

Explorers Academy of Science and Technology
IRN: 019474

Ohio Department of Education and Workforce
Office for Exceptional Children
2024-2025 IDEA Monitoring Review Summary Report

Introduction

The Ohio Department of Education and Workforce, Office for Exceptional Children, would like to extend appreciation to the Explorers Academy of Science and Technology 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 educational agency. 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 March 18-20, 2025, 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 Provider, and Administrator Interviews.

Data Sources

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

1. Parent Input

Explorers Academy of Science and Technology mailed/emailed 31 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 one comment.

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 One Plan; 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 staff reviewed 10 records of school-age students with disabilities. The Department staff selected records of students with disabilities from a variety of disability categories and ages. Eight student records were selected for IEP verification in the classroom setting.

4. Staff/Administrative Interviews

On March 19, 2025, the Department staff held eight sessions of interviews with six administrators and 23 teachers, student support coordinators, related services personnel, school psychologists, and paraprofessionals. Interviews focused on the following review areas: Child Find; Delivery of Services; Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), and IEP alignment and Discipline.

Strengths/Commendations:

Per the administration interviews the community is a cornerstone of the school. The administration notes that there are opportunities that the school is building to have their community involved in supporting the school. As reported in the administration interviews, the school is focusing on getting more professionals in differing areas of expertise involved such as more in person intervention specialists, mental health specialists, and behavior specialists.

The staff noted that the special education director is very organized, focused, and she is easily accessible for staff to ask questions. The general education teachers are very involved with all students in the school and all staff are very willing to learn and attend the trainings provided by the Department. This mindset will allow the school to be successful with their implementation of OEC's Monitoring Process and recommendations.

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 Shellby Davis (shellby.davis@education.ohio.gov) within 30 school days from the date of this report. The Department will review the CAP 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 25, 2025

Department Trainings

As part of the Department monitoring process, Explorers Academy of Science and Technology personnel, as identified by the Department, are required to complete the OEC Special Education Process Learning Management System (LMS) training modules within **30 school days** from the date of this report. 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 25, 2025

Individual Correction

The educational agency has **60 school days** from the date of this 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 12, 2025

