed staff members admitted they found it difficult to distinguish between Educational Needs and Implications for Instruction.</p> <p>Staff requested professional development in this area so they could better understand the difference between needs and implications.</p> | | |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>Educational Needs were sometimes generic in nature and did not address the child's individualized needs. Sometimes educational needs were stated in Part 1 but were not included in the Part 2 summary.</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 the IEP team's need to develop effective IEPs. Some descriptions left out relevant information related to the reported assessments.</p> | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| CF-8 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need] Twenty-one (21) out of 41, or 51%, evaluation team reports reviewed did not contain specific implications for instruction.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency will reconvene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide a clear description of specific implications for instruction. The IEP team must consider the results of this reevaluation.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>Interviewed staff members admitted they found it difficult to distinguish between educational needs and implications for instruction. Staff requested professional development in this area so they could better understand the difference between implications and needs.</p> | <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding implications for instruction.</p> | |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>In some cases, there was no description or there was a lack of clarity of the implications for instruction (the implications description was generic in nature and did not address the specific needs of the child).</p> | <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> Providing professional development on how to write purposeful implications for instruction to all staff members, who might be requested to complete a Part 1, is recommended for Adams County Ohio Valley School District.</p> | |
| CF-9 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.306(a)(1) [Determination of eligibility] OAC 3301-51-01 (B)(21) [Applicability of requirements and definitions] Seven out of 41, or 17%, evaluations reviewed 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> The educational agency must provide evidence that the ETR teams and other qualified professionals, as appropriate, participated in the determination of eligibility and educational needs. If not, the ETR team must reconvene and provide the Department evidence of group participation.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the eligibility determination process.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| CF-10 | Record Review | <p><i>OAC 3301-51-01 (B)(10) [Definitions] and 3301-51-06 [Evaluations]</i></p> <p>Twenty-eight (28) out of 41, or 68%, evaluations reviewed did not provide a justification for the eligibility determination decision.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency will reconvene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide a clear justification for the eligibility determination.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the eligibility determination decision.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> It is recommended that staff at Adams County Ohio Valley School District receive professional development on how to ensure their justification statements contain both:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the student qualifies for the suspected disability; and • How the student’s disability affects the child’s access and progress in the general education curriculum. | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>Staff interviewed indicated that they found it difficult to compliantly write a justification statement and stated professional development in this area would be greatly appreciated.</p> | | |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>In most cases, the justification statement did not include how the student’s disability affects the child’s access and progress in the general education curriculum.</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 | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------|--|--|---|
| DS-1 | Record Review | <p>SPP Indicator 13 34 CFR 300.320(b) [Transition services] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(2) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Twenty-two (22) out of 23 applicable IEPs reviewed, or 96%, 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 goals are updated annually. 3. The postsecondary goals 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 representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team Meeting. | <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 the Department of written procedures and practices regarding transition services.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>It is recommended that Adams County Ohio Valley School District improve their transition planning by better connecting students' preferences, interests, needs and strengths (PINS) to students' Postsecondary Education, Competitive Employment, and Independent Living goals.</p> <p>It is recommended training 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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| | Concerns Noted | <p>Several Transition Plans did contain the student's preferences, interests, needs and strengths (PINS) that were gathered from appropriate AATAs. However, they appeared to be the same for all three postsecondary goals.</p> <p>Several transition plans did not provide the evidence needed to support the absence of an Independent Living goal.</p> <p>Several Transition Plans referenced the Ohio Common Core Learning Standards as their course of study. This was found noncompliant since Common Core standards are no longer used in Ohio.</p> <p>Students must be invited to attend their own IEP meeting when transition planning is being discussed, starting at age 14 or younger, if appropriate.</p> | | |
