

Special Education Program Compliance Review

Final Report

June 23, 2015

Lakeville Public School District (0194-01)

Dr. Lisa L Snyder, Superintendent

Renae Ouillette, Director of Special Education

Table of Contents

Introduction and Authority	3
Scope of Monitoring	3
Resulting Findings and Corrective Action.....	3
Monitoring Findings by Area	4
Finding Area 1: Governance	4
Finding Area 2: Facilities and Environment	10
Finding Area 3: Child Find and Evaluation	11
Finding Area 4: IEP and IFSP Process and Implementation	13
Summary of Corrective Action Required.....	16
Appendix	17
Acronyms.....	17
Individual Student Record Noncompliance.....	18
Complaint Decisions	18
Interviews and Surveys	18
Federal Instructional Settings by Disability	19
Race/Ethnicity by Disability	20
Age by Disability	21

Introduction and Authority

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE), as the state educational agency, is required by federal law to monitor the education of children with disabilities pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). 20 U.S.C. § 1412(a)(11); 34 C.F.R. § 300.600. In addition, state law requires that every school district ensure all students with disabilities are provided the special instruction and services appropriate to their needs. Minn. Stat. § 125A.08(b)(1). Each local educational agency (LEA) within the state, including educational programs administered by any public agency, is under the general supervision of MDE. In order to evaluate special education programs, MDE staff has the authority to review all relevant information necessary to carry out the department's oversight responsibilities.

Scope of Monitoring

One or more monitors from MDE's Division of Compliance and Assistance conducted a full compliance review of the special education program of Lakeville Public School District (0194-01). The monitoring process included a review of:

- The district's total special education system (TSES) plan and restrictive procedures plans (RPPs).
- Seven district sites where special education services are provided
- Interview responses from the special education director, general education administrators, special education teachers and paraprofessionals, related services personnel, and general education teachers
- Previous monitoring and self-review reports
- Formal complaint history
- 13 Part B (students ages 3 – 21) and 7 Part C (children from birth to age 3) student records

Resulting Findings and Corrective Action

The following report identifies individual student record noncompliance, findings of systemic noncompliance, and corrective action requirements. Findings of systemic noncompliance are identified based on an analysis of compliance data collected from the sources listed above. If an area is identified as a finding of systemic noncompliance, the district is required to develop and implement a corrective action plan (CAP) to address each finding within one year of the date of this report.

Individual student record noncompliance occurs when a student file is cited for violation of any state or federal special education law. Citations of individual student files must be corrected by the district and verified by MDE by March 1, 2016. If individual student noncompliance is identified for correction, tracking is completed through the Minnesota Continuous Improvement Process: Self Review (MNCIMP:SR) system.

Monitoring Findings by Area

Finding Area 1: Governance

Topic Area: TSES

Each administrative unit is required to have a comprehensive, district specific TSES Plan for providing special education instruction and related services.

The TSES, submitted by Lakeville Public Schools, was recently updated to follow the template provided by MDE and submitted in September of 2014. The document contained all required components; however, MDE posted updated guidance for the TSES in January 2015.

Concern: Since the review of this document, MDE has posted an updated version of the TSES template on January 26, 2015. The district should revisit this document at least annually to ensure that the plan is up to date and incorporates the most current statutory information.

Topic Area: Restrictive Procedures Plan (RPP)

The district has a restrictive procedures plan that meets the requirements of Minn. Stat. §125A.0942. The district's restrictive procedures plan includes identification of procedures used by the district, documentation and review procedures, building oversight committee information, staff training and personnel development activities,

Topic Area: Staffing

The district employs an executive director of student services and special education, a director of special education, a lead teacher at Lakeville South High School, a lead teacher at Lakeville North High School who is also employed as an alternative learning center and crisis prevention institute instructor, a middle school lead teacher who also is employed as the continuous improvement monitoring process coordinator for the district, two elementary lead teachers, (one who is also employed as the special education professional development coordinator), an early childhood special education lead teacher and a technology support specialist.

The district also employs 111 special education teachers, 166 special education paraprofessionals, 18 speech-language pathologists, 8.5 occupational therapists, school psychologists, a social worker, teachers who provide Developmental Adapted Physical Education (DAPE), assistive technology services, and counseling services. The district contracts services for physical therapy, audiology, vision, and hearing impairments through Intermediate District 917. The district also provides licensed school nurses, early identification and assessment staff, a Part C service coordinator, and a Braille specialist.

Twenty-five percent of general education teachers and paraprofessionals reported concerns regarding the delivery of special education services or support when special education teaching or paraprofessional staff are absent. Concerns raised included undelivered services and inadequate or poorly-trained substitute staff, particularly regarding students' behavioral needs.