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: February 23, 2026

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: Shellby Davis, the Department's IDEA Monitoring Contact, at (614) 981-6498 or toll-free at (877) 644-6338, or by e-mail at shellby.davis@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 and Workforce, 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><u>OAC 3301-51-06 [Evaluations]</u></p> <p>Eight out of 10, or 80%, of evaluations reviewed did not appropriately document interventions provided to resolve concerns for the child performing below grade-level standards.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>In the interviews, it was noted by staff that there is no uniform Multi-Tier System of Support/Response to Intervention process within the school and that it is the responsibility of the general education teachers to implement this differentiation within their own classroom. Staff noted that they would like more training on this subject.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>During review of records, when interventions were provided to students either as part of the initial evaluation or in addition to the specially designed instruction or related services, not all components were provided. Often these intervention details were missing how long the intervention was provided, a description of the results compared to the baseline data, and what the team's decision was as a result of the intervention(s).</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. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>It is recommended Explorers Academy of Science and Technology develop a procedure of checks and balances within their internal monitoring process, to ensure interventions that are being provided to students are correctly documented within Part 1s of the ETR as well as in the Part 2 Summary of Interventions.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
CF-2	<p>34 CFR 300.501(b) [Parent participation in meetings] and OAC 3301-51-06 (E)(2)(a) [Evaluation procedures].</p> <p>Two out of ten, or 20%, of student records reviewed did not show evidence that the parent was afforded the opportunity to participate in the evaluation team planning process.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>Interviews denoted that parents are typically contacted by the school psychologists for the start of the evaluation process. The parents are typically contacted via phone calls. It was noted that most ETR meetings are conducted via virtual means. Interviewees noted that there is a formal “pre-ETR” meeting to discuss the need for evaluation, especially when there is an initial evaluation. The team will discuss the additional testing needed vs sufficient data available on the planning form</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>In the two records noted above, documentation of attempts to involve the parents (Prior Written Notice or PR-01, Parent Invitation or PR-02, Attempts to Obtain Parent Participation or OP-9) is missing or is very limited.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>It is recommended that the educational agency review and revise its written procedures and practices to include the parent and provide 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>It is recommended that the educational agency review and revise its written procedures and practices that include the parent in the evaluation planning process. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>The educational agency makes attempts to involve the parent in the ETR planning meeting then moves ahead with reevaluations after reasonable attempts to involve the parent, which should be thoroughly documented. This process could be strengthened in the documentation phase by instituting a written, school-wide policy.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>This finding does <u>not</u> need to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
CF-3	<p>34 CFR 300.300 [Parental Consent]</p> <p>Three out of ten, or 30%, of student records reviewed did not provide evidence of parental consent obtained prior to evaluation.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>In the three ETRs that were noted above, the Parent Consent for Evaluation form (PR-05) is missing from the evaluation documentation. There is no explanation in either the Prior Written Notice (PR-01) or the Attempts to Obtain Parent Participation (OP-9).</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>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></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices for obtaining informed parental consent. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>There is an opportunity for Explorers Academy of Science and Technology to strengthen its practices on obtaining written, informed consent for evaluations.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
CF-4	<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>Ten (10) out of ten, or 100%, of evaluations reviewed did not provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>In the review of records, it was noted that several assessments listed on the planning form were not included in Part 1 of the ETR, while in other instances, assessments reported in Part 1 were not listed on the planning form.</p> <p>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>Several records did not indicate observation and/or observation was indicated as “additional testing/data needed” but date and location of the observation were missing.</p> <p>Other areas noted during the review of records were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing the date of the new assessment. • The person responsible for a specific Part 1 was not the person who completed the assessment and Part 1. • Needs and Implications for Instruction were missing. • Questionnaires and checklists were not summarized into language understandable to the parent. 	<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 the Department of written procedures and practices to provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>There is an opportunity for the state support team to provide professional development and technical assistance to support staff with the completion of the Part 1s, especially with identifying educational needs and specific implications for instruction.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
CF-5	<p>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</p> <p>Eight out of ten, or 80%, of evaluations reviewed did not show evidence of clearly stating the summary of assessment results.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>It was noted that the school psychologist is the person who summarizes all Part 1s into Part 2. For Part 1 completion, general education teachers are sent questionnaires from the school psychologists and related service practitioners are left to complete their individual Part 1 and the school psychologist develops the Part 2 Team Summary. (Please note: a high number of selected records were transfer students, and thus the ETRs were completed by neighboring school districts/other community schools).</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>During the review of records, the information from Part 1, in some instances, was entirely omitted from Part 2. Information in Part 1 must be summarized in the 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 the Department of written procedures and practices regarding summary of data and assessment results. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>It is recommended that the Explorers Academy of Science and Technology develop an internal monitoring and review process to ensure compliance with the completion of the Part 2 Summary of Assessment Results so that all areas assessed in a Part 1 Individual Evaluator's Assessment are summarized Part 2.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
CF-6	<p>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</p> <p>Seven out of ten, or 70%, of evaluation team reports reviewed did not contain a clear and succinct description of educational needs.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>Staff noted that they work together as a team to identify the needs in the ETR meetings.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>During the review of records, the information from Part 1, in some instances, was entirely omitted from Part 2. Information in Part 1 must be summarized in the Part 2 in a manner that can be clearly understood by the parent and used by the IEP team to develop actionable 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 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. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
		<p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Explorers Academy of Science and Technology has an opportunity to develop an internal practice to monitor the completion of the Part 2 Summary of Assessment Results so that all areas assessed in a Part 1 Individual Evaluator's Assessment are summarized in the Part 2 summary. This is an opportunity for professional development and/or targeted technical assistance from the State Support Team staff.</p>	
