



PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NORTH CAROLINA

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION | Mark Johnson, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*

WWW.NCPUBLICSCHOOLS.ORG

December 13, 2017

Dr. Pamela Baldwin, Superintendent
Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools
750 S. Merritt Mill Road
Chapel Hill, NC 27516

Dear Dr. Baldwin:

The Exceptional Children (EC) Division is pleased to share the final report of the Exceptional Children Comprehensive Review conducted in Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools. We hope this report will be of assistance in future program planning by your leadership team. Please share this report with Central Office staff, building administrators, teachers, and other stakeholders, including parents, as needed. We look forward to the scheduling a meeting in early January 2018, to discuss the report and determine next steps in providing needed supports from NC DPI. If you have questions about this report prior to the meeting, please feel free to contact Sherri Vernelson, sherri.vernelson@dpi.nc.gov, 919-807-3982 or Sherry H. Thomas, sherry.thomas@dpi.nc.gov, 919-807-3992.

Thank you for inviting the NCDPI EC Division to conduct this review and for your hospitality and assistance during our visit. Please convey special thanks to your staff on behalf of the EC Division for the support provided to our team while they were onsite conducting interviews and student observations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William J. Hussey".

William J. Hussey

EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN DIVISION

William J. Hussey, *Director* | bill.hussey@dpi.nc.gov

6356 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-6356 | (919) 807-3969 | Fax (919) 807-3243

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER



Public Schools of North Carolina
State Board of Education
Department of Public Instruction

Exceptional Children Division Comprehensive Review 2017-18

Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools 681

Dates of Visit: October 12-13, 2017

Review Team Leads:
Sherri Vernelson and Sherry Thomas

Date of Report:
December 13, 2017

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Purpose of the Visit	3
Authority under General Supervision	3
Alignment to State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)	3
Alignment to the LEA Self-Assessment/Practice Profile	4
Program Review Team	7
Methodology: Program Review	7
Student Observation and IEP Compliance	8
Interviews and Surveys	9
Finance.....	11
Summary	12
Appendix A.....	13
Appendix B.....	17

Purpose of the Visit

The NC Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) Exceptional Children Division (ECD) conducted a review of the Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools Exceptional Children Program (CHCCS-ECP) on October 12-13, 2017, in response to the request of the CHCCS Superintendent and Senior Executive Director for Exceptional Children. Prior to the program review, they identified the following primary concerns related to the CHCCS EC Department: dismal outcomes in spite of rich human capital/resources for students with disabilities, current structure of technical assistance within the District, budget concerns and basic service delivery. During the visit, a twenty-four-member team from the ECD observed students with disabilities in a variety of settings and schools, reviewed student records, completed a fiscal review, obtained feedback from parents, and conducted staff interviews. The following report captures the findings of the program review.

Authority under General Supervision

Although this Program Review was not a formal monitoring visit, the ECD authority under general supervision is as follows:

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA), (20 U.S.C. 1400 (c)(1)), provides federal funds to assist states in educating children with disabilities and requires each participating state to ensure that school districts and other publicly-funded educational agencies in the state comply with the requirements of IDEA and its implementing regulations. Further, Section 616 of IDEA states that the primary focus of federal and state monitoring activities shall be on improving education results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities and ensuring that states meet the program requirements with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. Article 9 of Chapter 115C of the North Carolina General Statutes requires local school districts to provide appropriate special education and related services and requires the NC DPI to establish, monitor, and enforce regulations governing special education programs in the North Carolina public schools and all institutions wholly or partly supported by the state. The ECD of the NC DPI supervises and conducts the general supervision process in furtherance of the state's obligations under IDEA and Article 9.

Alignment to State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has implemented an accountability framework designed to more directly support States in improving the results for infants, toddlers, children and youth

with disabilities, and their families. Section 616(a)(2) of the IDEA requires that the primary focus of IDEA monitoring be on improving educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities, and ensuring that States meet the IDEA program requirements.

