

**Mason Run High School
IRN: 012037****Ohio the Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children
2019-2020 IDEA Monitoring Review Summary Report****Introduction**

The Ohio the Department of Education's Office for Exceptional Children would like to extend appreciation to the Mason Run High School 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 non-compliant.

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 review conducted by the Department on October 13-15, 2020 as part of its general supervision requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and Am. Sub. H.B.1.

During the 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. Public Parent Meeting and Written Comments

Mason Run High School mailed 45 the Department approved letters to all families with students with disabilities in the educational agency. The Department provided the educational agency with a public meeting announcement to post on the district website. Public parent meeting dates for all educational agencies selected for onsite reviews are also posted on the Department website.

On October 15, 2020, the Department consultants held a public meeting for parents and other interested parties. There were no parents or family members in attendance. There was one State Support Team

(SST) Region 11 representative attended the public meeting. Attendees could speak to the Department representatives publicly in the meeting, speak to the Department representatives individually, provide written comments or both. No attendees made comments during the public meeting. Written comment forms were available before, during and after the meeting. The Department did not receive any written comments.

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

2. Pre-Onsite Data Analysis

The Department conducted a comprehensive review which included district, building and grade level data; Special Education Performance 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 10 records of school age students with disabilities. The Department consultants selected records of students with disabilities from a variety of disability categories and ages.

4. Staff/Administrative Interviews

On October 13-15, 2020, the Department consultants held five sessions of interviews with two administrators and nine 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.

Strengths/Commendations:

- It was evident that staff at Mason Run High School are extremely passionate, caring and dedicated not only to students with disabilities, but the entire student body. Staff are willing to accommodate all students through individualized instruction and meet students where they are at academically, socially and emotionally.
- There is a positive relationship between staff members (administrators, general education teachers, intervention specialists) at Mason Run High School. They all work collaboratively to meet individual student needs.
- Mason Run High School does a thorough job of preparing students for life after high school. Every student that enrolls creates an Ohio Means Jobs backpack, a career profile and a career plan. Mason Run High School also provides training in the areas of interview skills, resume writing and financial literacy.

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 katelynn.crow@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: **March 9, 2021***

Department Trainings

As part of the Department monitoring process, Mason Run High School personnel, as identified by the Department, are required to complete the Special Education Essentials 2019-2020 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 a 75% or more on each quiz. Participants who do not achieve at least 75% will be contacted by the State Support Team (SST) for additional training.

*Completion of LMS Training Modules Due Date: **March 9, 2021***

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 are provided in a separate report.

*Individual Correction Due Date: **April 28, 2021***

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: **October 20, 2021***

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

For questions regarding the review, please contact: Katelynn Crow, the Department's IDEA Monitoring Contact, at 614-582-5460, toll-free at (877) 644-6338, or by e-mail at katelynn.crow@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	Record Review	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA	
	Interviews/Public Comments			<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>
	Concerns Noted			<p>Preschool records were not reviewed.</p>
CF-2	Record Review	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> 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> 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><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u> Mason Run High School would benefit from creating and implementing a formal school wide RTI process. All members of Mason Run High School should be trained on the correct implementation of the RTI process along with monitoring from administration to provide any technical assistance that is needed.</p> <p>It is recommended that Mason Run High School 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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.	
	Interviews/Public Comments			<p>OAC 3301-51-06 [Evaluations]</p> <p>Seven (7) out of eight (8), or 88% of applicable evaluations reviewed did not appropriately document interventions provided to resolve concerns for the child performing below grade-level standards.</p> <p>Staff members identified a concern that the school lacked a formal Response to Intervention (RTI) process. They noted that interventions, as well as accommodations and modifications, are provided for all students in order to meet individual needs.</p>
	Concerns Noted			<p>There did not appear to be a uniform process for documenting interventions and including them in the evaluation. It also did not appear that there was a standard process for initiating interventions and making referrals for evaluation.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
CF-3	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.501(b) [Parent participation in meetings] and OAC 3301-51-06 (E)(2)(a) [Evaluation procedures].</p> <p>One (1) out of 10, or 10% of 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> The educational agency must provide evidence that the parent was involved or provided the opportunity to participate in the evaluation planning process.</p> <p>The evidence may include evaluation planning form, prior written notice, parent invitation, referral form or communication log.</p> <p>If the educational agency cannot provide documentation that the parent was involved or provided the opportunity to participate in the evaluation planning process, the educational agency must conduct a reevaluation planning meeting with the parent.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices that include the parent in the evaluation planning process.</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			
	Concerns Noted			
CF-4	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.300 [Parental Consent]</p> <p>Two (2) out of 10, or 20% of student records reviewed did not provide evidence of parental consent obtained prior to new testing.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> 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> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices for obtaining parental consent obtained prior to new testing or policies and practices for moving forward when parents will not participate.</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			
	Concerns Noted			