CF-7	<p>34 CFR 300.306(a)(1) [Determination of eligibility] OAC 3301-51-01 (B)(21) [Applicability of requirements and definitions]</p> <p>Three out of ten, or 30%, of 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>Interviews</u></p> <p>Several staff members indicated they were not actively involved in some of the ETR meetings and that they had little say in the assessments' outcomes for their students. ETR team members and parents were sometimes absent during the ETR meetings.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>In the review of records, the three records noted above were missing signatures of some members of the group of qualified professionals, including the parent. There was no explanation as to why these signatures were missing in a PR-01.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>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 with evidence of group participation.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the eligibility determination process to include all required team members. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>It is recommended the Explorers Academy of Science and Technology develop a procedure of checks and balances to ensure all members of the ETR team are in attendance for the entire length of these meetings.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
CF-8	<p>OAC 3301-51-01 (B)(10) [Definitions] and 3301-51-06 [Evaluations]</p> <p>Nine out of ten, or 90%, of evaluations reviewed did not provide a justification for the eligibility determination decision.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency will reconvene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide a clear justification for the eligibility determination.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
	<p><u>Interviews</u> During interviews, the staff indicated they would like additional training to understand how to write a comprehensive eligibility justification statement.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u> In the review of records, it was noted that more than half of the selected ETRs did not explain the specific aspects of the student’s disability and how it affects their access to and progress in the general education curriculum. There was also a trend in the records that if there were two or more suspected disability categories, there was no explanation of how the student was eligible under one category and how they were ineligible for the other suspected disability categories. Finally, it was noted that in a few of the records that suspected Specific Learning Disability as an eligibility category, Part 3 was not completed.</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. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> The educational agency would benefit from professional development by the State Support Team on how to write a compliant justification statement for disability determination.</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	<p>SPP Indicator 13 34 CFR 300.320(b) [Transition services] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(2) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Two out of two, or 100%, of applicable IEPs reviewed did not show evidence that the postsecondary transition plan met all eight required elements of the IDEA for the student:</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 that 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>Interviews</u> Interviews revealed a lack of understanding of the secondary transition process and responsibilities, indicating a need for training and technical assistance in this area. This is the first year that the educational agency has taken on a 9th grade class and they plan to expand in the upcoming years.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u> In the review of records, it was seen across all applicable IEPs that there is a gap in knowledge of how to complete postsecondary transition goals indicating a need for training and technical assistance in this area.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency must reconvene the teams to review and correct the postsecondary transition plan for the IEPs identified as noncompliant.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding its written procedures and practices regarding transition services. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> The educational agency would benefit from postsecondary transition plan writing training from the State Support Team to provide 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 This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
DS-2	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(1) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Nine out of nine, or 100%, of IEPs reviewed did not contain Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLOP) that addressed the needs of the student.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>It was indicated in the interviews that all staff members are open to learning new ways to support students with disabilities both in their classrooms and in partnership with the intervention specialists.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>Record reviews revealed that present levels often lacked clear baseline data that directly reflected the measurement established in the corresponding goals. It was also noted that the present levels were missing a summary of current daily academic/behavior and/or functional performance compared to expected grade-level standards or to expected age-appropriate performance in a third of all records reviewed.</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 <u>grade-level</u> 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 academic assessments, curriculum-based measurements, transition assessments or functional behavior assessments); • Current performance measurement <u>directly</u> relates to the goal measurement. <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>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. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>This is an opportunity for professional development and/or targeted technical assistance from the State Support Team in developing Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLOP) that clearly addresses the needs of the student and clearly states measurable baseline data.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
DS-3	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Seven out of nine, or 78%, of IEPs reviewed did not contain measurable annual goals.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>During the interviews, 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><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>In the review of records, over half of all IEP goals lacked clarity of behaviors expected, condition, and the specific measurements for achievement and mastery of the goals. In many instances, the intended instructional level of the goal was unclear, or multiple skills were written into one goal, which makes it difficult to measure.</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 annual goals to contain the following critical elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly <u>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. <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the development of measurable annual IEP goals. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>An internal monitoring and review system would be very helpful to promote compliance within the annual IEP goals. Development and deployment of, and training in, a district-wide policy for effective IEPs would help provide district wide expectations.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
DS-4	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Three out of nine, or 33%, of IEPs reviewed did not contain annual goals that address the child’s academic area(s) of need.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>During the interviews, it was noted that many of the documents came from neighboring schools and were adopted by Explorers Academy. This led to IEP teams from the other schools identifying the academic needs rather than the team at Explorers Academy.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>It was noted in the review of records that the three IEPs that were marked noncompliant had academic needs identified in the ETR that were not addressed in the IEP or prioritized by the IEP team.</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 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></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of addressing identified academic needs. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Opportunity for professional development and targeted technical assistance in writing compliant measurable annual goals provided by the State Support Team. If academic needs were addressed in the ETR as being an area of concern, they must be addressed in the IEP in some capacity. It can either be addressed as a goal or a statement that indicates the team has prioritized other needs or found that it is not an area of concern at this time.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