When special education teachers are absent, the sub-call system is utilized to request substitute teachers. If there is an insufficient supply of substitute teachers available, the district has a

priority system whereby program teachers (DCD, EBD, ASD, for example) receive substitutes before resource room-based special education teachers. When there are long term absences, they are posted and the jobs are filled by candidates licensed in special education whenever possible.

With regard to related service providers, substitutes are not provided for short-term absences of psychologists, occupational therapists, and speech therapists, but providers are expected to make up missed service time. Because DAPE teachers often also serve as general education teachers, substitutes are provided in their absences. Long term absences are posted and the jobs are filled by licensed candidates whenever possible. If a licensed candidate cannot be recruited, the district has several contracted service agencies it utilizes for coverage.

When paraprofessionals are absent, the sub-call system is used to report absences. All positions are expected to be filled, but priority is given to paraprofessionals assigned to high needs programs/students. If a position cannot be filled, existing paraprofessionals and their supervising teachers have plans for how to ensure adequate coverage for students. Long term absences are posted and filled as needed. The district has a pool of substitute paraprofessionals it can access.

Topic Area: Training

The district offers the necessary training, support, and resources to provide services to students. In the past two years, district staff participated in the following professional development activities or training:

- Restrictive Procedures, Confidentiality, Mandated Reporting, Para Responsibilities, Para Do's and Don'ts – provided to paraprofessional staff.
- Due Process Procedures and District "Toolbox" for required special education documentation – provided to special education teachers and related service providers
- English Learners and Special Education – provided to ESL teachers, special education teachers, and related services staff
- Crisis Prevention and Intervention (including review of restrictive procedures plan) Multiple opportunities throughout the year – provided to special education teachers, related services staff and paraprofessionals
- AIMSweb data collection and progress monitoring – provided to special education teachers
- IEP 101: Foundations for Writing a Good IEP– provided to special education teachers and related services staff
- Writing Standards-based IEPs – provided to special education teachers and related services staff
- Understanding ASD: What General Education Teachers Need to Know – provided to general education staff

- Overview of Mental Health Conditions and Warning Signs – provided to general education staff
- Using Digital Devices as Assistive Technology – provided to special education teachers and related services staff
- FastForWord Training - provided to special education teachers
- Vizzle Training – provided to special education teachers
- Unique Software Training– provided to DCD teachers
- Introduction to Schoology – provided to all special education staff (licensed and non-licensed)
- Read 180/System 44 Training – provided to special education teachers
- Math 180 Training – provided to all special education teachers
- PREPaRE Curriculum Training – provided to student support staff (psychologists, social workers, nurses)
- Winning Strategies: Annual Paraprofessional Conference– provided to paraprofessionals
- Conscious Discipline-provided to licensed staff
- Trauma Informed Care-provided to licensed staff
- Confidentiality procedures

While 90% of licensed special education providers report the training they receive through the district ensures they are adequately prepared to provide services to students receiving special education, only 49% of general education teachers agree. Over half of general education respondents indicated that no training has been provided by the district to assist them in order to adequately provide services to students with special needs. Other general education teachers reported that the training they had received was very general and did not address specific concerns such as working more effectively with students identified as having mental health needs or EBD.

Only 41% of paraprofessionals agree that the training they receive through the district ensures they are adequately prepared to provide services to students receiving special education. Fifty-nine percent expressed a desire for more disability specific training or training regarding students' mental health issues.

Eighty-nine percent of special education teachers and related service providers report they receive training for assistive technology or services required by a student's IEP as appropriate; while 60% of general education teachers agreed that they receive the necessary training on assistive device or service being considered for use with students. Overall, stakeholder staff reported the need for more awareness and training regarding assistive technology.

Only 41% of paraprofessionals indicated that they have received adequate training in the use of assistive technology. Specific concerns shared by paraprofessionals included that the training

offered in the past did not address specific students' needs and that there exists a need to have more formal training offered on the use of assistive technology.

A majority of the staff reporting the use of restrictive procedures have received relevant training during the past two years.

Principals are updated on district special education policies and procedures by the director of special education and by the executive director of student services and special education at monthly administrative meetings. All administrators receive a weekly administrative update that includes a special education section. Principals are invited to the monthly building level special education meetings facilitated by the lead teachers. Emails and calls from principals and deans reportedly are responded to in a timely manner by the director and by the executive director.

General education teachers are informed about special education policies and procedures by their assigned lead teacher through emails or at staff meetings. Information is also shared in Problem-Solving Team meetings and Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings at each school as issues and questions arise.