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending programs along the continuum:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility. (20 U.S.C 1416(a)(3)(A))

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Additionally, the data collected through this review provides information for use with *Outcome Indicator: Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)*

Alignment to the LEA Self-Assessment/Practice Profile

The core elements described below illustrate the inter-related nature and alignment to the areas requested by the Superintendent for review. The primary purpose of the LEA Self-Assessment is to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. This is a growth-based model identifying strengths, as well as areas of growth, and provides a snapshot of where the LEA is at a particular point in time. As the ECD moves forward state-wide with the LEA self-assessment, this is an opportunity to consider the results presented here to strategically plan long and short-term objectives to enhance the LEA's capacity to effectively deliver services to students with disabilities and improve outcomes.

Core Element 1: Policy Compliance and Monitoring

This core element examines how the LEA monitors and ensures compliance with federal and state policies regarding students with disabilities.

1.1: The LEA provides training on the legal requirements of IDEA, Article 9 and *NC Policies Governing Services for Children with Disabilities*.

1.2: The LEA has an effective system for internal monitoring and general supervision, to include IEP implementation.

1.3: LEA uses effective methods and practices for resolving complaints/disputes (formal and informal) within required timelines.

Core Element 2: Fiscal Management

This core element examines how the LEA monitors fiscal resources and ensures compliance with federal and state policies regarding students with disabilities.

2.1: LEA fiscal management policies and procedures comply with federal and state regulations, policies and procedures for appropriate use of funds.

2.2: LEA timely and accurately completes and submits eligible grant funding applications/reimbursements, and required amendments/supplements.

2.3: LEA implements effective practices for fiscal accountability.

Core Element 3: IEP Development, Implementation, and Outcomes

This core element examines the processes the LEA has in place to ensure the development and implementation of high quality IEPs and how the LEA monitors outcomes for students with disabilities.

3.1: Data indicate that students with IEPs are making progress towards grade level standards in the general education curriculum.

3.2: Data indicate that students participating in the Standard Course of Study are making progress on IEP goals.

3.3: Data indicate that students participating in the Extended Content Standards are making progress on IEP goals.

3.4: Data indicate that students with disabilities are graduating.

3.5: IEPs are developed based on each student's unique needs and relevant progress monitoring data that clearly documents student growth.

3.6: IEPs are implemented at a high level of fidelity.

Core Element 4: Problem-solving for Improvement

This core element examines how the LEA collects and uses data to identify potential problems, works toward solutions, plans to implement changes, and continually improves outcomes for students.

4.1: LEA collects and analyzes data to problem-solve and develop improvement strategies for any student not meeting IEP goals.

4.2: LEA collects and analyzes disaggregated data about groups of students with disabilities to establish priorities for improvement.

4.3: LEA collects and analyzes aggregated data about students with disabilities to establish priorities for improvement.

4.4: LEA uses data analysis and identified priorities for decision-making and continuous improvement of the LEA EC program at least annually.

Core Element 5: Research-Based Instruction

This core element examines how the LEA identifies, implements, and monitors research-based instruction and practices.

5.1: LEA has a clear data driven procedure for identifying needed research-based initiatives, practices, and/or instructional methods to ensure students' mastery of the NC Standard Course of Study.

5.2: LEA develops effective implementation plans to support improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

5.3: LEA purposefully carries out implementation plans, monitoring progress and making adjustments to improve outcomes.

5.4: Implementation plan includes strategies that support improvement, sustainability, and actively build capacity over time.

Core Element 6: Communication and Collaboration

This core element examines how the LEA ensures effective communication (internally and externally, as well as across all levels) and involves all stakeholders in meaningful ways.

6.1: LEA has effective vertical and horizontal communication processes in place to support policy and practice.

6.2: LEA facilitates meaningful parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities (e.g. rights and procedural safeguards, specific disability information, instructional practices, etc.)

6.3: LEA partners with community stakeholders (including preschool, mental health, etc.) to enhance service provision to students and families.

6.4: LEA collaborates with SEA to support program and initiative improvement.

Comprehensive Review Team

The Program Review Team included the following staff and consultants from the NC DPI ECD and was led by assigned Section Chiefs.