| DS-2 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(1) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Thirty-nine (39) out of 41, or 95%, IEPs reviewed did not contain Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLOP) that addressed the needs of the student.</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 the following information as it relates to each goal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of current daily academic/behavior and/or functional performance compared to expected grade-level standards or to expected age-appropriate performance in order to provide a frame of reference for annual goal development in the specific area of academic and/or functional need; • Baseline data provided for developing a measurable goal (for example, ETR results, if current, formative | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>There is a lack of understanding across staff members regarding the required contents of the present levels for IEP goals. This points to an opportunity to further deploy and develop already existing training and technical assistance in this area.</p> | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | Concerns Noted | <p>The Present Levels of Performance (PLOP) in the IEPs reviewed were inconsistent in quality and content.</p> <p>Measurable baseline data were missing in many cases.</p> <p>Often, the Present Levels of Performance did not relate to the annual goals as well as missing the grade level standard comparison.</p> | <p>academic assessments, curriculum-based measurements, transition assessments or functional behavior assessments);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current performance measurement directly relates to the goal measurement. <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the review of current academic/functional data when writing IEPs.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> Professional development and/or targeted technical assistance needs to be provided in developing Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLOP) that clearly address the needs of the student.</p> <p>An internal monitoring and review system is recommended to promote compliance in present levels.</p> | |
| DS-3 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Thirty-two (32) out of 41, or 78%, IEPs reviewed did not contain measurable annual goals.</p> | <p><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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly <u>defined behavior</u>: the specific action the child will be expected to perform. The <u>condition</u> (situation, setting or given material) under which the behavior is to be performed. <u>Performance criteria</u> desired: the level the child must demonstrate for mastery and the number of | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan. |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>General Education teachers would like to have more input in developing measurable annual goals for students within their classroom. With this in place, present levels of performance could be compliantly obtained from staff when they are requested.</p> | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>Although most respondents indicated familiarity with the required elements for annual IEP goals, there is still a need for further training and technical assistance in this area.</p> <p>Staff indicated the need for ETR's to contain new assessments instead of just being a review of previous assessments.</p> <p>Due to old assessment data, staff found it extremely difficult to write goals for their students that were current and suited their academic and functional needs."</p> | <p>times the child must demonstrate the skill or behavior.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the development of measurable annual IEP goals.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> An internal monitoring and review system would be very helpful to promote compliance with writing measurable annual IEP goals.</p> <p>Additional training and technical assistance for annual IEP goal development is recommended. Focus should be given to a goal statement that is measurable, with the same measurement in the present levels, and can be reported in progress monitoring in the same way.</p> <p>The ETR team should review the ETR data to see how relevant and current they are, then decide which assessments need to be administered so the IEP team will have good assessment data that will enable them to write goals more beneficial to the student.</p> | |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>Measurable goals in the IEPs reviewed were inconsistent in quality and content. Often one or more required elements were missing.</p> <p>Several goals contained two or more skills, making them noncompliant.</p> <p>Several goals were missing either the clearly defined behavior, the condition, or the performance criteria.</p> | | |
| DS-4 | Record Review | <p><i>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education program]</i></p> <p>Thirteen (13) out of 38 applicable IEPs reviewed, or 34%, did not contain annual goals that address the child's academic area(s) of need.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the IEP. Annual goals must address the academic needs of the child unless the team provides evidence that the goals were prioritized based on the severity of the needs of the child.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>If academic needs were addressed in the ETR as being an area of concern, they must be addressed in the IEP in some capacity. The needs can be addressed as a goal, a related service or a statement that indicates the team</p> | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>has prioritized other needs or found that it is not an area of concern at this time. Several ETRs mentioned academic needs in written expression, reading, decoding and spelling; those academic needs were never carried over and addressed within the students' IEPs.</p> | | <p>regarding the IEP process of addressing identified academic needs. <u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> It is strongly recommended that the district consider providing additional training and technical assistance for ensuring all academic needs addressed within the ETR are brought over to the IEP as either a goal or addressed within the Profile.</p> | |
| DS-5 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education] Thirteen (13) out of 31 applicable IEPs reviewed, or 42%, did not contain annual goals that address the child's functional area(s) of need.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the IEP. Annual goals must address the functional needs of the child unless the team provides evidence that the goals were prioritized based on the severity of the needs of the child.</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan. |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>If Functional Needs were addressed in the ETR as being an area of concern, they must be addressed in the IEP in some capacity. These needs can be addressed as a goal, a related service or a statement that indicates the team has prioritized other needs or found that it is not an area of concern at this time. Several ETRs mentioned Functional Needs that included: "Frustration," "Adaptive Functioning" and "Self-Care." Those functional needs were not carried over and addressed within the students' IEPs.</p> | <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of addressing identified functional needs. <u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> It is strongly recommended that the district consider providing additional training and technical assistance for ensuring all functional needs addressed within the ETR are brought over to the IEP as either a goal or addressed within the Profile.