


Brookline
SEPAC
Special Education Parent Advisory Council

PSB Special Education
“Standard Operational Procedural Manual”

SEPAC’s Reading

Craig Haller, SEPAC Co-Chair
September 2017



There is no doubt that any manual may have errors, typos, outdated information and the like. That is to be expected, it is not illegal, not necessarily nefarious, and not a big issue if corrections or updates are made. It is very important that a procedures manual be as clear and accurate as possible. One should not have to say “I think that means ...” Clarity in a procedure manual is of the utmost importance. It is not what is “meant” that counts, it is what is written.

Historical timeline

On the eighth day, the good lord had an IDEA

- Granville H
- Cathy K
- Candace M
- Denise R
- Kirsten B
- Karen S
- Sam Z

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



A standard operating procedure manual is typically handed to the next person to take over an administrative job. They look it over, see the implementation, and as part of their first few months, fix, modify, add, edit the procedures as they see fit. That is what an administrator does. Parts of any manual will contain original text and design and will have the fingerprints of everyone who has ever touched it. After a few months, it has a new owner.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS of **BROOKLINE**

Special Education - Standard Operational Procedural Manual: Referral, Evaluation, and Placement of School-Age Students with Disabilities



Revised Summer 2017
Office of Student Services

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



From the Introduction

“This manual has been developed as a resource for the Brookline PK-12 Staff, Administration and Community. It references State and Federal regulations and the processes of the Public Schools of Brookline. The following policies and procedures are aligned with:

- The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Massachusetts General Laws ch.71 B, et seq., and Special Education Regulations 603 CMR 28.00 et. seq.,
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004, and 34 CFR 300 et. seq.
- Section 504 The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (as amended).”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Topics for this presentation

This is *not* a comprehensive discussion of all the items of concern.

- Makeup of the IEP Team
- Effective Progress
- Placement
- Discipline
- Other

Words highlighted in yellow are emphasized by the presentation, not in the original. **Bold**, *italics* and underlines are in the original.

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



IEP Process Guide

(Massachusetts Department of Education, emphasis theirs)

“ The IEP is written to fit the student.

The placement is chosen to fit the IEP.

The IEP under no circumstances should be written “to fit” a particular placement. Teams must remember this critical fact when moving through the Team process to ensure that the IEP is written to address the unique needs of the student. ”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The IEP defines FAPE, the appropriate education for a particular child. Period. It has no connection with a particular placement, it is not written for a particular school or district. Utterances such as “We don’t / can’t offer that here” are NOT appropriate. Saying “I need to check with the administration ...” is both not true and inappropriate – to be explained shortly. The IEP is FAPE for this one student and that is the ONLY consideration; what this student needs to access the curriculum. Once FAPE is defined, the placement is discussed and chosen. In that order.

Required Team Membership

(Section 1414(d)(1)(B))

- (i)**the parents of a child with a disability;
- (ii)**not less than 1 regular education teacher of such child (if the child is, or may be, participating in the regular education environment);
- (iii)**not less than 1 special education teacher, or where appropriate, not less than 1 special education provider of such child;
- (iv)**a representative of the local educational agency who—
 - (I)**is qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities;
 - (II)**is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum; and
 - (III)**is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the local educational agency;
- (v)**an individual who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results, who may be a member of the team described in clauses (ii) through (vi);
- (vi)**at the discretion of the parent or the agency, other individuals who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the child, including related services personnel as appropriate; and
- (vii)**whenever appropriate, the child with a disability.

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



This is the definition of the Team in the IDEA. MA follows this definition. Notice there are seven members defined, not all are always needed. Also note the “representative of the local educational agency” is typically the ETF in our district. If there is an administrator present, they cover this role. The job description of that person, the ETF, is in the middle of the definition of the Team. That is a vital position.

Brookline took this definition verbatim for the Procedural Manual. All seven members are delineated ... but ...

Required Team Membership

(Brookline SOP Manual p. 19, black bars show parts that were removed from the definition when reproduced in the manual)

- (i) the parents of a child with a disability;
- (ii) not less than 1 regular education teacher of such child (if the child is, or may be, participating in the regular education environment);
- (iii) not less than 1 special education teacher, or where appropriate, not less than 1 special education provider of such child;
- (iv) a representative of the local educational agency [REDACTED] . . . (Educational Team Facilitator)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED];
- (v) an individual who can interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results, who may be a member of the team described in clauses (ii) through (vi);
- (vi) at the discretion of the parent or the agency, other individuals who have knowledge or special expertise regarding the child, including related services personnel as appropriate; and
- (vii) whenever appropriate, the child with a disability.