Name	Position
Sherry Thomas, Team Lead	Assistant Director, Exceptional Children Division
Sherri Vernelson, Team Lead	Section Chief, Sensory Support and Assistive Technology
Paula Crawford	Section Chief, Program Improvement and Professional Development
Carol Ann Hudgens	Section Chief, Policy Monitoring and Audit
Dreama McCoy	Section Chief, Supporting Teaching & Related Services
Joe Simmons	Section Chief, Behavior Support
Kevin Allen	Regional Coordinator, North Central/Sandhills/Northeast/Southeast
Nance Bellizzi	Regional Coordinator, Piedmont-Triad/Southwest
Barbara Scriven	Regional Coordinator, North Central/Sandhills
Jenny Eigenrauch	Consultant, Autism
Rhonda Harrell	Consultant, Behavior Support
Nancy Woytowich	Consultant, Deaf/Hard of Hearing
Ginger Cash	Consultant, Interventions
Anikko Gorham	Consultant, Monitoring
Glendora Hagins,	Consultant, Monitoring
Karen Little	Consultant, Monitoring
Julie Whetzel	Consultant, Monitoring
Valencia Davis	Consultant, Part B IDEA
Kelly Pleasant	Consultant, Pre-School IDEA
Melissa Towery	Consultant, Strategic Planning, Literacy and Math
Antwan Campbell	Specialist, Educational Interpreter
Heather Ouzts	Specialist, Parent Liaison
Lauren Holahan	State-wide Consultant, Occupational Therapy and Medicaid
Laurie Ray	State-wide Consultant, Physical Therapy and Medicaid

Methodology: Program Review

Both qualitative and quantitative data collected through the sources listed below were reviewed and are discussed in this report. They include:

- Student observations and IEP compliance reviews
- Central Office staff interviews
- Related Service Providers' Case Load Reviews and Interviews
- Principal Interviews
- EC Teacher Interviews
- Parent Forum Feedback and Surveys
- Fiscal Monitoring Review

Student Observation and IEP Compliance

Students observed in 19 Chapel Hill-Carrboro City Schools were selected randomly from all disability categories. The only schools that were not visited were the Middle College High School and the UNC Hospital School. The following chart shows the student representation in each eligibility category:

AU	DD	DB	DF	ED	HI	ID MI	ID MO	ID SE	LD	MU	OI	OHI	SI	TBI	VI
16.3%	8.1%	<.1%	<.1%	3.6%	.6%	1.4%	1.4%	.3%	38%	2.6%	.3%	20%	6.7%	.4%	.2%

An analysis of the current population of students with disabilities in CHCCS indicates that 38% are identified in the category of specific learning disability (SLD). Additionally, there are a significant number of students identified in the category of Other Health Impaired and Autism. Students with more significant cognitive impairment and traditionally low-incidence populations comprise a small percentage of the students with disabilities population.

The LEA has approximately 1,260 identified students with a disability (SWD). One hundred fifty-five (155) or twelve point three (12.3%) of the SWD were observed during the program review. Forty percent (40%) of the observations occurred in the general education classroom; fifty-six percent (56%) occurred in the special education classroom and four percent (4%) occurred in other settings. A summary of these observations will be analyzed in the following table.

**It should be noted that the observations were a brief snapshot in time. The results should not be interpreted in the context of sometimes, always or never.*

Commendations	Primary Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 99% of IEPs were current. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 39% of observations showed paraprofessional staff supporting students with instructional and functional tasks.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 76% of observations showed data being collected on IEP goals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 37% of observations during reading, math, and PE showed evidence of programming that demonstrates explicit, systematic, multi-sensory instruction.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 72% of observations showed evidence of IEP goals being addressed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Of 25 co-teaching situations observed, 68% were one-teach, one-assist; 36% were team teaching.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good transition between activities/classrooms was observed throughout the observations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 60% of observations showed differentiated instruction appropriate to the student's level Only 62% of observations showed evidence of accommodations, modifications and/or supplemental aids and services.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good classroom management was frequently observed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At multiple sites, the EC teacher was absent and there was no substitute; staff reported substitutes are not used for EC teachers.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High student engagement and individualized instruction at multiple sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Weak/little evidence of specially designed instruction was observed at multiple sites.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good use of technology throughout the observations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over-staffing with no direct, positive impact on instruction being observed. • Delivery of service time did not always align with the amount of time indicated on the IEP.
---	---