Special education teachers and related service providers meet monthly with their lead teacher to review policies and procedures. The district hosts an annual special education summer institute in which the director of special education and the executive director of student services provide updates on federal, state, and local policies and procedures. The district also has a website for special education that contains information regarding policies, procedures, and available forms. In 2014-15, the district launched a Schoology site for all special education staff that contains forms, tutorials, website links, and other helpful tools. Special education staff has access to an email conference where information is regularly shared. Speech therapists, occupational therapists, and psychologists have monthly department meetings to discuss relevant topics including various policies and procedures. These groups also have email conferences in which they can communicate on a daily basis.

Paraprofessionals in most of the district's schools meet monthly with a school administrator (dean or principal) to review policies and procedures. Several of the district's schools also pay paraprofessionals to come to the school in late summer to review expectations students' IEPs. Information is also shared on the paraprofessional email conference and through communications with special education teachers and lead teachers. Paraprofessionals assigned to specific programs meet with their supervising teachers weekly when possible and monthly before or after school as additional paid time. Paraprofessionals also have access to the special education website and the district will be developing a Schoology site for them that includes resources and information pertinent to their roles.

Contracted services staff members have district email accounts and access to various email conferences depending on their roles. Contracted employees are invited to attend building staff meetings and monthly special education meetings and are given copies of the special education "toolbox" and other resources used by licensed staff. Contracted licensed employees have access to the district special education website and to the Schoology page and can contact the lead teachers and the director of special education with questions or concerns via email or phone.

School level clerical staff members receive information about special education policies and procedures through quarterly meetings and regular communication with the special education lead teacher. The district continuous improvement monitoring process coordinator also meets with the special education clerical staff individually to review due process requirements. At the district office, clerical staff members meet weekly with the director and executive director to review practices and processes. Administrative assistants attend statewide trainings as appropriate (MARSS, MASBO, TIES, Infinite Campus, DHS/MDE Third Party Billing) and also have opportunities to meet with their colleagues in Dakota County to discuss pertinent issues and concerns.

Lakeville conducts a review of student records to ensure compliance. Regular staff orientation days (at the start of the school year or upon employment) and district wide staff development trainings are scheduled to share information regarding district special education policies and procedures. Teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators also communicate issues or updates regarding special education in person with relevant staff during the school day, via email, information contained in the due process manual, at department and building meetings, and on the district website as necessary.

Finding: The district must develop and implement a CAP to ensure that before or immediately upon employment, each paraprofessional develops sufficient knowledge and skills to begin meeting the needs of the students with whom the paraprofessional works. The CAP must also be designed to ensure that annual training opportunities are available to enable the paraprofessional to continue to further develop the knowledge and skills that are specific to the students with whom the paraprofessional works, including understanding disabilities, following lesson plans, and implementing follow-up instructional procedures and activities. Minn. Stat. § 125A.08(c).

Topic Area: SEAC

The most recent SEAC meeting was held on May 14, 2015. According to the director the SEAC meets monthly throughout the school year. Funds are raised for several projects including recognizing outstanding inclusive educators during inclusive schools week in December of each year. Funds raised are also used to send students with disabilities to summer camps.

Topic Area: Service Delivery, Teaching Models, and Collaboration

As reported by special education teachers and related service providers, the district uses a variety of instructional models to ensure appropriate instruction to students, including the following:

- Pull-out direct services provided by a licensed special education provider in the special education setting
- Push-in direct services provided by a licensed special education provider in the general education setting
- Co-teaching by general and special education teachers in the general education setting

- Resource room support that may include academic or behavioral remediation, assistance with assignments, and organization from special education staff in the special education setting
- Indirect services provided in the general education setting that may include progress reviews, cooperative planning, consultation, modification of the environment, curriculum, or materials, and direct contact with the student to monitor and observe student progress
- Itinerant instruction
- Homebound instruction
- Instruction in a hospital or other care and treatment facility
- Special education services provided in daycare settings

Eighty-eight percent of general education teachers reported there are no limitations to the methods of instruction available to students receiving special education support. One comment shared by some general education teachers was a belief that the district could be better equipped to meet the needs of students who are EBD, particularly the process of moving a student to a more-restrictive setting .

Half of special education teachers interviewed stated that time allotted for special education teachers, related service providers, general education teachers, and paraprofessionals to collaborate and review students' needs, progress, and concerns is inadequate. This sentiment was echoed by 73% of paraprofessionals interviewed.

Sixty-seven percent of general education teachers report that communication and collaboration between general and special education is inadequate. General education teachers commented that there is never enough time for collaboration. General and special education teachers requested additional consultation with special education teachers and paraprofessionals regarding accommodations and modifications in general education, instructional delivery options, or tools that may better support individual students' needs.