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The title “Educational Team Facilitator” is added and the federally mandated job definition and responsibilities of the ETF are removed. Here it is blacked out, in the manual, those are the words that are simply missing. They are replaced by a simple faux ellipses. What are those words?

Required Team Membership


(Section 1414(d)(1)(B) – parts *not* in manual)

(iv) a representative of the local educational agency who—

(I) is qualified to provide, or supervise the provision of, specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of children with disabilities;

(II) is knowledgeable about the general education curriculum; and

(III) is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the local educational agency;

 MA adds: “... who has the authority to commit resources”

[Guidance for Implementing IDEA 2004](#), updated 3/12/2015 – also not in Brookline SOP)

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The job description of the ETF, BY LAW, includes what is in the red square. Also note, MA adds that the district representative, our ETF, has the authority to commit resources. There is never a need to “check with” anyone outside the Team for any reason. If it is a legally compliant Team, the ETF can commit district resources. Period. For instance, if the Team decides the child needs transportation, either to school or to school sponsored after-school activities, the Team makes the decision, there is no “checking with Transportation.” For one reason, the ETF can commit that resource, and two, placement is not decided yet so why ask Brookline?

IEP Team composition

(DESE Coordinated Program Review Procedures)

1. The child's parents.
2. A representative of the school district who acts as Chairperson and who is (1) qualified to supervise or provide special education; (2) is knowledgeable about the general curriculum; and (3) is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the district.
3. A representative of the school district who has the authority to commit the resources of the district (and who may act as the Chairperson).

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Every six years the Commonwealth does a CPR – Coordinated Program Review. This is to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations. This quote is part of criterion SE 8. It is curious to note that a vital part of the federal and state definition of a Team, wording in the middle of the definition are missing in the document that our ETFs are trained with and refer to. The documents offered to parents for information.

Just as a curious double check, I randomly picked a district in another state to see what they say ...

IEP Team composition

(NYC Standard Operating Procedures Manual, p. 66, emphasis in original)

“ **THE DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE**

The District Representative is a representative of the school district who is:

- Qualified to provide or supervise the provision of special education and
 - Knowledgeable about the general education curriculum and
 - Knowledgeable about the availability of district resources
- ”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



New York City Department of Education matches the IDEA and thoroughly explains the ETF's role and responsibilities. There are an additional nine bullets that talk about the district representative working as a team, etc. in addition to the three bullets here.

The point being that a major part of the power of the Team to act is represented as it is in the law.

Parent participation

(34 CFR 300.322(b)(1)(i))

(1) The notice required under paragraph (a)(1) of this section must –

(i) Indicate the purpose, time, and location of the meeting and who will be in attendance;

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The meeting notice. Simple. The Federal law, followed directly by the Commonwealth, that defines the basis of the meeting invitation. It clearly states “who will be in attendance” and there are advisories on this. Federal law. The district must tell the family who they are bringing to the meeting. We had many “strong” discussions with the district last November about surprise administrators.

This shows the law.

Required Team Membership

(Brookline SOP Manual p. 19, emphasis theirs)

“Any person who is invited to the Team meeting by Brookline **must** be included on the invitation sheet. This is true if a district administrator’s participation is required as a **contributing member** of the IEP team, their name must be included on the meeting notification.

Additionally, members may include:

- If transition services, or vocational education is to be discussed a representative knowledgeable about these services must attend
- Other individuals at the request a Team member”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



This is Brookline’s procedure as to who is listed on the meeting invitation and additional Team members. Let’s look at it a point at a time, breaking down this slide.

As to the makeup of the Team

(Brookline SOP Manual p. 19 - closer look)

“Any person who is invited to the Team meeting by Brookline **must** be included on the invitation sheet.”

Fulfills the IDEA requirement 34 CFR 300.322(b)(1)(i) under “*Information provided to parents.*”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The first sentence matches the IDEA. Plain and simple, a perfect place to end the definition.

As to the makeup of the Team

(Brookline SOP Manual p. 18, emphasis in original)

“Any person who is invited to the Team meeting by Brookline **must** be included on the invitation sheet. This is true if a district administrator’s participation is required as a **contributing member** of the IEP team, their name must be included on the meeting notification.”

(And it is true for ANY other reason as well ... no one can come to the meeting for any reason without being on the meeting notice or prior agreement with the family, contributing member or not.)