Primary Recommendations

- **The provision of specially designed instruction for all students with disabilities.**
 - **More explicit, direct instruction to address deficit areas for students.**
 - **Instruction should align with goals and deficits indicated on the IEP, including accommodations/modifications.**
 - **Individualized learning should be balanced with electronic devices and peer/group/whole class discussions.**
 - **Stronger co-teaching models should be implemented to support all students.**
- **Review substitute teacher policy to ensure FAPE is provided for all students, all the time.**
- **Review staff to student ratios to ensure appropriate use of personnel.**
- **Clarify roles/need for paraprofessionals in all settings to ensure appropriate utilization of staff.**

Interviews and Surveys

Face-to-face interviews on programming for students with disabilities and general EC processes and procedures were conducted with Building Administrators, EC Teachers, and Central Office Administrators, including the Senior Executive Director and the Superintendent.

Parent surveys were provided electronically in both English and Spanish but only resulted in one response being submitted. A parent forum was held during the visit at two different times, to accommodate working schedules. While the forum had minimal participation (three parents), there was much input, information and many concerns that were shared regarding CHCCS. This information is shared below.

Commendations	Primary Concerns
Central Office Interviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular and ongoing communication within the EC Department • Opportunities for professional development and opportunities for legal updates. • EC Department is looking at baseline data to determine effectiveness of programming and initiatives. • Quarterly benchmarks in place; developing pacing guides. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No systematic way to identify evidence – based practices, initiatives, and instructional methods to implement in CHCCS. • Historically, a lack of training provided in CHCCS on evidence-based practices. • No process established system-wide to measure the effectiveness of programming and initiatives.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using data to drive the support to administrators and teachers. • Principals now serving as LEA for IEP meetings. • Defining roles of Program Facilitators. • Monthly PLCs to analyze/discuss data at the school level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consistent fidelity measures used in CHCCS; little progress monitoring found consistently throughout system. • District wide feeling there is no change needed; demographics have changed and need is evident. • Demographics lend to an unbalanced stakeholder representation.
<p>Building Administrator Interviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers collaborate within PLCs. • Building administrators serving as LEA for IEP meetings. • Lesson plans are expectations for all teachers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not as much push-in services as they would like. • District is in transition aligning to core standards. • Not clear on the role and responsibilities of the Program Facilitators.
<p>Special Education Teacher Interviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heavy emphasis on inclusion/collaborative classes. • Data books utilized for each student. • Facilitators seen as coaches with the revision of their roles this year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate settings classes seem to have little engagement with non-disabled peers in some schools. • Different levels of engagement by teachers in the IEP meeting preparation. • Teachers understanding of basic special education policies and procedures not consistent.
<p>Program Facilitator Interviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SWD participate in general education at some level. • Internal file reviews completed to ensure compliance. • Monthly Facilitator meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a clear understanding of their current role. • Inconsistent understanding of policies and procedures regarding special education services.
<p>Parent Survey/Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much praise and appreciation for teachers and all they do for their children. • Acknowledged the diversity shift that has happened in the community. • Acknowledged that the system tries to be diverse. • Principals who are engaged make a difference. • Contact with Central Office has been positive; quick responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feel they are not represented or welcomed by the SNAC group. • Expressed frustration that diversity is not embraced or acknowledged within CHCCS. (not directed at the EC Division, but the system in general). • There are lots of new, inexperienced teachers system-wide. • Unclear explanations or communications from the schools. Parents feel they are not fully informed, system-wide. • Reported lack of progress reports/difficulty interpreting and understanding these reports. • Dynamics of how children of color are handled is very different. Differences: Color, economic status, who's parents are not highly educated.

