

**Sciotoville Community School**  
**IRN: 143644**

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

### **Introduction**

The Ohio the Department of Education's Office for Exceptional Children (OEC) would like to extend appreciation to the Sciotoville Community 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 noncompliant.

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

### **Overview**

The following report is a summary of the onsite review conducted by the Department during the week of November 7, 2022, as part of its general supervision requirements under the IDEA and Am. Sub. H.B.1.

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

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

Onsite reviews are targeted to include the following specific areas:

- Child Find.
- Delivery of Services.
- Least Restrictive Environment.
- IEP Verification of Delivery of Services.
- Parent Input; and
- Teacher, Special Education Service Providers and Administrator Interviews.

### **Data Sources**

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

#### **1. Parent Input**

Sciotoville Community School mailed 72 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 did not receive any parent comments.

## 2. Pre-Onsite Data Analysis

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

## 3. Record Review/IEP Verification

Prior to the onsite visit, the Department consultants reviewed 17 records of school age students with disabilities. The Department consultants selected records of students with disabilities from a variety of disability categories and ages. Seven student records were selected for IEP verification in the classroom setting. During these IEP Verifications, student's goals and services were being carried out as specified within their IEPs.

## 4. Staff/Administrative Interviews

On Tuesday November 8th, the Department consultants held six sessions of interviews with two administrators and 33 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**

Staff could not say enough about how the Special Education Director has been a major positive addition to Sciotoville's administration. His willingness to drop everything and answer questions, review and provide feedback on their drafted IEPs, lend an open ear as well as his open-door policy has been a huge relief and comfort to all special education staff as well as other members of the faculty.

Intervention Specialists play a vital role in Sciotoville's Teacher Based Teams (TBTs). Their insight, suggestions and data regarding students with disabilities play an important role during these meetings.

Sciotoville's staff has laid the foundation for setting high expectations for all students to be successful no matter their age or grade level. This unique and distinctive foundation 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 [Raymond.McCain@education.ohio.gov](mailto:Raymond.McCain@education.ohio.gov) within 30 school days from the date of this report. The Department will review the corrective action plan submitted by the educational agency for approval. If the Department determines that a revision(s) is necessary, the educational agency will be required to revise and resubmit. The educational agency will be contacted by the Department and notified when the action plan has been approved.

***CAP Due Date: February 15, 2023***

### **Department Trainings**

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

***Completion of LMS Training Modules Due Date: February 15, 2023***

### **Individual Correction**

The educational agency has **60 school days** from the date of this summary report to correct all identified findings of noncompliance for individual students whose records were selected and reviewed by the Department during the onsite review unless noted otherwise in the report. Detailed information on individual findings is provided in a separate report.

***Individual Correction Due Date: April 10, 2023***

### **CAP Activities and Systemic Correction**

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

***Completion of CAP Activities and Systemic Correction Due Date: October 20, 2023***

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

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

**The Department's Review Findings and Educational Agency Required Actions**

**Component 1: Child Find**

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

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
CF-1	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.305(a) [Review of Existing evaluation data] and OAC 3301-51-11 (c)(1)(a) [Preschool children eligible for special education]</b></p> <p>Preschool records were not reviewed.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u> NA</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA</p>
CF-2	Record Review	<p><b>OAC 3301-51-06 [Evaluations]</b></p> <p>Four out of 17, or 24%, evaluations reviewed did not appropriately document interventions provided to resolve concerns for the child performing below grade-level standards.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u> 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><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	<p>Teachers stated a need for a refresher course on the Intervention Assistance Team (IAT) process as a whole and another for the types of Tiers I, II and III interventions they can provide to students within the process.</p> <p>Interviews identified an opportunity to strengthen the intervention documentation process for initial and reevaluations.</p>	<p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>District leadership expressed a need to further develop the Multi-Tiered System of Support process across the grade levels. In addition, the identification and use of valid and reliable, targeted interventions at appropriate times is a related area in need of attention.</p>	

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
CF-3	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.501(b) [Parent participation in meetings] and OAC 3301-51-06 (E)(2)(a) [Evaluation procedures].</b></p> <p>One out of 17, or 6%, student records reviewed did not show evidence that the parent was afforded the opportunity to participate in the evaluation team planning meeting.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must provide evidence that the parent was involved or provided the opportunity to participate in the evaluation planning process.</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></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices that include the parent in the evaluation planning process.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
CF-4	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.300 [Parental Consent]</b></p> <p>Five out of 17, or 29%, student records reviewed did not provide evidence of parental consent obtained prior to new testing.</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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
	Concerns Noted	<p>Although attempts are made to obtain parental consent for evaluations involving new testing, this process could be strengthened to ensure documented parent permission through a written, district-wide policy.</p>		