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Then this is added. Note that “contributing member” has no definition in special education law and the emphasis shown is in the manual. The second sentence is correct that contributing members must be on the list. According to the IDEA, federal law, all members must be, so this is moot. Non contributing members, whatever that means, must also be on the list.

As to the makeup of the Team

(Brookline SOP Manual p. 18)

“Any person who is invited to the Team meeting by Brookline **must** be included on the invitation sheet. This is true if a district administrator’s participation is required as a **contributing member** of the IEP team, their name must be included on the meeting notification.

Additionally, members may include:

- If transition services, or vocational education is to be discussed a representative knowledgeable about these services must attend
- **Other individuals at the request a Team member”**

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Then this additional part. Let’s look closer.

As to the makeup of the Team

(Brookline SOP Manual p. 18) continued

“Additionally, members may include:

- Other individuals at the request a Team member”

ONLY if those other individuals are listed on the meeting notice AND ONLY IF the “other individuals [who] have knowledge or special expertise regarding the child, including related services personnel as appropriate” (IDEA § 300.321(a)(6))

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



A Team member CANNOT randomly request other individuals and invite them. The federal law, **not mentioned in the manual**, states that others who are invited must have knowledge or special expertise regarding the child. And they must be on the meeting notice.

As to the makeup of the Team (others as observers, evaluators)

I personally surveyed 20 special education professionals across 13 districts about evaluating ETFs. Not one ever surprises a family with a non-team member, even to evaluate. Some discuss with family in advance and have “ground rules.” Non-team members are especially problematic when combined with other issues in this presentation and the SOP manual.

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



As to the makeup of the Team

(member brought by parent)

“Under 34 CFR §300.322(b), the public agency must inform parents in advance of the IEP meeting, including the purpose, time, and location of the meeting and who will be in attendance. There is no similar requirement in the IDEA for the parent to inform the public agency, in advance, if he or she intends to be accompanied by an individual with knowledge or special expertise regarding the child, including an attorney.” ~OSEP letter to Andel, 2/16

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The US Department of Ed, Office of Special Ed Programs, i.e., the feds, have issued guidance that the parents can, in fact, bring surprise members of the Team, including a lawyer or advocate. And the IEP meeting **MUST CONTINUE** unless the parent agrees to postpone. Again, bringing a lawyer or advocate without notice is legal, the meeting must go on. This is something appropriate for a procedural manual, but missing. Do note that it is generally best practice to inform the district if you are bringing others of note.

Effective Progress ...

(Brookline SOP, page 33)

Teams determine whether a student is making effective progress in school.

To determine whether a student is making effective progress, the Team must determine whether the student has:

... (multiple bullet points)

Made growth according to the chronological age, the developmental expectations and the individual educational potential of the child.

... (more bullet points)

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Making effective progress is often a key to eligibility for special education, and one of the least understood. The manual takes the definition from the Commonwealth and in the midst of many bullet points, it properly reproduces this one. It does not emphasize this bullet in any manner nor refer to it or its origin. The words “the individual educational potential of the child” are vital.

Effective progress ... continued

(34 CFR 300.111(c)(1))

Missing from the SOP:

“Although failing grades would allow the Team to assert that the student is not making effective progress, the Team would not be able to comparably assert that the student is making effective progress solely because he/she is making passing grades. In fact, the federal special education law specifically prohibits the Team from finding a student ineligible solely because the student is advancing from grade to grade.”

(34 CFR 300.111(c)(1)) From MA DOE Special Education Technical Assistance Guide

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The IDEA specifically prohibits the Team ... Having a Team member, or worse yet, a non-team administrator, or staff member, say “The student is passing all of his classes, he is making effective progress” is problematic. That is a vital part of the concept. A simplistic example would be a student with a 140 IQ, obvious capabilities and getting C’s and D’s. That is probably NOT effective progress. By itself it is not “eligibility” but it is not effective progress.

Parent involvement in placement

(IDEA 34 CFR 300.501(c)(1),(c)(4))

“Each public agency must ensure that a parent of each child with a disability is a member of any group that makes decisions on the educational placement of the parent’s child.”

“A placement decision may be made by a group without the involvement of a parent, if the public agency is unable to obtain the parent’s participation in the decision. In this case, the public agency must have a record of its attempt to ensure their involvement.”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Federal law, the parent is a member of the Team and any group that makes decisions about the child’s placement. Any group.