Related Services Providers:	Please see Appendix A for the phone interviews that were conducted by Dr. Laurie Ray, Consultant for Physical Therapy, NC DPI/EC Division
-----------------------------	---

Primary Recommendations:

- **Define the role of Program Facilitators**
- **Develop a systematic way to identify evidence –based practices, initiatives, and instructional methods**
- **Establish system-wide measures to determine the effectiveness of programming and initiatives**
- **Ensure access to non-disabled peers is present for all students through meaningful, intentional opportunities.**
- **Strengthen facilitator and teacher knowledge of policies and procedures regarding services for students with disabilities**
- **Establish a parent group that is representative of all students with disabilities in CHCCS; work to encourage more diverse parent involvement in the parent advisory council**

Finance

In order to address the concern regarding exceptional children finances, interviews were conducted with the Finance Director and the EC Senior Executive Director. Valencia Davis, IDEA Consultant, and Sherry Thomas, Assistant Director, conducted the interviews.

Commendations	Primary Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finance Director is available to work with the Senior Executive Director of EC • Budget reports are provided to the Senior Executive Director of EC • Generally, discrepancies between the Budget Analysis Report and BAAS are not found in CHCCS • Always growing and changing to meet the needs of EC Students (as reported by CHCCS) • Ensure that CHCCS meets IDEA MOE yearly • Use variety of funding sources to support transportation costs • Billing Medicaid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PRC 070 carryover does not appear to be reflected in the budget report *Further, ongoing discussion between NCDPI School Business Division, EC Division and CHCCS Finance Director is needed to resolve this issue. **See Addendum B

Primary Recommendations:

- **See the attached Financial Report in Addendum B.**

Summary

The NCDPI ECD thanks Chapel Hill Carrboro City Schools for the invitation to provide feedback on their Department for Exceptional Children. The willingness with which the Central Office staff communicated and shared information allowed the ECD to engage in a thorough review of the program based on the concerns that were voiced. Additionally, building administrators, program facilitators and exceptional children teachers accommodated the NCDPI ECD staff during observations and interviews.

This report reflects the compilation of all data gathered during the two-day visit, as well as follow up through phone interviews with related services providers. In addition to Appendix A, Perry Flynn, Consultant for Speech-Language Pathology reviewed caseload data provided by CHCCS. The review determined that the case load numbers between SLP staff and students is exceptional. Chapel Hill has very low caseloads in SLP. However, based on the data, it appears that most if not all the students received 30 minutes once or twice a week in a pull-out situation. In best practice, this is not viewed as ideal, as it seems uniform rather than individualized.

Analysis of the information collected during the review confirmed Dr. Tate's initial concerns: dismal outcomes in spite of rich human capital/resources for students with disabilities, current structure of technical assistance within the District, budget concern and basic service delivery.

There have been many recommendations made in this report. While some provided direct, clear action, other recommendations relate to data collection and analysis, fidelity and implementation of direct, explicit specially designed instruction, and general system-wide procedures. Models of co-teaching were also identified as a need in the district. Additionally, duties, roles and responsibilities were also identified for some positions in the District. An intended but relevant discovery identified through the parent forum was the indication by parents that they view diversity as an issue in the District. This concern was not expressed specifically toward the EC Department but the District as a whole. Intentionally providing equity and access to all parents through the SNAC will be a way to begin to address this need.

It will be important for CHCCS Central Office leadership to review these recommendations in light of the District Strategic Plan, the LEASA and any other District-wide plan. The Exceptional Children Division recommendations should function as part of the District plan; not separate and apart. To effectively achieve these recommendations, consideration should be given to align all initiatives. During the Central Office interviews, it was clear that the current senior administration is working to develop a District-wide approach to data collection, strategic instruction and growth for all students. It is the intent of the recommendations included in this report to support this developing plan.

Appendix A

CHCCS Lead Related Service Provider Interviews 10/9/17 (& follow up on 10/14 &10/16)