Concern: The district is encouraged to create specific time in staff schedules to support collaboration and the provision of indirect service for students.

Topic Area: Resources and Supports for Staff

Virtually all special education teachers and related service providers report they receive assistance and support with their questions and concerns related to special education from their building and special education administrators. Ninety percent report the district overall provides sufficient support and resources to ensure appropriate special education services and supplemental aids and services.

Eighty-four percent of general education teachers report they receive assistance and support with their questions and concerns related to special education from administration or special education staff.

Eighty-nine percent of paraprofessionals confirm they receive ongoing direction from a licensed teacher and if they provide IEP health-related services as part of their responsibility for a student receiving special education services, they also receive ongoing direction from a school nurse as appropriate. Paraprofessionals, for the most part, agreed the district provides them with sufficient support and resources to ensure students receive an appropriate education.

Finding Area 2: Facilities and Environment

Topic Area: Facilities

Eighty-six percent of special education teachers and related service providers, and 78% of paraprofessionals corroborated that special education space is conducive to learning. Seventy-four percent of paraprofessionals also agreed that classrooms in which students receive instruction, related services, and supplementary aids and services meet the special physical, sensory, and emotional needs of the students. Most paraprofessionals also agreed that special education space is essentially equivalent to the general education space.

Many special education teachers and paraprofessionals commented, however, that space in many buildings is very limited which makes service delivery difficult at times. Paraprofessionals also noted that general education class sizes of 38 to 40 makes it difficult to individualize instruction in the mainstream environment. An additional concern was that DAPE services are often provided in the hall or cafeteria in winter months and it is up to the students and staff to move tables and chairs prior to instruction.

Staff stated that emergency procedures are in place and understood.

Topic Area: Equipment and Supplies

Eighty-seven percent of special education teachers, related service providers, and paraprofessionals report they are provided with assistive technology and the necessary special equipment and instructional materials to provide instruction, related services, and supplementary aids and services.

Seventy-five percent of general education teachers and 73% of paraprofessionals shared that they are provided with the special equipment, assistive technology, and instructional materials necessary to provide the specific accommodations, modifications, and supports required by students' IEPs.

Topic Area: Rooms Used for Seclusion

The district does not have a room used for seclusion registered with the state and no such room was found through interviews or during the site visit.

Topic Area: Strengths and Concerns Identified by Stakeholders

Special education teachers and related service providers emphasized that teachers, administration, and support staff all work together to ensure that students reach their potential. It was also noted that the use of assistive technology is provided to help differentiate the learning of students.

Special education staff also commented on the fact that special education, early childhood family education, and community education preschool are housed in same building allowing opportunities for collaboration and support on a more timely basis. In previous years these programs were housed in different buildings.

Finding Area 3: Child Find and Evaluation

Topic Area: Pre-referral and Child Find Processes

The district general education and special education staff do not demonstrate adequate knowledge of the district and building child find processes. The processes described, including a referral process and child study team, are deemed insufficient for identifying children within the schools that are potentially eligible for special education services.

General education teachers shared a number of concerns regarding the pre-referral and child find processes (including referral for evaluation designed to determine if a student is a child with a disability). In particular, less than half of general education teachers reported they participate in regularly scheduled meetings to discuss concerns regarding students in general education who may need pre-referral interventions. Thirty-nine percent indicated they receive consultation and resources from special education teachers regarding pre-referral interventions and half receive resources for collecting data, recording progress, and documenting other pre-referral information. Overall, 23% of general education teachers stated they do not understand the pre-referral process, including their role in implementing and documenting pre-referral interventions.

Another concern voiced by almost half of general education teachers is that referrals for potential special education evaluations must be provided before the end of March or mid-April so special education staff can complete an evaluation by the end of the school year.

Thirty percent of special education teachers indicated that they participate in regularly scheduled meetings to discuss concerns regarding students in general education who may need pre-referral interventions. Forty-two percent reported they provide consultation and resources to general education teachers regarding pre-referral interventions and a third indicated that they provide resources for collecting data, recording progress, and documenting other pre-referral information.

The child find team meets from weekly to monthly depending upon need and the team typically includes a special or general education administrator, special education teacher(s), school psychologist, and general education teachers. As needed, related service providers and paraprofessionals also attend child find team meetings.

Finding : The district must develop and implement a CAP to ensure that pre referral interventions are being provided before a pupil is referred for a special education evaluation. Minn. Stat. § 125A.56 subd. 1(a).

Finding: The district must develop and implement a CAP to ensure that all children who may need special education services are identified. 34 C.F.R. § 300.111.