TEAM decision

(603 CMR 28.06(2))

“Determining placement. At the Team meeting, after the IEP has been developed, the Team shall consider the identified needs of the student, the types of services required, and whether such services may be provided in a general education classroom with supplementary aids and/or services or in a separate classroom or school. The Team shall consider all aspects of the student’s proposed special education program as specified in the student’s IEP and determine the appropriate placement to provide the services. The Team shall determine if the student shall be served in an in-district placement or an out-of-district placement and shall determine the specific placement according to the following requirements ...”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



State law. At the TEAM Meeting, the TEAM considers, the TEAM shall ... determine ... Placement is a TEAM decision only. And the parent is ALWAYS a member of the TEAM. Involved in ALL Team discussions and decisions.

Placement discussion ...

(Brookline SOP manual, page 58)

“Teams should always consider in-district settings as they relate to the student’s needs. These settings include the general education classroom, a learning center, or a separate classroom or district-wide program. You should contact your Special Education Director for support if the Team is considering a setting that is more restrictive.”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Brookline’s procedure is that if the Team is considering a placement within the district, “you” (Remember, this manual is principally for the ETF who has full knowledge of all programs and can allocate resources) the ETF should contact the special education director. Multiple issues here ... this is a Team only decision, the placement is discussed immediately following the IEP development (it is the last 2 minutes of that most parents don’t notice). How does this mesh with the laws and how is it logistically to be done?

Placement in district-wide program

(603 CMR 28.06(2)(d))

“In-district placement. The placement decision made by **the Team** shall indicate the specific program setting in which services will be provided. **The Team** shall first consider in-district settings such as a general education classroom, a resource setting, a separate classroom, a work setting, a vocational school program, and/or another type of **setting identified by the Team** as appropriate and able to provide the services on the IEP in a natural or less restrictive environment. **If an in-district setting is able to deliver the services on the IEP, the Team shall identify such placement and include such determination with the proposed IEP.”**

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The next part of the Commonwealth’s law on in-district placement. Again, the TEAM shall ... identified by the Team ... and ending with “the Team shall identify such placement and include such determination with the proposed IEP.” This is for in-district placement, maybe a learning center in the same school, or moving from one school to another for RISE. Team and only Team decision. No group discussions without the parent involved. State law. Very clear.

Placement in district-wide program

(Brookline SOP manual, page 62, italics in original)

"Prior to recommending a student to a district-wide program, the team will complete the following process: Initial concerns regarding a student's lack of effective progress with a current IEP will be shared with Team Facilitator and principal.

Under the direction of the Team Facilitator, the school based PSS and relevant staff will review current components of the student's IEP to determine that all attempts at supporting the child in the least restrictive environment have been implemented. The Team seeks a clear determination of student needs.

Consideration must be given to the following:

1. Increase of supports within school, including consideration of decreased time in general education setting
2. Use of composite programs (using parts of in-house programs and/or other unique combinations of resources)
3. Additional staff training
4. Consultation from in-district specialists or outside consultants
5. Use of new/alternative specialized instructional materials
6. Completion of FBA and possible creation and implementation of positive behavior support plan
7. Communication with parents about concerns regarding child's progress-open and ongoing documentation of response to changes and interventions"

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Brookline's procedure ... before someone (Team? ETF?) recommends a student to an in-district program (remember a Team decision), the ETF and the PRINCIPAL get involved. Then the ETF directs the PSS (no definition offered) and other "relevant staff" (also undefined) to review the IEP, etc. This is followed by a list of seven considerations, the last mentioning communication with the parents. All of this must happen between the design of the proposed IEP and the Placement meeting which happen consecutively in an hour or two. Again, by law, this is a TEAM decision, and only the TEAM. During the IEP meeting. The ONLY "consideration" that must be given is to the proposed IEP as it is written immediately after it is written. Not, as suggested, outside consultants, etc.

IEP Development

(603 CMR 28.07(1)(c))

“When the participation or consent of the parent is required and the parent fails or refuses to participate, the school district shall make and document multiple efforts to contact the parent. Such efforts may include letters, written notices sent by certified mail, electronic mail (e-mail), telephone call, or, if appropriate, TTY communications to the home, and home visits at such time as the parent is likely to be home. Efforts may include seeking assistance from a community service agency to secure parental participation. The school district shall ensure that its efforts to involve the parent and gain parental consent meet a reasonable measure standard as articulated in federal law at 34 CFR §§300.300(c)(2) and 300.322(d).”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The parent has 30-days, by law, to respond to the proposed IEP. State law is that when the parent does not sign the proposed IEP (not returned at all, this is not about rejecting or accepting the IEP, it is about returning it with a decision) the school must make AND document multiple efforts to contact the parent. Many efforts, many methods. Brookline's procedure is different.