</p> | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| DS-6 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e)(i) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>Thirty-six (36) out of 41, or 88%, IEPs reviewed did not contain a statement of specially designed instruction (SDI) including related services that addresses the individual needs of the child and supports the annual goals.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u> 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> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of determining specially designed instruction.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>Staff mentioned the difficulty providing SDI to their students especially during “Study Skills” classes where SDI minutes should be taking place. Most of that time is used for making up missing assignments or other classwork, which they mentioned is the priority of the school.</p> <p>Staff want the appropriate time to deliver only SDI to their caseload of students and not working on missing assignments or classwork.</p> <p>Staff also mentioned that administration is pushing for 30-40 minutes per goal a week for SDI delivery. When “study skills” is not being utilized the way it was supposed to be set up, it is impossible to meet those “required” minutes.</p> <p>Staff also mentioned that administration wants the intervention specialists to “push” the delivery of SDI during co-teaching or general education classes. This also makes it difficult to carry out since the co-teaching model is not properly being implemented.</p> <p>Intervention specialists stated that they do not have a good grasp on how to write appropriate, useful and beneficial SDI.</p> | <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> Adams County Ohio Valley School District needs to develop some formal process to ensure that all intervention specialists are delivering their required specially designed instruction to their students as it is written in the student’s IEP.</p> <p>With the development of a universal tracking system for SDI, the district will be ensuring their students are receiving all the time and frequency stated within section 7 of their IEP.</p> | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | Concerns Noted | <p>In some cases, the SDI was generic in nature and not individualized to the needs of the student as described in the present levels and goals. Other examples lacked specific instructional reference and only listed accommodations or instructional settings.</p> <p>The nature of instruction must align with the student's individual needs and skills. In many instances, the SDI was very broad and not specific to the student.</p> <p>Several IEPs had both one-on-one and small group instruction together for one SDI along with only one time and frequency between the two.</p> | | |
| DS-7 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i) [Definition of IEP] Six out of 41, or 15%, IEPs reviewed did not indicate the specific location where the specially designed instruction will be provided.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the location where the specially designed instruction will be provided.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of determining the location where specially designed instruction will occur.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> It is strongly recommended Adams County Ohio Valley Schools develop a process to ensure SDI is being delivered in the location stated in the student's IEP.</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan. |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>Staff also mentioned that administration is pushing for 30-40 minutes per goal a week for SDI delivery. When "study skills" is not being utilized the way it was supposed to be set up, it is impossible to meet those "required" minutes.</p> <p>Staff indicated that the location specified in the SDI section of the IEP does not always accurately represent the exact location they are delivering student's SDI.</p> | <p>Even though this did not qualify as a required CAP component, serving students in a different location other than what their IEP states could lead to legal issues since it may be seen as not following the student's IEP as written.</p> | |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>Locations were unclear as to exactly where the SDI was being delivered. "Pullout support classroom" was mentioned in a few IEPs.</p> | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|--|---|
| DS-8 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>Seventeen (17) out of 41, or 41%, IEPs reviewed did not indicate the amount of time and frequency of the specially designed instruction.</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 amount of time and frequency of the specially designed instruction.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of determining the amount and frequency of specially designed instruction to be provided.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>Several IEPs had time and frequency set for “quarterly.” This time frequency is not specific enough to the parent. Daily, weekly and/or monthly frequency terms are preferable.</p> <p>Time and frequency must relate to one specific provider. Several of the records reviewed had two providers listed for one SDI. Intervention specialists and related service providers are both able to deliver SDI; however, if a general education teacher is assigned to assist in the delivery of SDI, they must be included in the supports for school personnel box.</p> | <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Training from SSTs as well as internal monitoring review system would be very helpful to promote compliance in the areas of specially designed instruction.</p> <p>Adams County Ohio Valley School District will need to develop a procedure to ensure specially designed instruction time and frequency is being correctly documented.</p> | |
| DS-9 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(v) [Development of IEP] OAC 3301-51-01(B)(3) [Applicability of requirements and definitions]</p> <p>Two out of six applicable IEPs reviewed, or 33%, did not identify assistive technology to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the 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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>Assistive Technology mentioned in the ETR as a need or mentioned within measurable goals must be identified in Section 7 under Assistive Technology.</p> | <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding assistive technology.</p> | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> Adams County Ohio Valley School District will need to develop a procedure to ensure Assistive Technology is being correctly documented.</p> | |