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
			<p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>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> <p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>There is an opportunity for the district to strengthen the policies and practices on obtaining written, informed consent for evaluations.</p>	
CF-5	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.304(c)(4) [Other evaluation procedures]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-01 [Applicability of requirements and definitions] and 3301-51-06 (E)(2)(a) [Evaluation procedures]</b></p> <p>Twelve (12) out of 17, or 71%, 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>Sciotoville must develop an internal monitoring process which contains procedures to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active team participation in the ETR planning process;</li> <li>• Appropriate evaluation data is available; and</li> <li>• Assessments identified on the Planning form are being completed and represented in a Part 1.</li> </ul>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
	Concerns Noted	<p>Record reviews revealed that, in some cases, assessments included on the planning form were not all addressed in Part 1 of the ETR.</p> <p>Questionnaires and checklists provide information for the team; however, they must include the required sections contained in the required Part 1 form, Summary of Assessment Data, Educational Needs, Implications for Instruction.</p>		

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
CF-6	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</b></p> <p>Four out of 17, or 24%, 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><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding summary of data and assessment results.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
CF-7	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</b></p> <p>Eight out of 17, or 47%, evaluation team reports reviewed did not contain a clear and succinct description of educational needs.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency will reconvene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide a clear and succinct description of the student's educational needs. The IEP team must consider the results of this reevaluation.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding description of educational needs.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
	Concerns Noted	<p>Educational needs were sometimes generic in nature and did not address the child's individualized needs.</p> <p>Sometimes Educational Needs were stated in Part 1 but were not included in the Part 2 summary.</p>		
CF-8	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.306(c) [Procedures for determining eligibility and educational need]</b></p> <p>Four out of 17, or 24%, evaluation team reports reviewed did not contain specific implications for instruction.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency will reconvene the ETR teams to conduct a reevaluation and provide a clear description of specific implications for instruction. 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><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>
	Concerns Noted	<p>Records reviewed were missing Implications for Instruction. This would provide the parents with an understanding of where their child is regarding their academic growth.</p> <p>Sometimes Implications for Instruction were stated in Part 1 but were not included in the Part 2 summary.</p>		

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Corrections/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
CF-9	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.306(a)(1) [Determination of eligibility]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-01 (B)(21) [Applicability of requirements and definitions]</b></p> <p>One out of 17, or 6%, 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>
CF-10	Record Review	<p><b>OAC 3301-51-01 (B)(10) [Definitions] and 3301-51-06 [Evaluations]</b></p> <p>Two out of 17, or 12%, 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><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the eligibility determination decision.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>



**Component 2: Delivery of Services**

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

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-1	Record Review	<p><b>SPP Indicator 13</b>  <b>34 CFR 300.320(b) [Transition services]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(2) [Definition of individualized education program]</b></p> <p>Seven out of 10 applicable IEPs reviewed, or 70%, 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"> <li>1. There are appropriate measurable postsecondary goal(s).</li> <li>2. The postsecondary goals are updated annually.</li> <li>3. The postsecondary goals were based on age-appropriate transition assessment (AATA).</li> <li>4. There are transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goal(s).</li> <li>5. The transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goal(s).</li> <li>6. The annual goal(s) are related to the student's transition service needs.</li> <li>7. There is evidence the student was invited to the IEP Team Meeting where transition services were discussed.</li> <li>8. When appropriate, there is evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team Meeting.</li> </ol>	<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>There is a need for all personnel involved with students of transition age to be trained in, and familiar with, the secondary transition process, including responsibilities at every level.</p> <p>Training must be provided to all ETR and IEP members responsible for assessing and writing transition plans to ensure they are compliant and beneficial to the student.</p>	<p><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
	<b>Interviews/Public Comments</b>	Interviews revealed a lack of understanding of the secondary transition process and responsibilities, indicating a need for training and technical assistance in this area.		
	<b>Concerns Noted</b>	Transition Services were sometimes not written as to what the district will provide to the student.  Some of the Postsecondary goals had “would like to,” stated when referencing what the student’s career choice or independent living preference. Postsecondary goals must be written as to what the student WILL be doing.		
<b>DS-2</b>	<b>Record Review</b>	<b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(1) [Definition of individualized education program]</b>  Fifteen (15) out of 17, or 88%, IEPs reviewed did not contain Present Levels of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLOP) that addressed the needs of the student.	<u>Individual Correction</u>  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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• PLOP must relate to the goal measurement</li> <li>• Baseline data provided for developing a measurable goal.</li> </ul> <u>Systemic Correction</u>  The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the review of current academic/functional data when writing IEPs.  <u>Opportunities for Improvement</u>  This is 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, as well as relating to the measurable goals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes  The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	<b>Interviews/Public Comments</b>	There is a lack of understanding across staff members regarding the required contents of the present levels for IEP goals. This points to an opportunity to further deploy and develop already existing training and technical assistance in this area.  Several staff members indicated they use common assessment data to create a current baseline for the Present Levels of Performance. However, these data points are not specific to the deficits described in the goals.		
	<b>Concerns Noted</b>	Record reviews revealed that present levels often lacked clear baseline data that directly reflected the measurement established in the corresponding goals.		