IEP Development

(Brookline SOP manual, page 53)

“When a parent does not respond to the IEP and proposed placement within 30 calendar days, the district will send a rejection for no response to the BSEA.”

(Note: I requested guidance as to what this means from the BSEA. They were unable to understand it any better than I.)

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



If, after 30 days the parent does not respond to the proposed IEP, Brookline will simply send a “rejection for no response” to the Commonwealths Bureau of Special Education Appeals, where hearings happen. Note that I reached out to the BSEA as to the meaning of this sentence and their response was the same as mine, it is not clear. Note that there is no known “rejection for no response” form or status. The law says to do everything practicable to get the parent’s involvement and document your efforts.

Discipline

We have recurring issues of mishandling behavior and discipline issues when they concern our students with disabilities. I have repeatedly brought this to the attention of both the senior administration and the school committee.

(Information and resources concerning discipline are on the SEPAC website)

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Discipline of SWD

(my comments to senior staff on this issue)

“... the section on “Discipline of Students with Disability” talks about students after 10 suspensions, talks about students committing crimes, but says **absolutely nothing** about dealing with unexpected behavioral issues otherwise. In the last two years there are multiple OCR Dear Colleague letters, advisories and more that are specifically applicable to our students, ... precisely what I have brought to your attention with links and printouts, to no avail. There is nothing in the manual other than five sentences that vaguely hint at some of this, bizarrely under the category of ‘Eligibility.’ ”

(my email, in part, to senior staff)

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The district has acknowledged that we need a new discipline policy and it must include students with disabilities. But that is different than the standard operating procedures. They **MUST** include issues such as an increase in behaviors with a student. In conjunction with the new policy, the procedures must call for an IEP meeting to discuss behavioral interventions, etc.

Seemingly minor, but not

There are many other issues with the manual that parents need to know in order to ensure their rights. These include errors as well as omissions which should be fixed for they withhold information by their absence. There are many dead links, mistakes in legal references, errors in timelines, omissions of facts or clarifications within discussed procedures.

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Concerning RTI

(Brookline manual, p.6, emphasis in original)

“Although some students may eventually be referred for special education services, per the regulations, Rtl should not be seen as a “pre-referral” mechanism **rather a prerequisite.**”

Note: Response To Intervention is completely separate from special education.

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Other parts of the manual get this correct. My understanding of this sentence is that RTI is NOT done as a pre-referral to a special education referral, rather it is a prerequisite to a referral for special education services. I have read it many times, and in context I am more confused. But the law is clear.

Concerning RTI

(US DoE, Office of Special Education Programs)

“ The use of RTI strategies cannot be used to delay or deny the provision of a full and individual evaluation, pursuant to 34 CFR §§300.304-300.311, to a child suspected of having a disability under 34 CFR §300.8. ”

~OSEP 1/2010, A Response to Intervention(RTI) Process Cannot Be Used to Delay-Deny an Evaluation for Eligibility under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



It does not matter where in RTI the student is, or not at all, the use of RTI cannot delay a referral for special education services, and their potential start. In other words, RTI is NOT a prerequisite for special education services.

Unclear or undefined entities

“ ... schools in Brookline [have] developed Child Study Teams (CST) at the K-8 levels and Student Intervention Teams (SIT) at the high school level as an avenue for gathering data and implementing interventions and or supports prior to a special education referral. ”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Multiple emails to both the Deputy Superintendent for Teaching and Learning and the Deputy Superintendent for Student Services as to how the Child Study Teams are formed and who members are have been acknowledged, but alas, not answered. Multiple acknowledged emails from September 1, and no answer (there are responses, just no answers).

IEP Timelines

(Brookline SOP, page 10)

“ Following a Team meeting where the student is found eligible, the parent is given 2 copies of the proposed IEP draft or summary sheet containing service delivery and goals. The district then has 10 school days to send formal IEP as well as a placement page for parent signatures. ”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



The draft IEP is a document that is sometimes used, it is where the IEP Team starts its discussion, a draft that gets turned into a proposed IEP.

A proposed IEP is the version that comes out of the IEP Team meeting, immediately used for a placement discussion and is given to the parent to sign.