Strengths	Areas for Improvement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSPs very data-minded, conscientious re: documentation • Communication protocols are much clearer, streamlined, consistent • Regular department meetings are really helpful; provide “voice” and “seat” for practitioners • Glad for input prior to or during decision making • Appreciate having a strategic plan • Personnel going okay • Effort to make IEP meetings organized, coherent (including pre-meetings) is appreciated • FTE= 3 PT, 11 OT (1 vacancy), 21 SLP, 10 SP • Making an effort to bring consistency across disciplines; aligning clinical reasoning through peer review (2x/mo SLP, 1x/mo OT, 1x/wk PT) • 1-2 monthly discipline-group meetings supportive of alignment • Coaching model supporting program improvement in EC classes/teachers • Discipline specific peer review prior to placement • Lead OT is a great resource for CHCCS • Transition to PCG was difficult initially but now believe it will assist with the transition to ECATS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of life impacted by high documentation demand; need to review basic requirements (e.g., are objectives required for all students?) • Need to prioritize documentation demands/focus • Local progress monitoring standards don’t necessarily match therapy interventions/areas of student performance • Need TA on how to do therapy PM • PCG documentation cumbersome and not necessarily aligned to local PM standards; duplicative? • Include RSPs in CHCCS PD • Don’t know who to get approval for PD/workshop • Don’t know what their budgets are/what they have to spend on PD, materials, equipment; yet they’re being asked to approve purchase request • Procurement protocols are slow, unclear • Hiring communication breaks down (tech is difficult) • Leave requests/timesheet tracking is convoluted and discipline or site-dependent • Change is constant and sometimes without notice until reprimanded • EC classroom morale low; need good news, highlighting strengths • SLP and OT teams feel stretched • PK and ELL staffing needs continue to be a challenge • Resources/program availability/staff/interventions vary across schools; creates inequity • EC teachers lack Community of Practice/PLC • School psych team struggling with new 504 referral procedure and assisting with facilitator vacancies (scheduling meetings, file creation, etc.)- need infrastructure for IEP management which does not rely on school psychologists
Teacher Interview Questions	
1. Describe how SWD are included in Gen Ed:	

- Based on LRE but what is that? Teams need more education on determining LRE for students. General Education with 1:1 is seen as not restrictive vs. collaborative setting with student independent or reverse inclusion vs. inclusion in General Education, Special Education and some schools embrace inclusion but varies school to school.
- Almost all are in General Education but it varies as they get older; most complex are away from General Education peers in PS, our PS has blended classes, at least 4 EC students in those classes (1/3), not including SI students as EC; in ES many times TA move class to class to afford access to General Education, SLPs are pulling students, co-teaching (mostly with OT or resource teacher), treating in classes; focus on SLP to assist students to access school, work to make a distinction between school provided services and private services
- Most in General Education or in adapted curriculum- ES will go to center or circle time (impressed to see a class going to the lunchroom now), specials/lunch, but less academic unless it is a good fit; HS- included in PE or specials; MS- recess/PE, lunch, specials
- This is pretty broad so I'll try to fully answer this--All students are included in specials and assemblies. Inclusion is a priority at both of the schools that I serve. One of my schools has 2 adapted curriculum classes and they do a wonderful job of ensuring that the students in those classes are incorporated in the general ed classrooms. Scheduling is conducted to ensure that a TA or the teacher herself is with the students in their general ed classes. For resource level students - push in services/inclusion is the model, but with some cases pull out services are required but not the rule. We have a separate setting common core class at one of my schools, those students are pushed back into the gen ed classes as much as possible, and always for specials and assemblies.

2. Tell me how you prepare for an IEP meeting:

- Calling parent and discussing student and specific needs
- Pull data (General & Special Education teachers)
- Draft goals if possible; get input
- Gather data, look at the compilation and performance; primary service SI, easy to chart, more collaborative =more complex. Month prior, review list of challenges and determine priorities for the next year
- Try to call or catch parents at drop off/pick up; shared google doc to draft goal (just school team-voluntary); draft IEP 1 week prior/sent to parents; wrap up data in progress report
-