Topic Area: Transfer Process

The district has processes in place to ensure smooth transition of both in state and out of state transfer students. The processes, as described, are in compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.323(e)–(f). Licensed special education staff indicated that they carefully review the prior district’s IEP for all students transferring into the district.

Topic Area: Exit Procedures

The district has compliant procedures for exiting students from special education services when a student has made adequate progress such that continuing need for services no longer exists. A reevaluation is completed prior to exiting a student from special education and related services.

The district also has compliant procedures for exiting students from special education services when a student nears graduation or age 21. Special education staff confirm a reevaluation is conducted prior to a student graduating or exceeding the age of 21. Special education teachers also confirm that a summary of performance is completed, documented, and shared with the student prior to exiting.

Topic Area: Evaluations

The district has processes in place to ensure appropriate evaluation and identification of students with disabilities including the use of nondiscriminatory evaluation practices. All special education teachers and related service providers concur that they know when and how to address concerns related to racial or cultural discrimination when evaluating students.

Licensed special education staff reported they have access to and use a variety of tools and strategies to identify educational as well as secondary transition needs. Special education teachers and related service providers also indicated that parents are involved via interviews, surveys, and checklists provided before and during the evaluation process. Parental input is also obtained by phone conversations and in person and parents are invited to the evaluation planning meeting.

General education teachers almost unanimously agree that they understand their role as a team member in the determination of eligibility for special education students being evaluated and actively participate in the determination of needed additions, modifications, and related services needed to enable each student to meet the measurable annual goals set out in the student’s IEP and to participate, as appropriate, in the general curriculum.

Licensed special education staff demonstrated an accurate knowledge of the team override process and documentation required to determine a student eligible for special education and related services despite not meeting specific eligibility criteria.

Topic Area: Due Process Compliance

The results of the district’s self-review of records indicate the district is in compliance with Timeline, Notification, Evaluation, and Eligibility Standards related to the evaluation process and identification of special education needs and related services. The district is commended for its commitment to special education compliance.

Topic Area: Strengths and Concerns Identified by Stakeholders

General education teachers stated that the child find team and the learner support team has been strengthened over the last several years. In particular, there is an established protocol for teachers to follow when they have a concern regarding a student's learning. General education teachers are also improving the development, implementation, and documentation of outcomes for pre referral interventions. This also has helped reduce the number of students referred for special education evaluations.

Finding Area 4: IEP and IFSP Process and Implementation

Topic Area: Least Restrictive Environment

The district does not have processes in place to ensure special education students are provided special education services in the least restrictive environment, are integrated in the general education classrooms, and participate in special activities such as field trips with their classroom peers, as confirmed by special education teachers, related service providers, general education teachers, and paraprofessionals,

General education teachers shared a concern that it takes an inordinate amount of time to secure placements and services for students with emotional and/or behavioral needs.

When special education teachers, related service providers, general education teachers, or paraprofessionals were interviewed, they expressed concerns regarding educational placement decisions or options available to students receiving special education in the district. Twenty-six percent of special educators indicated that students receiving special education services are not fully integrated with non-disabled peers to the maximum extent possible. Twenty-two percent reported that students may be removed from mainstream classes not because of the nature or severity of the child's disability, but because of administrative convenience, or a lack of appropriate programs and educational alternatives being made available to students. Examples include that there is only one programming option for students 18-21 years of age which may not be appropriate for all students at this age. Staff also voiced a concern that there are students placed in full pull-out courses because there are no other options available for them. Nearly a quarter of special educators indicated that children with a disability do not have equal access to extra-curricular and nonacademic activities (e.g., counseling services, athletics, transportation, health services, district-sponsored clubs, recess, meals, etc.) that are available to non-disabled peers.

The district does have processes in place to ensure children ages birth to three are provided special education services in their natural settings (home, childcare, etc.) and provides support to community program staff to ensure preschool children with disabilities are successful in community placements.

Finding: The district must develop and implement a CAP to ensure that a continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related services.34 C.F.R. § 300.115a.

Topic Area: Communicating IEP Content

District staff described a mixture of processes for special education licensed providers to communicate student needs and IEP services with general education teachers and special education paraprofessionals working with students.

Special education teachers and related service providers indicate that each person responsible for implementing a student's IEP participates in a discussion of the IEP at the beginning of the year and when appropriate. Providers either receive a copy of the IEP, or relevant portions of the IEP (that includes written information about the child's disability, IEP goals, and necessary accommodations and modifications), and can ask to review IEPs.