| DS-10 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(i) [Definition of individualized education] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(g) [Definition of IEP] Thirty-six (36) out of 41, or 88%, IEPs reviewed did not identify accommodations provided to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p> | <p><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.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding accommodations.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> Training from SSTs as well as internal monitoring review system is recommended to promote compliance in the areas of accommodations.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>The need for and use of accommodations was misunderstood by some staff members, indicating a need for training and technical support in this area.</p> | | |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>IEP accommodations listed were not explained regarding conditions and extent of the accommodation. Phrases like “as needed” and “may need” are not acceptable in describing accommodations. Accommodations cannot be the choice of the teacher or the student.</p> <p>The condition(s) and/or extent were not clearly explained (who, when and where services were provided).</p> | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| DS-11 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>Nineteen (19) out of 28 applicable IEPs reviewed, or 68%, did not identify modifications to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u> 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> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding modifications.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> The extent of and conditions for modifications must be explained. Refer to the current level of instruction, reading level or pace of instruction. The extent of modifications must be specific and clearly explained. Training from SSTs as well as an internal monitoring review system is recommended to promote compliance in the areas of modifications.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>Staff indicated during interview sessions they had a difficult time distinguishing between the differences between accommodations and modifications and when and how to implement them.</p> | | |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>Several modifications referenced “Core Standards” instead of the Ohio Learning Standard Extended.</p> <p>The modification list in section 7 failed to reference the extent of and conditions for each modification.</p> | | |
| DS-12 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>Five out of 12 applicable IEPs reviewed, or 42%, did not identify 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> The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review the supports for school personnel that were identified by the IEP team and define the supports on the IEP including who will provide the support and when it will take place.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a</p> |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>Staff indicated they were not familiar on exactly who should be referenced in the Supports for School Personnel section.</p> <p>Several stated when a student has a one-on-one paraprofessional, they are listed in the Supports for School Personnel Section.</p> | <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding supports for school personnel.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> There is a need to better describe adult-to-adult consultation. Clarify the support to include: <i>who</i> will receive; <i>who</i> will deliver; <i>when</i> the support will be provided; and for <i>what</i> purpose. For example, the Intervention Specialist consults with the General Education Teachers and Paraprofessionals on progress monitoring for a particular goal or goals. General Education Teachers/Paraprofessionals would then be listed as receiving support for school personnel.</p> <p>Procedures and training provided to all intervention specialists on compliantly completing the Support for School Personnel section of the IEP is recommended.</p> | Corrective Action Plan. |
| | Concerns Noted | IEP's that contained Support for School Personnel did not clarify what support will be provided, who will receive and who will deliver the support. | | |
| DS-13 | Record Review | <p><i>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(h)(ii) [Definition of IEP]</i></p> <p>The one applicable student record reviewed has a justification statement explaining why the student cannot participate in the regular assessment and why the alternate assessment is appropriate for the student.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u> NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> NA</p> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| DS-14 | Record Review | <p>OAC 3301-51-07(L)(2) [Development, review and revision of IEP]</p> <p>Thirty-one (31) out of 36 applicable student records reviewed, or 86%, did not show evidence of progress reporting data collected and analyzed to monitor performance on each goal.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>None</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding measurable annual goals and services consistent with progress made.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Training from SSTs as well as internal monitoring review system would be very helpful to promote compliance in the areas of progress monitoring.</p> <p>It is highly recommending Adams County Ohio Valley School District develop and train all Intervention Specialist on tracking and completing 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> |
| | Interviews/Public Comments | <p>Several staff members indicated they used Same Goal for their progress monitoring.</p> <p>Staff indicated they would like to have a universal form of tracking progress, so all staff members are collecting and documenting progress monitoring consistently.</p> | | |
| | Concerns Noted | <p>Even though progress was being gathered and reported, it must be recorded using the same performance criteria defined in the annual measurable goal.</p> <p>Progress Reports on annual measurable goals must be provided to parents of a child with a disability at least as often as report cards are issued to all children. If the district provides interim reports to all children, progress reports must be provided to all parents of a child with a disability.</p> <p>Several records reviewed were lacking progress report and those that did were missing qualitative and quantitative data.</p> | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------|--|---|---|
| DS-15 | Record Review | <p>OAC 3301-51-07(L) [Development, review and revision of IEP]</p> <p>One out of seven applicable IEPs reviewed, or 14%, did not show evidence that revisions were made based on data indicating changes in student needs or abilities.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the teams to review and amend the IEPs to reflect changes made based on current needs or abilities.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding using data to revise IEPs based on changes in student needs or abilities.</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> |