3. Describe how you collect data on IEP goals for students following extended content standards:

- Depends on goal- extend standards are usually collaborative with teacher collecting data with team input
- Narrative notes, consults, work samples, demonstration, teacher & parent reports, beginning to graph data (we want to be compliant but also practical; changing goals to promote graphing data; prioritizing key data point vs. all data points)
- Alicia has tried to be reasonable; change is varied from team to team
- SLPs collect data on goals they address and work with teachers (who are working to get data but usually rely on RSP); SLPs/OTs as models for data collection; SLPs working to gather data at different points of day vs. same time (literacy time vs. later in the day for other subjects)
- My data is the same regardless of curriculum; in the past, made data sheets that did not get far, talking with instructional staff to collaborate for data points/collection/mode, developing; data in the note and progress report seems a lot because not planned up front with team; @ statewide meeting, lots of ideas for data planning and challenging assumptions & operationalizing all aspects of goal with/for entire team; iPhone and google docs are critical data tools!
- I, as a school psychologist, don't directly collect data toward IEP goals as I'm typically not a direct service provider. However, I typically am involved in IEP meetings as a part of the re-evaluation discussion/IEP and Eligibility/IEP meetings being combined. In this regard, I prepare for IEP meetings by reviewing the file (to include prior assessments), current school/district assessment

data, MTSS data (where relevant) and consulting/collaborating with team members (to include parents) as needed. For initial IEP meetings or those where there is the possibility of a change in placement/category, I conduct parent interviews before the meeting to give the parent time to ask questions in a private setting, and take the time to think things over prior to the meeting with the large team, etc. As a part of my preparation I also may or may not include completing forms - DEC 7 or DEC 3 - depends on whether or not meetings are combined.

4. Tell me about the role of the EC Program Facilitators:

- <Laughs> It really depends; some are really, very good and highly organized, others are not
- This position has noble goals but many facilitators moved from the classroom b/c they did not want to be there and now they are coaching?! Some compliance officers were/are not compliant themselves
- Some are really good, others are maddening
- Perhaps it is a lack of understanding of the role? Or poor fit with position (lack of organization, planning abilities, executive function)?
- My understanding is this role has changed; in the past- compliance, meetings scheduling, coordinating logistics for IEP meetings, facilitated meetings discussions for all types (evaluation results, eligibility, referral, re-evaluation meetings) vs. case mgrs. for annual reviews///Now, program facilitator as coach for EC teachers for goals, data collection, student progress
- I know we are spoiled! My program facilitator is very organized, has excellent relationship with parents, effortless with documentations/forms during meetings. They schedule & lead IEP meetings, progress reports are done, files complete, IEP documentation. Liaison between family and school and doctor for homebound transition. Handle all paperwork, although role may be transitioning.
- For our district, this role is in transition. Historically, the ECPF has scheduled meetings, ensured record/program compliance and served as the LEA at meetings. One of my PF's also helped teachers with writing measurable goals, problem solved with them when students were not making progress on IEP goals, etc. Now with the new model, they are transitioning away from being the person solely responsible for scheduling meetings and the EC teachers are responsible for doing that themselves and the ECPFs are training them to do that, as well as how to complete the forms in CECAS and which forms correspond with which processes, etc. The goal is to move the ECPF role overall from that which is solely focused on scheduling and compliance to a coaching/support model. Across the district different PF's had different skill sets

5. Tell me how you ensure compliance with EC processes:

- Following rules as we understand them
- I provide verbal & written instructions, follow up with open discussions and questions with follow up as needed; ex: we were told to have goals and objectives for all students, now=no, just for students on extended standards. We requested TA document to clarify, received it quickly and it went out, decreasing the conversation. The quick provision, highly responsive central office was a big help
- My leadership style is different from others- I expect competence and am not a tight monitor or punitive leader
- My peers as a group are on top of deadlines, dates using spreadsheet for placements, results, evaluations; good data for their program; keep up with aligning eligibility to referral, rely on others for referrals; Use bi-monthly meetings to clarify confusion, follow up; some difficulty= knowing what is wrong but not in a role to make things happen for compliance; doing detective work that is perhaps not appropriate (screening for referral at face value vs. reviewing full chart and finding AU suspected, or something that would require a full evaluation)

- Follow program facilitators! Big piece of compliance has always been program facilitators; develop google docs to assist and organize (IEP due form/tracker)
- Transitioning students PS→ES sent to APE teachers for screen
- Facilitator (SR) plans out every re-evaluations, IEPs with parents with tentative calendar; PS evaluation team has chart tracking progress available to all PTs
- I help to ensure compliance by 1) being aware of the date referrals are made and tabulating the 90-day timeline for myself so that I ensure my evaluations are done in a timely manner. Also (historically) working with my PF to ensure our dates were consistent and that meetings were scheduled accordingly. I supposed I could say I was another means of checks and balance for my PF.