General education teachers agree they have access to relevant portions of the IEP as described above. Additional IEP information is shared on an as-needed basis. Most general education teachers confirm they are aware of and understand the IEPs of students in their classrooms and implement accommodations and modifications as indicated in the IEPs. However, 29% of general education teachers noted they would appreciate more communication for consultation and collaboration with special education teachers and related service providers.

68% of paraprofessionals reported access to the IEP of each child with a disability to whom they are assigned. Other paraprofessionals indicate they receive copies of students' accommodations, although occasionally not in a timely manner.

Concern: The district is encouraged to create specific time in staff schedules to support collaboration and the provision of indirect service for students.

Topic Area: Team Members and Meetings

The district has processes to ensure all required IEP team members are given timely notice of meetings. General education teachers report they get a scheduled meeting on their calendars in advance of the meeting.

All general education teachers interviewed confirm that as a member of the IEP team and to the extent appropriate, they participate in the determination of appropriate positive behavioral interventions and supports, program modifications, and supplemental aids and services for the student.

Topic Area: Excusal Process

The district does not have processes to ensure required IEP team members are excused from the meeting if unable to attend, in whole or in part. Though most special education teachers understood the requirement for parents to excuse a required IEP team member prior to the IEP team meeting, approximately half of general education teachers either did not know what occurs, or indicated they provide their input and leave without any knowledge of excusal.

Based on interview data, the district does not ensure written input is provided by excused IEP team members prior to the meeting if the meeting involves a modification to, or discussion of, the member's area of the curriculum or related services in all cases. Special education teachers reported that written input is shared with the case manager by the excused member prior to the IEP team meeting, but general education teachers' comments noted that this process is not consistently followed.

Finding: The district must develop and implement a CAP to ensure that written input is provided by an excused required member of the IEP team. 34 C.F.R. § 300.321(e).

Topic Area: Extended School Year (ESY)

The district has processes to ensure determination of the need for Extended School Year services for students and provides services for those students in need.

Topic Area: Progress Reporting

The district has a process in place to ensure a student's IEP is reviewed and revised to address insufficient progress toward meeting one or more IEP goals.

Paraprofessionals communicate student progress with case managers through email and verbal communication. Student progress and concerns are shared during regularly scheduled meetings, daily check-ins, and staff team meetings. Paraprofessionals maintain written notes regarding student progress and concerns as well. General education teachers also share progress with case managers during meetings, via email, or through more informal conversation on a frequent basis. Teachers provide both verbal and written feedback regarding the student's progress on specific goals.

None of the special education teachers or related service providers expressed concerns regarding progress data on goals and objectives received from licensed special education staff, general education teachers, or paraprofessionals.

If progress data collected on a student's goals and objectives indicates insufficient progress for the student to meet one or more of the annual goals, special education teachers and related service providers ensure that the team discusses the concerns related to lack of progress and reviews the IEP to determine what changes, if any, need to be made. If needed changes warrant a reevaluation or IEP team meeting, appropriate planning and notice to parents ensues.

Topic Area: Secondary Transition

The district has a process to ensure students receive appropriate transition services, activities and/or programming opportunities to address their postsecondary goals. Staff shared that there are multiple programming opportunities available for students, including the Dakota County Technical College program for transition, independent living classes, career investigations, and meetings with representatives from vocational rehabilitation.

Special education students are also provided with services or offered transition-related activities through the district's transition program for students ages 18-21 with unmet IEP goals.

Topic Area: Due Process Compliance

The results of the district's self-review of records indicate the district is in compliance with Timeline, Notification, and IEP/IFSP Standards related to the IEP/IFSP process and provision of special education and related services.

Summary of Corrective Action Required

The district had no findings of individual noncompliance as formally notified on April 1, 2015. MDE applauds the Lakeville Public School District for exemplary work and officially having zero findings of noncompliance from the record review process.

MDE monitors completed a site visit to Lakeville Public School District (0194-01) during the week of April 20-24, 2015. During that site visit, and over the course of the 2014-2015 school year, monitors completed facility reviews, staff interviews, and both classroom and student observations. District staff completed a review of individual student records, and results were verified by MDE staff. The lead monitor completed an in-depth analysis of all collected data.

Noncompliance identified in this report must be corrected within one year of the date of this report. Following is a summary of the noncompliance areas requiring a corrective action plan (CAP):

Finding Area	Focus Area	Regulatory Reference
1	Training	Minn. Stat. § 125A.08(c)
2	<i>NONE</i>	
3	Child Find	34 C.F.R. § 300.111
3	Pre referral	Minn. Stat. § 125A.56 subd. 1(a)
4	Team Member Excusal Process	34 C.F.R. § 300.321(e)
	Continuum of Alternative Placements	34 C.F.R. § 300.115(a)

The district must enter a proposed CAP into the MNCIMP:SR system for each finding within 45 calendar days from the date of this monitoring report. Please review the CAP Development Guide enclosed with this report. For clarification of the issues in this report or assistance needed prior to developing the CAPs, please contact the district's lead monitor indicated below.