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
CF-5	Record Review	<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>Eight (8) out of 10, or 80% of evaluations reviewed did not provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency will convene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide evidence that the evaluation addresses all areas related to the suspected disability.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to 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></p> <p>Mason Run should develop an internal monitoring process which contains procedures to ensure that assessments identified on the planning form are being completed and represented in a Part 1 Individual Evaluator’s Assessment.</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>Many staff members stated that they had been asked to complete a Part 1 Individual Evaluator’s Assessment for an ETR but had not received formal training on how to correctly complete this area.</p>		
	Concerns Noted	<p>In several cases, assessments included on the planning form were not presented in Part 1 of the ETR. All assessments and data listed for evaluation on the planning form, and agreed upon by the parent, must appear- in some form- in a Part 1 Individual Evaluator’s Assessment.</p> <p>Additionally, Part 1 forms used by Mason Run were often checklists that were missing either the summary, needs or implications section.</p>		
CF-6	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</p> <p>Nine (9) out of 10, or 90% of 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</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
	Interviews/Public Comments	Staff members stated that after they completed a Part 1 Individual Evaluator's Assessment, they gave them to the school psychologist who would generate the team summary based on the provided information.	<u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding summary of data and assessment results.	Corrective Action Plan.
	Concerns Noted	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.		
CF-7	Record Review	<i>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</i> Four (4) out of 10, or 40% of evaluation team reports reviewed did not contain a clear and succinct description of educational needs.	<u>Individual Correction</u> 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. <u>Systemic Correction</u> The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding description of educational needs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted	In several cases, educational needs were stated in Part 1, but were not included in the Part 2 summary. Educational needs should be written in a way that allows them to be used by the IEP team to develop meaningful goals and services.		
CF-8	Record Review	<i>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</i>	<u>Individual Correction</u> The educational agency will reconvene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide a clear description of	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
		Four (4) out of 10, or 40% of evaluation team reports reviewed did not contain specific implications for instruction.	<p>specific implications for instruction. 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 implications for instruction.</p>	<p>agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted	In several cases, implications for instruction were stated in Part 1, but were not included in the Part 2 summary.		
CF-9	Record Review	<p><i>34 CFR 300.306(a)(1) [Determination of eligibility]</i> <i>OAC 3301-51-01 (B)(21) [Applicability of requirements and definitions]</i></p> <p>Two (2) out of 10, or 20% 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>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 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.</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>
		Interviews/Public Comments		
		Concerns Noted		

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>Record Review</p> <p><i>SPP Indicator 13</i> <i>34 CFR 300.320(b) [Transition services]</i> <i>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(2) [Definition of individualized education program]</i></p> <p>Eight (8) out of 10, or 80% of IEPs reviewed 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 a 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>An internal monitoring and review system would be helpful to ensure that transition plans are not missing essential components.</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
	Interviews/Public Comments	During interviews, staff members seemed to be knowledgeable and proactive regarding post-secondary transition programming. This, however, did not translate into all student records.		
	Concerns Noted	In some cases, information was completely omitted. In many cases, the IEP goal related to the transition service was left blank. Additionally, transition services are not what the student will do, but what the school will provide to the student.		
DS-2	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(1) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Ten (10) out of 10, 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>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the IEP teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the PLOP related to each goal to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of current daily academic/ behavior and/ or functional performance (strengths and needs) compared to expected grade level standards in order to provide a frame of reference; • PLOP must relate to the goal measurement • Baseline data provided for developing a measurable goal. 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments	Several staff members indicated that they use data from MAP testing and APEX in order to create a current baseline for the Present Levels of Performance.	<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.</p>	
	Concerns Noted	The present levels of performance in the IEPs reviewed were inconsistent in quality and content. Often, the present levels of performance did not relate directly to the annual goal and a comparison to grade level standards was missing.	<p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>An internal monitoring and review system would be helpful to promote compliance in present level of performance. There is also an opportunity for professional development and/or targeted technical assistance in developing Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLOP) that clearly address the needs of the student.</p>	

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-3	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>Four (4) out of 10, or 40% of IEPs reviewed did not contain measurable annual goals.</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.</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>There is an opportunity for professional development and/or targeted technical assistance in developing measurable annual goals that contain all elements. An internal monitoring and review system would be helpful to promote compliance in measurable annual IEP goals.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments	<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>		
	Concerns Noted	<p>Measurable goals in the IEPs reviewed were inconsistent in quality and content. Often, one or more required elements were missing. Some goals listed multiple behaviors within the same goal.</p>		
DS-4	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education program]</p> <p>All IEPs reviewed contain annual goals that address the child's academic area(s) of need.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted			

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-5	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education]</p> <p>Four (4) out of 10, or 40% of IEPs reviewed did not contain annual goals that address the child's functional area(s) of need.</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>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of addressing identified functional needs.</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 members stated that often behavior needs that had been seen previously in other settings, are not seen at Mason Run High School.</p>		
	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. It can either be addressed as a goal, a related service, an accommodation 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	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>Two (2) out of 10, or 20% of IEPs reviewed did not contain a statement of specially designed instruction that addresses the individual needs of the child and supports the annual goals.</p>	<p><u>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.</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>
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted			

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
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]</p> <p>One (1) out of 10, or 10% of IEPs reviewed did not indicate the specific location where the specially designed instruction will be provided.</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>	<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>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>	
	Concerns Noted			
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>One (1) out of 10, or 10% of 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>	<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>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>	
	Concerns Noted			
DS-9	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) [Definition of individualized education program] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>Two (2) out of two (2), or 100% of applicable IEPs reviewed did not identify related services that address the needs of the child and support the annual goals.</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 to include related services that were identified as needed in the IEP.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments		<p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of addressing identified related service needs.</p>	
	Concerns Noted	Related services were not well defined or were totally omitted.		