6. What are your school level administration's expectations for lesson plans? N/A, ensuring there is a Plan of Care in place, including in session note; hoping to purchase Plan of Care through PCG, have modified Plan of Care forms collaboratively

I can't speak to this with great depth except that it is expected that in order for students to learn proper planning of lessons has to take place and that gen ed and EC teachers are to collaborate in order to improve outcomes.

Appendix B

Summary of Chapel Hill-Carrboro Fiscal Review

Fiscal Concerns

Interview with the EC Director yielded several fiscal concerns;

- No carryover in PRC 60
- 11 million budgeted in local yet routinely had to payback PRC 32
- Little flexibility in moving personnel around from budget to budget
- “Broke but should not be”

Interview with the EC Bookkeeper yielded some fiscal concerns;

- She started with CHCCS in 2016-17 and has had little training in financial procedures for CHCCS. She has years of experience in bookkeeping and came with the EC Director from Guilford Co
- \$210,882.94 was left in the PRC 70 budget in 15-16 but the 16-17 budget in BAAS only shows \$45,893.95 carried over –where is the money?

Documents Reviewed

- 2016-17 expenditures for PRC 49, 60, 70, 118, 119, 82, 32
- Budget planning form for all PRCs used by the LEA
- BAAS
- 611 Grant for 2016-17 including MOE

Findings

- The budget planning form does not match the initial budget in BAAS in some instances
 - PRC 60 – No – line items did not match and the total was incorrect
 - PRC 70 - No – line items did not match but the total was correct
 - PRC 118 – ok
 - PRC 119 – ok
 - PRC 82 – ok
 - PRC 49 – ok
- Looking for \$3,250 in 118 for 16-17
- Looking for \$164,988.99 in 70 for 16-17
- Looking for \$169,855.78 unencumbered in 32 (state) for 16-17
- Looking for \$35,967.08 unencumbered in 32 (local) for 16-17
- There appears to be a need for training on the budgeting and budget revision process between EC and Finance
 - This training could include, timelines for getting initial budget plans into BAAS, timelines for getting initial Budget Analysis reports and timelines for requested revisions
 - Develop a time during the year to reconcile Budget Analysis with BAA

The finance officer's response to my questions are below. *Note: Figures came from the expenditure reports received by NC DPI IDEA Consultant from the CHCCS EC Bookkeeper.*

Email dated 10/13/17, Finance Officer CHCCS

To date, BAAS has posted in only \$45,893.35 in PRC070 carryover from 16-17. I have placed an inquiry to XXX in Allotments about the balance of the carryover. I mentioned to XXX and XXX that they should also check in with the program person at DPI to make an inquiry. Sometimes only a portion of carryover is posted by DPI to control the spending and later the balance is posted. I can let you know as soon as we know. I've attached a copy of the final budget analysis for PRC070 which had an unencumbered balance of \$214,835.95. The difference is the sales tax refund we posted in at the end of the year.

I have attached a final copy of the State and Local PRC032 budget analyses. You can see that we zeroed out the State funds (not sure where you got the \$168,855.78 balance). We did not revert any State funds. On the Local side I attached the July Report and the final June 30 Report to show that the district's original Local 032 budget was \$10,868,542, but by the end of the year we had increased the Local allotment to \$11,130,744 which was an increase of \$262,202. My final report shows that we still overspent the Local PRC032 budget by \$12,533.40. Again, I am not sure where you received the numbers you have.

The Board's Local budget allotments do not carryover. We allocate budgets on a fiscal year basis. The Board does allow carryover of fund balance to cover material outstanding purchase orders that are billed by June 30. There were no purchase orders that carried over for EC this past fiscal year.

Each year the EC Program receives a new Local budget allotment that is posted in July and finalized in August once the Board officially approves a budget. The new fiscal year budget allotments will be the same as the continuation budget plus any salary increase dollars and approved expansion requests. I have attached a copy of the current year's Local 032 budget also.

I will get back to you on the Federal carryover funds as soon as I hear from DPI. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Submitted by Valencia Davis, IDEA Consultant
October 2017