Ken Kalamaha
 Compliance Specialist
 Division of Compliance and Assistance
 1500 West Highway 36
 Roseville, MN 55113
 651-582-8584
 Ken.Kalamaha@state.mn.us

Appeal of any finding in this report must be submitted within 30 calendar days to Marikay Canaga Litzau, J.D., at the address above. Appeals must be in writing and include the issues being challenged along with documentation to support the disputed issues.

Appendix

The appendix includes special education child count data related to disability and federal instructional setting, race/ethnicity, and age, as well as data on individual student record noncompliance, complaint decisions, and interview and survey reliability.

Acronyms

Data sources

CC	Child count
Srv	Students served by District 0738-01
RR	Students sampled for the record review

Disability categories

ASD	Autism Spectrum Disorders
DB	Deaf-Blind
DCD-MM	Developmental Cognitive Disability: Mild to Moderate
DCD-SP	Developmental Cognitive Disability: Severe to Profound
DD	Development Delay
DHH	Deaf and Hard of Hearing
EBD	Emotional or Behavioral Disorders
OHD	Other Health Disabilities
PI	Physically Impaired
SLD	Specific Learning Disability
SLI	Speech or Language Impairments
SMI	Severely Multiply Impaired
TBI	Traumatic Brain Injury
VI	Visually Impaired

Child Count

In the December 1, 2014, Part B federal child count, students identified as receiving special education and related services are 14.3 percent (n = 1558) of the district total enrollment compared to the statewide average of 15.3 percent. Students receiving special education and related services within 0194-01 represent 13.9 percent (n = 1518) of the district's total enrollment. This data may include students who are open enrolled into the district, but does not include students in non-public educational settings unless the student receives special education and related services from the district. The district's Part C child count (children birth through age 2) is 0.1 percent of the population compared to 2.5 percent statewide (preliminary). The "population" used is based on census data reported by the district to MDE.

IDEA	District (CC)	District (Srv)	Statewide
Part B	14.3 percent	13.9 percent	15.3 percent
Part C	0.1 percent	2.0 percent	2.5 percent

Individual Student Record Noncompliance

Individual citations of noncompliance are identified by student and reported through the web-based MNCIMP:SR tracking system. The district had no findings of individual noncompliance as formally notified on April 1, 2015.

Complaint Decisions

Complaint files were reviewed for records of formal complaints filed regarding Lakeville Public School District (0194-01) and no formal complaints were opened during the relevant time period.

Interviews and Surveys

Online interviews were completed by special education staff, general education teachers, and special education paraprofessionals, with follow-up interviews on-site as deemed necessary. To ensure the reliability of the results, sample size was calculated with a confidence interval of 10 and a confidence level of 90 percent. For those groups where the minimal sample size was not reached, the results included in the report should be interpreted with caution.

Group	Sample Size	Number of Responses	Statistically Reliable?
General education teachers	58	75	Yes
Special education teachers and related service providers	48	50	Yes
Special education paraprofessionals	48	49	Yes

Federal Instructional Settings by Disability

The following table shows the distribution of students ages six through 21 receiving special education and related services across each of the eight federal instructional settings. The federal instructional settings can be referenced using the following:

- FS 1 – Outside of the regular class room less than 21 percent of the day
- FS 2 – Resource room between 21 percent and 60 percent of the school day
- FS 3 – Separate classroom more than 60 percent of the school day
- FS 4 – Public separate day school facility greater than 50 percent of the school day
- FS 5 – Private separate day school facility greater than 50 percent of the school day
- FS 6 – Private residential facilities greater than 50 percent of the school day
- FS 7 – Private residential facility greater than 50 percent of the school day
- FS 8 – Homebound/hospital placement

Disability	FS 1 CC	FS 1 Srv	FS 1 RR	FS 2 CC	FS 2 Srv	FS 2 RR	FS 3 CC	FS 3 Srv	FS 3 RR	FS 4 CC	FS 4 Srv	FS 4 RR	FS 5-8 CC	FS 5-8 Srv	FS 5-8 RR
ASD	33	38	100	26	30		34	32		7					
DB															
DCD-MM	5			11	12		77	88		7					
DCD-SP							100	100	100						
DD	72	75		8	11		16	14		4					
DHH	69	80	100	23	20		8								
EBD	49	51		30	32		14	16		6					
OHD	53	53		42	42	100	5	4		0					
PI	33	38		46	46		17	12					4	4	
SLD	44	42	33	52	55	67	4	4		0					
SLI	97	96		3	3	100	0	0							
SMI				8	17		83	67					8	17	
TBI				67	100		33								
VI															

Note: Each **row** will total approximately 100 percent (due to rounding) for each data source. Some cell values may have been suppressed to protect data privacy.