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-3	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education program]</b></p> <p>Three out of 17, or 18%, 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"> <li>1. Clearly <u>defined behavior</u>: the specific action the child will be expected to perform.</li> <li>2. The <u>condition</u> (situation, setting or given material) under which the behavior is to be performed.</li> <li>3. <u>Performance criteria</u> desired: the level the child must demonstrate for mastery <b>and</b> the number of times the child must demonstrate the skill or behavior.</li> </ol> <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><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
DS-4	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education program]</b></p> <p>Three out of 16, or 19%, IEPs reviewed did not contain annual goals that address the child's academic 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 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.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-5	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(2)(i) [Definition of individualized education]</b></p> <p>One out of 8 applicable IEPs reviewed, or 13%, 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"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
DS-6	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) [Definition of individualized education program]</b> <b>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e)(i) [Definition of IEP]</b></p> <p>Thirteen (13) out of 17, or 76%, IEPs reviewed did not contain a statement of specially designed instruction including related services 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><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>With the development of a universal tracking system for SDI, the school will be ensuring their students are receiving all the time and frequency stated within section 7 of their IEP.</p> <p>Sciotoville will need to review and possibly revise their Intervention/Enrichment programs, researching a more appropriate scheduling or create a new process so student's SDIs can be provided and delivered in a beneficial and successful manner.</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>Intervention specialists stated that they do not have a good grasp on the concept of specially designed instruction (SDI).</p> <p>Staff members indicated a need for a universal tracking system for SDI.</p> <p>SDI minutes are provided by more than one intervention specialist to several students with disabilities at the same time and in the same room. This seems to hinder the delivery of SDI, as students could not focus due to noise and distractions in the room.</p>		
	Concerns Noted	<p>In some cases, the specially designed instruction was generic in nature and not individualized to the needs of the student described in the present levels and goals. Other examples lacked specific instructional reference and only listed accommodations or instructional settings.</p>		

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-7	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) [Definition of individualized education program]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i) [Definition of IEP]</b></p> <p>Three out of 17, or 18%, 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> <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>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
DS-8	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(7) [Definition of individualized education program]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(i) [Definition of IEP]</b></p> <p>Two out of 17, or 12%, IEPs reviewed did not indicate the amount of time and frequency of the specially designed instruction.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review and amend the amount of time and frequency of the specially designed instruction.</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding the IEP process of determining the amount and frequency of specially designed instruction to be provided.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>The educational agency does <u>not</u> need to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
DS-9	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.324(a)(2)(v) [Development of IEP]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-01(B)(3) [Applicability of requirements and definitions]</b></p> <p>All applicable IEPs reviewed identified 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>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA</p>