DS-5	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education]</p> <p>Two out of nine, or 22%, of IEPs reviewed did not contain annual goals that address the child’s functional area(s) of need.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>In the interviews, it was noted that there are school level practices surrounding functional needs such as social emotional/behavior. This shows that the Explorers Academy holds these needs as an important pillar of the learning environment.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>In the two records that were noted as noncompliant, there were social emotional needs that were identified in the ETR that were</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 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> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>It is recommended that the educational agency review and revise its written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of addressing identified functional needs. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>This finding does <u>not</u> need to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
	not addressed either as a goal nor as an accommodation in the IEP or prioritized in the IEP.	<p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <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. It can either 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.</p>	
DS-6	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e)(i) [Definition of IEP] Seven out of nine, or 78%, of 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>Interviews</u></p> <p>Although most respondents indicated familiarity with the required elements for SDI, there is still a need for further training and technical assistance in this area.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>Review of records indicated that the SDI statement was missing instructional levels and specific skills to describe how the SDI differs from the general education 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 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 the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of determining specially designed instruction. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>It is recommended that professional development in the area of writing compliant SDI be provided by the State Support Team.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
DS-7	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i) [Definition of IEP] Four out of nine, or 44%, of IEPs reviewed did not indicate the specific location where the specially designed instruction will be provided.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>During interviews, staff noted that they were completing the location section as if the services were in-person with no reference to the virtual services that were being provided.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></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 location where the specially designed instruction will be provided.</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 location where specially designed instruction will occur. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
	The records found noncompliant in this area had two different locations listed under one SDI description. To ensure the parent understands the delivery of specially designed instruction (including how much time will be spent in each SDI setting/environment), only one location can be listed for each SDI statement.	<p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Training and technical assistance from SST staff as well as an internal monitoring review system would be very helpful to promote compliance in the area of SDI location.</p>	
DS-8	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>All applicable IEPs reviewed indicated the amount of time and frequency of the specially designed instruction.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> N/A</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-9	<p>34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(v) [Development of IEP] OAC 3301-51-01(B)(3) [Applicability of requirements and definitions]</p> <p>This area was not applicable to the records reviewed.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> N/A</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-10	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(i) [Definition of individualized education] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(g) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>All applicable IEPs reviewed identify accommodations provided to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> N/A</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-11	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>All applicable IEPs reviewed identify modifications to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> N/A</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
DS-12	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e) [Definition of IEP] All applicable IEPs reviewed identify support for school personnel to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> N/A</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-13	<p>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(h)(ii) [Definition of IEP] This area was not applicable to the records reviewed.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> N/A</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-14	<p>OAC 3301-51-07(L)(2) [Development, review and revision of IEP] Nine out of nine, or 100%, of student records reviewed did not show evidence of progress reporting data collected and analyzed to monitor performance on each goal.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u> On the majority of progress notes, there was no evidence of data collected and/or reported on each annual goal through progress reports. Statement from progress notes: “Data could not be collected on this goal/objective due to a change in case management and a new intervention specialist. Data on this goal will be collected and reported in the next progress monitoring period.”</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> None</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding measurable annual goals and services consistent with progress made. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> Professional development and targeted technical assistance from SSTs and an internal monitoring review system would promote compliance in the areas of progress monitoring.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.
DS-15	<p>OAC 3301-51-07(L) [Development, review and revision of IEP] This area was not applicable to the records reviewed.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> N/A</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings	Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be Addressed in CAP
DS-16	<p>34 CFR 300.321(5) [IEP team] OAC 3301-51-07(I) [IEP team]</p> <p>Five out of nine, or 56%, of IEPs reviewed did not indicate that the IEP Team included a group of qualified professionals.</p> <p><u>Interviews</u></p> <p>During interviews, it was reported that parent involvement can be low at meetings.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>For the records that were found noncompliant for this section, the reasons were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Missing signature of district representative who is a required IEP team member -Missing signature of parent (and no reasonable attempts documentation was provided) -Blank signature page for two records 	<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. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Training from State Support Team staff on how to document when an IEP team member is absent as well as an internal monitoring review system would be very helpful to promote compliance in this area.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed 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	<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>Four out of nine, or 44%, of 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>Interviews</u></p> <p>It was noted in the interviews that staff are not familiar with the continuum of placements of students within the educational agency.</p> <p><u>Concerns Noted</u></p> <p>For the records that were found noncompliant for this section, the most common reasons were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The justification did not describe why the student cannot be served in the general education classroom based on individual student needs. --The statement did not match the location listed in Section 7 of the IEP for specially designed instruction. 	<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. The Department will verify 100% compliance in this area through a review of new records that have been written after all the trainings have been completed.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>An internal monitoring and review system would be very helpful to promote compliance in this area. There is an opportunity to improve the continuum of services offered at Explorers Academy of Science and Technology.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>This finding needs to be addressed in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>