Race/Ethnicity by Disability

The following table shows the distribution of students ages birth through 21 across racial/ethnic groups. The race/ethnicity can be referenced using the following:

- Amer. Indian – American Indian
- Asian – Asian or Pacific Islander
- Black – black, non-Hispanic
- Hispanic – Hispanic, regardless of race
- White – white, non-Hispanic

Disability	Amer. Indian CC	Amer. Indian Srv	Amer. Indian RR	Asian CC	Asian Srv	Asian RR	Hisp CC	Hisp Srv	HISP RR	Black. CC	Black. Srv	Black. RR	White CC	White Srv	White RR
ASD				22	21		8	8		6	5		16	14	12
DB							1								
DCD-MM	6			6	4		2	2		6	5		2	2	
DCD-SP				3	3		1	1		2	2		2	2	6
DD				9	9	100	13	14	50	10	11		9	10	6
DHH					1		2						1	1	12
EBD	19	24		3	3		5	5		14	13		9	9	
OHD	44	41		13	13		13	15		15	17		19	20	19
PI				1	1					1	1		2	2	
SLD	31	35		15	18		40	38	50	34	35		21	22	12
SLI				25	25		15	17		11	11		17	18	12
SMI				1	1								1	0	
TBI							1						0	0	
VI										1	1				

Note: Each **column** will total approximately 100 percent (due to rounding) for each data source. Some cell values may have been suppressed to protect data privacy.

Age by Disability

The following two tables show the distribution of students ages birth through 21 by disability.

Disability	0-2 CC	0-2 Srv	0-2 RR	3-5 CC	3-5 Srv	3-5 RR	6 CC	6 Srv	6 RR	7 CC	7 Srv	7 RR	8 CC	8 Srv	8 RR	9 CC	9 Srv	9 RR	10 CC	10 Srv	10 RR	11 CC	11 Srv	11 RR	12 CC	12 Srv	12 RR
ASD	4	5	14	11	11		14	13		20	19		19	18		14	14		17	15		23	21		13	12	
DB				1																							
DCD-MM							3	3		4	2		3	3		3	4					2	2		1	1	
DCD-SP																1	1		4	3		1	1		1	2	
DD	80	82	29	54	57	33	32	36																			
DHH	4	2	14	3	1		1			1	2		1	1		1	1		1			1	1		2	2	
EBD				3	3					12	12		13	12		10	9		9	10		13	13		7	7	
OHD				1	1		5	5		10	11		13	15		15	12		16	16		22	22		27	26	
PI				1	1		3	1		1	2		2	3		2	2		3	3					2	2	
SLD							1			9	9		16	15		20	21		22	23		26	26		33	32	
SLI	11	11	14	25	26		39	40		41	42		31	31		34	36		28	28		12	13		14	14	
SMI				1	1		1	1		1	2		2	2		1	1		1	1		1					
TBI													1												1	1	
VI				1	1																						

Disability	13 CC	13 Srv	13 RR	14 CC	14 Srv	14 RR	15 CC	15 Srv	15 RR	16 CC	16 Srv	16 RR	17 CC	17 Srv	17 RR	18 CC	18 Srv	18 RR	19 CC	19 Srv	19 RR	20 CC	20 Srv	20 RR	21 CC	21 Srv	21 RR
ASD	22	21		15	15		11	9	12	10	7		7	6		18	8		50			27			50		
DB																											
DCD-MM	3	3		7	6		2	2		3	3		2	3		18	8		6			27			50		
DCD-SP	1	1		1	1		3	4		5	7	50	3	3		7	8		12	100		9					
DD																											
DHH				1			1	1	12				2	2													
EBD	6	7		8	7		10	10		13	13		19	17		14	17		12								
OHD	19	21		28	29		30	30	38	31	30		31	35		14	29					9					
PI	3	3		1	1		2	3		2	2		2	2								9					
SLD	35	35		37	39		38	39	25	35	38	50	32	32		25	25					9	100				
SLI	11	10		2	2		2	2	12							4	4										
SMI										1			1						12			9					
TBI																			6								
VI																											

Note: Each **column** will total approximately 100 percent (due to rounding) for each data source. Some cell values may have been suppressed to protect data privacy.