| DS-16 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.321(5) [IEP team]</p> <p>OAC 3301-51-07(I) [IEP team]</p> <p>Six out of 41, or 15%, IEPs reviewed did not indicate that the IEP Team included a group of qualified professionals.</p> | <p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>For the IEPs identified as noncompliant, the educational agency must.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide evidence that the IEP team, including the parent, participated in the IEP meeting; or • Provide evidence that the educational agency made reasonable attempts to include the parent in the IEP meeting; and/or • Provide documentation that the parent and the educational agency consent, in writing, to excuse the required member prior to the IEP meeting; or • Reconvene the IEP team to review the IEP with all required members present. <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the involvement of all required team members, including the parent, in IEP meetings.</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 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 | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|--|---|
| LRE-1 | Record Review | <p>34 CFR 300.114 [LRE requirements] and 300.320(a)(5) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(f) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Twenty-five (25) out of 41, or 61%, IEPs reviewed 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>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 the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the least restrictive environment placement decision process.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Training from SSTs as well as an internal monitoring review system would is recommended to promote</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p> |
| | Interviews | <p>Interviews revealed some challenges with describing or implementing a true co-teaching model with co-planning that was consistent across all buildings. Other respondents were concerned that district administrative policies limit placement choices across the continuum of alternative settings based upon individual student needs.</p> <p>During interviews, there were inconsistencies reported regarding the understanding of least restrictive environment (LRE) and a continuum of services. Intervention specialists are sometimes pulled out of classrooms to address the testing needs of students, to the detriment of serving students in the general education setting.</p> <p>During the interview sessions, both intervention specialists and general education teachers expressed a need for professional development and support at the building level for a co-teaching</p> | | |



| Record Review Item | Evidence of Findings | | Evidence of Correction/Recommendations | Must be addressed in CAP |
|--------------------|------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| | | <p>model to be successful. They also voiced the need of a common planning time to be successful.</p> <p>Staff indicated that co-teaching in some buildings and at some grade levels works well, but it is inconsistent. All intervention specialists agreed that they would like to receive training on co-teaching as well as to be able to visit classrooms where co-teaching is being delivered well.</p> | <p>compliance in the areas of Least Restrictive Environment.</p> | |
| | <p>Concerns Noted</p> | <p>Explain to what extent and/or condition the student will receive instruction outside the general education classroom. LRE justification statements need to be specific, precise, and clear about <i>why</i> the student is removed and <i>when</i> they are removed.</p> | | |



Additional Considerations and Opportunities for Improvement:

- District leadership values the co-teaching model, and interviews suggest that both general education and special education staff are supportive of the practice. Taking this interest and investing in a solid approach to co-teaching may prove effective for the district in multiple ways. Continuing to advance the practice of co-teaching would ensure that all teachers are provided necessary training and afforded shared planning and communication time. Co-teaching may also serve as a means to strengthen the communication between general education and special education personnel at both the classroom and administration levels, leading to greater success for all students.
- During the interview sessions, both intervention specialists and general education teachers expressed a need for both professional development and support at the building level for a co-teaching model to be successful. They also voiced the need of a common planning time to be successful.
- Adams County Ohio Valley School District has an opportunity to streamline their implementation of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) across all grade levels within the district. During interviews, it was shared that the implementation of PBIS varies throughout the district.
- The district must review, revise, or update the policies, procedures and practices regarding discipline and behavior support services. This includes Manifestation Determination Review (MDR), Functional Behavior Assessments (FBA) and Behavior Intervention Plans (BIP). This is necessary when students are being considered for a change of placement to the Oliver School.
- Adams County Ohio Valley School District administration would greatly benefit from enhancing their communication styles with all staff members regarding both students with disabilities as well as special education practices and policies. A more visible approach in all the buildings and classrooms would be greatly appreciated by all staff members who work with students on IEPs. This would also provide administration a glimpse into the types of behavioral situations staff are encountering with students especially in the cross-categorical classrooms.
- Develop and implement a formal process of tracking Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) to ensure Free Appropriate Public Education (3301-51-07 (K)).
- Adams County Ohio Valley School District would benefit from developing a new teacher onboarding process geared toward any new staff member hired regarding their Special Education Policies, Procedures and Practices.
- Progress Monitoring is extremely important in creating IEPs that are best suited for individual student needs. It is clear, as evidenced by discussion and interviews, that district staff know how their students are progressing and are in the habit of collecting multiple points of data regarding that progress. There is still a pattern that suggests a need for professional development with regard to what must be monitored and how that information connects to students needs and the tracking of success toward annual IEP goals.