There is no definition known by me for a “proposed IEP draft.”

There is no definition known by me for a “formal IEP.”

If following the Team meeting the parent is given 2 copies of the proposed IEP, the rest of this statement is moot and nonsensical. If the parents are given a proper summary, the district has 2 calendar weeks (not 10 school days and they are different) to send a “proposed” IEP.

Furthermore, if the parents leave without a proposed IEP and without a summary, the district has 3-5 calendar days to get two copies of the proposed IEP to the parents. And, even if the parents are given a summary, the parents can request, and the district must, give the parents the proposed IEP in 3-5 calendar days. These last parts of the timeline are not mentioned in the manual and are an issue I have brought up to the district in writing, verbally, and in presentations at least a dozen times.

Extended School Year

(Brookline manual, page 48)

“ The forms will be collected once during the school year. The “Student Recommendation Form” and the “Extended School Year Documentation Form” fill [sic] be collected in March. Please do not wait to complete the forms. The IEP team should be reviewing and updating forms after each vacation. ”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



Parents are ALWAYS a part of the IEP Team. The parent is a part of the recommendations. This says the Team is reviewing ESY forms used for ESY eligibility after each vacation. Schedule your additional IEP Team meetings for the weeks of November 27, January 1, February 26, AND April 23. OR be left out of Team discussions around ESY for your child.

Other topics

Some of the additional topics that SEPAC was assured would be covered in the revision to training and are missing from the manual:

- Recording a meeting
- Length of meetings
- Team Meeting requests and availability
- Communication logs
- Discipline with respect to OCR, IEPs, etc.
- Electronic delivery of forms
- ~~IEP etiquette~~*
- Confidentiality

* Although in the first list of in “suggested practices” in the DESE IEP Process Guide, under “working together,” it was removed because **“I do not believe IEP meeting etiquette needs to be addressed as this as only been raised by one person rather than hearing this as a larger concern.”**

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



And there is so much more.

Willingness to express concerns

The administration will not address issues unless multiple families bring it to their attention. Not just SEPAC.

BUT, parents feel that the power of the IEP Team and Placement Team, the only and final say on services and placement, actually sits with the administration, and that adds to the hesitation to report problems or complaints *to* the administration.

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review





SPECIAL EDUCATION FORM

WORKING TOGETHER FOR THE SUCCESS OF OUR STUDENTS

Education Record Request Form – for all States

Bullying Report Form – for all States

Complaint Forms...

PRS Complaint – procedural complaint to the Commonwealth

Email concern/complaint to your school district

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



| Who should get the email? |

You will automatically get a copy of the email. If the person who receives it hits "reply," that email will go to you.

School *

Upper Devotion

Which school the issue involves. If it does not involve a particular school, choose "District-wide"

Upper Devo - send the email TO: *

- Cecile Budelmann, Team Facilitator
- Principal Monica Crowley
- ↓ Administrators (often better as cc) ↓ -----
- Administrator, Seph Bartholomew
- Co-Director of Special Education, Casey Ngo Miller
- Deputy Superintendent Samuel Zimmerman
- Superintendent Bott

Upper Devo - copy the email to (CC:)

- Cecile Budelmann, Team Facilitator
- Principal Monica Crowley
- ↓ Administrators ↓ -----
- Administrator, Seph Bartholomew
- Co-Director of Special Education, Casey Ngo Miller
- Deputy Superintendent Samuel Zimmerman
- Superintendent Bott

Also send a copy to:

spouse, advocate, lawyer, etc.

Separate email addresses with a comma

| Specifics |

This is the list of issues that we currently support. Choose one. You can choose "Other" if you don't see your concern here.

Common Issues *

- IEP services have not started (*must start first day of school*)
- IEP has not been received (*must be within 14 calendar days*)
- Unexpected people at meeting
- Time or day of IEP Team meeting not mutually agreeable
- Request for log of IEP service delivery
- Missing some IEP services (*you must know in advance if services will not be provided for any reason*)
- Misuse of time-outs (See the laws [here](#))
- Other - not specified

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



From the Deputy Superintendent

“In the spirit of collaboration, I ask when SEPAC shares their presentation tomorrow evening that attendees are also informed that comments/revisions were shared with the district team today and we will be reviewing and making appropriate revisions.”

9/13/2017

Brookline SEPAC - 2017 SOP Manual Review



And what needs to happen when and if there are PROCEDURAL changes? Items that have been reviewed and taught?