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-10	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(6)(i) [Definition of individualized education]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(g) [Definition of IEP]</b></p> <p>Ten (10) out of 16, or 63%, 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></p> <p>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>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <p>The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.</p>
	Interviews/Public Comments	<p>The need for and use of accommodations was misunderstood by some staff members, indicating a need for training and technical support in this area.</p>	<p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding accommodations.</p>	
	Concerns Noted	<p>In other records, explanations for accommodations were presented in vague terms that did not specify the extent of the accommodations (“adult supports,” “behavior charts,” “fading prompts,” “behavior intervention,” “positive supports”). These items should be explained. Not doing so may prevent the student from receiving needed accommodations due to a lack of communication. The conditions for and the extent of student accommodations must always be clear, specific and transferable to another district.</p>	<p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u></p> <p>Training from SSTs as well as an internal monitoring review system would be very helpful to promote compliance in the areas of accommodations.</p>	
DS-11	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) [Definition of individualized education program]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e) [Definition of IEP]</b></p> <p>One out of 10 applicable IEPs reviewed, or 10%, 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></p> <p>The educational agency must reconvene the teams of the IEPs identified as noncompliant to review the modifications that would alter the amount or complexity of grade-level materials and would enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum and include them in the IEP</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>The educational agency must submit evidence to the Department of written procedures and practices regarding modifications.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <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
DS-12	Record Review	<p><b>34 CFR 300.320(a)(4) [Definition of individualized education program]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(e) [Definition of IEP]</b></p> <p>All applicable IEPs reviewed identified supports for school personnel to enable the child to be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u>  NA  <u>Systemic Correction</u>  NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-13	Record Review	<p><b>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(h)(ii) [Definition of IEP]</b></p> <p>There were no student records reviewed who are taking the alternat assessment.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u>  NA  <u>Systemic Correction</u>  NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-14	Record Review	<p><b>OAC 3301-51-07(L)(2) [Development, review and revision of IEP]</b></p> <p>Eleven (11) out of 17, or 65%, 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>  None  <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.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes The educational agency needs to address this finding in a Corrective Action Plan.
	Concerns Noted	<p>Even though progress was being gathered and reported, it must be recorded using the same performance criteria defined in the annual measurable goal. Progress reports on annual measurable goals must be provided to parents of a child with a disability at least as often as report cards are issued to all children. If the district provides interim reports to all children, progress reports must be provided to all parents of a child with a disability.</p>	<p><u>Opportunities for Improvement</u>  Training from SSTs as well as an internal monitoring review system would be very helpful to promote compliance in the areas of progress monitoring.</p>	

Record Review Item	Evidence of Findings		Evidence of Correction/Recommendations	Must be addressed in CAP
DS-15	Record Review	<p><b><i>OAC 3301-51-07(L) [Development, review and revision of IEP]</i></b></p> <p>All applicable IEPs reviewed showed evidence that revisions were made based on data indicating changes in student needs or abilities.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
DS-16	Record Review	<p><b><i>34 CFR 300.321(5) [IEP team]</i></b>  <b><i>OAC 3301-51-07(I) [IEP team]</i></b></p> <p>All IEPs reviewed indicated that the IEP Team included a group of qualified professionals.</p>	<p><u>Individual Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p> <p><u>Systemic Correction</u></p> <p>NA</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA



### 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><b>34 CFR 300.114 [LRE requirements] and 300.320(a)(5) [Definition of individualized education program]</b>  <b>OAC 3301-51-07 (H)(1)(f) [Definition of individualized education program]</b></p> <p>Three out of 16, or 19%, 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"> <li>• Be based on the needs of the child, not the disability.</li> <li>• Reflect that the team has given adequate consideration to meeting the student’s needs in the general classroom with supplementary aids and services.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Describe potential harmful effects to the child or others, if applicable.</li> </ul> <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><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>

### **Additional Considerations and Opportunities for Improvement:**

- Based upon interviews and discussions with staff members, Sciotoville needs to redefine/refresh their Response to Intervention/Multi-Tiered System of Support (RTI/MTSS) process so that every staff member knows exactly what is expected of them, how the entire process is carried out (Tiers I, II and III), as well as exactly what interventions and data collection information is available for them to use. If a formal document delineating processes and procedures for RTI/MTSS does not exist, the district will need to create one for staff members to refer to after training. Also, Sciotoville needs to research and select researched-based interventions along with decision rules for all tiered interventions including academic and behavior concerns.
- Sciotoville should highly consider developing and implementing a formal process of tracking specially designed instruction (SDI) to ensure Free Appropriate Public Education [OAC 3301-51-07 (K)].
- Sciotoville would benefit from developing a new teacher onboarding process geared toward any new staff member hired regarding their Special Education Policies, Procedures and Practices.
- The continuum of alternative placements did not appear to be available across all grade levels and settings. Sciotoville will need to revise and add to their continuum of alternative placements, under rule 3301-51-09 Delivery of Services (C), to ensure that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related services.
- Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS): The need for behavior supports was a prominent topic in interviews with all staff. District administration stated their awareness of the need for professional development in this area and have mentioned embracing PBIS. Interviews with staff have revealed a supportive culture and general readiness for fine-tuning these supports on a district-wide level.
- Sciotoville has a large number of paraprofessionals who carry out a multitude of tasks throughout the school day. During interviews, staff were not aware of who oversaw those paraprofessionals, how they were assigned to specific tasks as well as who provides them with trainings and professional development. From the interview sessions, it seemed to be the consensus there could be a better way to utilize the paraprofessionals so that their talents could be better suited to meet the special needs of the students.