

Sample Public School District Special Education Focused Monitoring Report On-site Review

District Code: Sample Public School District (00000)

ISD Code: Sample ISD (00)

Date of Report: _____

On-site Review Date: _____

Focused Monitoring Team:

Name:	Title:
_____	Team Lead
_____	Technical Assistance Provider
_____	ISD Monitor
_____	Team Member

Section 1: Focused Monitoring Priority:

Suspensions and Expulsions by Race/Ethnicity

State Performance Plan:

The State Performance Plan (SPP), as authorized by the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) 2004*, sets the context for focused monitoring. States are required under federal law to evaluate and report on efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of the IDEA. The plan includes evaluating and reporting on specific indicators. As required by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, all locals in the state must meet the federally established rigorous target of zero percent for SPP Indicator 4B.

SPP Indicator 4B - Suspensions and Expulsions by Race or Ethnicity

SPP Indicator 4B is the percent of locals that have:

- (a) A significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with an individualized education program (IEP).
- (b) Policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(§ 300.600(d) and 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22))

Section 2: Selection Criteria:

Michigan identifies locals with 2013-2014 data greater than or equal to the State threshold of 3.6 percent in at least one racial/ethnic group of students with an IEP suspended/expelled out of school for greater than ten days as having a significant discrepancy.

The local must ensure that its policies, procedures, and practices are compliant for students with an IEP who are Black and Two or More Races.

Section 3: Local Hypotheses:

The local's staff hypothesized that the high rate of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for greater than ten days for Black and Two or More Races students with an IEP could be due to:

- Students from children's home have behavior issues
- Changing demographics

Areas of Strength Related to the Focused Monitoring Priority:

During the on-site review, the Office of Special Education (OSE) team identified the following areas of strength for the local:

- District wide positive behavior intervention support program in place
- Discipline procedures for students with disabilities in place

Results of On-site Review:

The following monitoring activities were conducted by the OSE team:

- A review of 8 student records
- Interviews with 8 staff members
- A review of the local's policies, procedures, and practices related to students with IEPs

The on-site review yielded findings of noncompliance.

See the following table for specific information on the finding(s).

Finding(s) of Noncompliance	Evidence	Applicable State & Federal Rules	Required Corrective Action
<p>Finding #1 The local is not in compliance with the IDEA regarding the submission of valid and reliable data.</p>	<p>Two of eight student records lacked a match between the number of out of school suspension days and the number submitted to the Michigan School Data system.</p>	<p>§300.601</p>	<p>The local must review and revise its data collection process to ensure the submission of valid and reliable data.</p> <p>Provide professional development for all relevant staff regarding the new procedures.</p> <p>Evidence of change in the local's practice must be provided and verified by the office of Special Education (OSE).</p>

Finding(s) of Noncompliance	Evidence	Applicable State & Federal Rules	Required Corrective Action
<p>Finding #2 The local is not in compliance with the IDEA regarding IEP development including:</p> <p>Consideration of the use of positive behavioral interventions or other strategies to address behaviors needs.</p>	<p>One of eight student records lacked the consideration of the use of positive behavioral interventions or other strategies to address behaviors needs.</p>	<p>§300.324(a)(2)(1)</p>	<p>The local must revise or develop procedures to ensure that:</p> <p>All IEPs where behavior impedes the learning of the student and others consider the use of positive behavioral interventions or other strategies to address behaviors needs.</p> <p>Provide professional development for all relevant staff regarding the new procedures.</p> <p>Evidence of change in the local's practice must be provided and verified by the office of Special Education (OSE).</p>
<p>Finding #3 The local is not in compliance with the IDEA regarding student discipline including: Developing functional behavior assessments (FBA) and behavior intervention plans (BIPs), as appropriate.</p>	<p>One of eight student records reviewed lacked evidence of FBA and BIP were completed as required.</p>	<p>§300.530(f)(1)(I)</p>	<p>The local must develop discipline procedures to document and ensure:</p> <p>That when appropriate, a FBA and BIP are developed.</p> <p>Provide professional development for all relevant staff regarding the new procedures.</p> <p>Evidence of change in the local's practice must be provided and verified by the office of Special Education (OSE).</p>

Correction of Noncompliance:

The State requires the local to revise all noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices and correct all student level noncompliance. The State will verify that the noncompliant policies, procedures, and practices have been revised and all noncompliance corrected through follow-up review of data, interviews, and other documentation. The noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible.

By June 1, 2015, the local must submit a focused monitoring corrective action plan through the *Continuous Improvement and Monitoring System (CIMS) Workbook*. A progress report must be submitted by October 1, 2015. Technical assistance will be provided by the OSE staff.

As required by § 300.600 through § 300.609, the local needs to correct all areas of noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of notification, including verification. If this deadline is not met it will impact the local's determination and the State will take action to promptly bring the local into compliance; this may include increased state supervision and/or financial sanctions.