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-10	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) [Definition of individualized education] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>One (1) out of two (2), or 50% of applicable IEPs reviewed did not indicate the location where the related services will be provided.</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 to include the location where the related services will be provided.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments		<p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of determining the location where related services will occur.</p>	
	Concerns Noted	The location in which the related services will be provided was omitted.		
DS-11	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>One (1) out of two (2), or 50% of applicable IEPs reviewed did not indicate the amount of time, duration and frequency of the related services to be provided.</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 on the IEP the amount of time and frequency of the related services to be provided.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments		<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 related services to be provided.</p>	
	Concerns Noted	The time, duration and frequency of related services was omitted.		
DS-12	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>There were no applicable IEPs reviewed regarding identifying 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>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted			

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-13	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(i) [Definition of individualized education] OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(g) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>Eight (8) out of 10, or 80% of 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> There is an opportunity for professional development and/or targeted technical assistance in identifying accommodations. An internal monitoring and review system would be helpful to promote compliance in the area of accommodations.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments	<p>Staff members stated that all students at Mason Run High School are provided with some type of accommodation to help meet their individual needs.</p>		
	Concerns Noted	<p>IEP accommodations listed were not explained regarding conditions and extent of the accommodation. The phrase “as needed” is not acceptable in describing accommodations.</p>		
DS-14	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>Three (3) out of three (3), or 100% of applicable IEPs reviewed 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> This area is an opportunity for professional development and/or targeted technical assistance to address the content that students are expected to learn where amount or complexity of materials are altered from grade level curriculum expectations. When an instructional or curriculum modification is made, either the specific subject matter is altered, or the performance expected of the student is changed.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted	<p>The extent of and conditions for modifications must be specific and clearly explained. Refer to the current level of instruction, reading level, or pace of instruction.</p>		

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-15	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>There were no applicable IEPs reviewed regarding supports for school personnel to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted			
DS-16	Record Review	<p>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(h)(ii) [Definition of IEP]</p> <p>There were no applicable student records reviewed regarding 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></p> <p>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted			
DS-17	Record Review	<p>OAC 3301-51-07(L)(2) [Development, review and revision of IEP]</p> <p>Six (6) out of seven (7), or 86% of applicable student records reviewed 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>Mason Run High School would benefit from developing a procedure to ensure progress reporting is correctly documented, stating how the student is progressing towards mastering their measurable annual goals. Training from SSTs as well as an internal monitoring review system would be helpful to promote compliance in the area of progress monitoring.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted	<p>In some cases, progress monitoring reports/documents were not submitted and/or the evidence was vague in description. Additionally, progress must be recorded using the same performance criteria defined in the annual measurable goal.</p>		

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-18	Record Review	<p>OAC 3301-51-07(L) [Development, review and revision of IEP]</p> <p>One (1) out of one (1), or 100% of applicable IEPs reviewed 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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments			
	Concerns Noted	Progress reports indicated that the student had met a measurable annual goal. In this case, the IEP should have been reviewed and amended.		
DS-19	Record Review	<p>34 CFR 300.321(5) [IEP team] OAC 3301-51-07(I) [IEP team]</p> <p>Five (5) out of 10, or 50% of 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 documentation that the parent was informed prior to the IEP meeting that the person qualified to interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results would not participate in the meeting, and • Provide a written excuse signed by the parents and the educational agency that allowed the person qualified to interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results not to be in attendance at the IEP meeting, or • Reconvene the IEP team to review the IEP with all required members present. <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 people qualified to interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results in the IEP process</p> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>It is recommended that Mason Run High School develop a procedure of checks and balances to ensure all members of the IEP team are in attendance for IEP meetings.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Interviews/Public Comments	Staff members described efforts to communicate with parents and involve them in their child's educational process whenever possible.		
	Concerns Noted	In some cases, the signatures of the parent or student were missing.		

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>Ten (10) out of 10, or 100% 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>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> There is an opportunity for professional development and/or targeted technical assistance in developing LRE statements that explain the extent to which the child will not participate with nondisabled children in the general education classroom. An internal monitoring and review system would be helpful to promote compliance in LRE.</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>Staff members described limited placement choices across the continuum of alternative settings.</p>		
	Concerns Noted	<p>LRE statements were vague and did not explain why the instruction and services could not be delivered in the general education setting.</p>		