

Data Verification Report
 Breckinridge County Schools
 Issued March 2, 2012

General Information	
<i>Type of Report:</i>	Consolidated Monitoring Visit – Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Part B)
<i>Focus Areas Reviewed:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation / Eligibility • Least Restrictive Environment
<i>Data Sources:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of Student Due Process Files
<i>DLS Review Team Members</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gretta Hylton, IDEA Team Leader • Susan Farra, Consultant • Chris Thacker, Systems Consultant IT

Onsite Visit Methodology

The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), Division of Learning Services (DLS) has recently conducted a focused monitoring visit in your district. The focus areas for this review include priorities established by the Kentucky Department of Education. For this monitoring cycle, DLS established the following monitoring priorities:

- Eligibility for students identified for special education and related services
- Least restrictive environment (LRE) documentation.

Your district is one of 14 districts that received an onsite visit during the 2011-12 school year through the KDE Consolidated Monitoring Process.

The IDEA portion of the review was conducted by a team assembled by DLS as specified in the General Information section of this report. In order to complete the compliance review, the team reviewed individual student records.

Districts were directed to make available the pertinent student records randomly selected by the DLS team leader in order to determine the district's compliance status related to the focus areas stated above.

This report contains a section for each priority area reviewed for your district. It also contains "coded" student-specific noncompliance that must be corrected by the district. Individual student names are not provided in the report, due to confidentiality concerns. A separate list with codes and student names will be made available to the Director of Special Education after the issue of this report.

Even though eligibility and LRE are the focus of this report, the team may have noted other concerns when reviewing the student files. KDE is required under its general supervision responsibility to cite districts for IDEA noncompliance that it discovers during the course of monitoring.

Eligibility and Least Restrictive Environment

Records for eligibility were reviewed based upon the requirements outlined in 707 KAR 1:300 (Child find, evaluation and reevaluation), 707 KAR 1:310 (Determination of eligibility) and 707 KAR 1:350, Section 1 (Placement decisions).

The following information outlines specific areas the review team investigated in order to determine compliance with eligibility and LRE requirements.

Data Verification Report
Breckinridge Public Schools
Issued March 2, 2012

Referral and Classroom Interventions

The review team assessed the district's compliance with 707 KAR 1:300 Section 3 as it pertains to ensuring that each child has been provided appropriate instruction and intervention services prior, or as a part of the referral process. The instruction and intervention services must include:

- Relevant research-based instruction and intervention services in regular education settings, with the instruction provided by qualified personnel;
- Data-based documentation of repeated assessments of achievement or measures of behavior which are collected and evaluated at reasonable intervals, reflecting systematic assessment of student progress during instruction; and
- Results having been provided to the child's parents.

Adverse Effect

For all disability categories, the Kentucky IDEA regulations require the ARC to document discussion of the adverse effect of the disability on the child's educational performance. Adverse effect means that the progress of the child is impeded by the disability to the extent that the child's educational performance is significantly and consistently below the level of similar aged peers. 707 KAR 1:002, Section 1(2).

Autism

Autism as defined by 707 KAR 1:002, means a developmental disability significantly affecting and nonverbal communication and social interaction, generally evident before age three (3) that adversely affects a child's educational performance. Other characteristics often associated with autism are engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements, resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines, and unusual responses to sensory experiences. The term shall not apply if a child's educational performance is adversely affected primarily because the child has an emotional-behavior disability.

Developmental Delay (DD)

Developmental Delay as defined by 707 KAR 1:002, means that a child within the ages of three and eight has not acquired skills, or achieved commensurate with recognized performance expectations for his age in one or more of the following developmental areas: cognition, communication, motor development, social-emotional development, or self-help-adaptive behavior. Developmental Delay includes a child who demonstrates a measurable, verifiable discrepancy between expected performance for the child's chronological age and current level of performance. The discrepancy shall be documented by:

- Scores of two standard deviations or more below the mean in one of the areas listed above as obtained using norm-referenced instruments and procedures;
- Scores of one and one-half standard deviations below the mean in two or more of the areas listed above using norm-referenced instruments and procedures; or
- The professional judgment of the ARC that there is a significant atypical or pattern of development. Professional judgment shall only be used where normal scores are inconclusive and the ARC documents in a written report the reasons for concluding that a child has a developmental delay.

Data Verification Report
Breckinridge Public Schools
Issued March 2, 2012

Emotional – Behavioral Disability (EBD)

Emotional – behavior disability as defined by 707 KAR 1:002, means that a child, when provided with interventions to meet instructional and social-emotional needs, continues to exhibit one (1) or more of the following, when compared to the child’s peer and cultural reference groups, across settings, over a long period of time and to a marked degree:

- Severe deficits in social competence or appropriate behavior which cause an inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with adults or peers;
- Severe deficits in academic performance which are not commensurate with the student’s ability level and are not solely a result of intellectual, sensory, or other health factors but are related to the child’s social-emotional problem;
- A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression; or
- A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems.

This term does not apply to children who display isolated (not necessarily one (1)) inappropriate behaviors that are the result of willful, intentional, or wanton actions unless it is determined through the evaluations process that the child does have an emotional-behavioral disability.

Functional Mental Disabilities

Per 707 KAR 1:002 Section 1, (37) in order for a child to be eligible under the functional mental disability (FMD) category the following criteria must exist:

- Cognitive functioning is at least three (3) or more standard deviations below the mean;
- Adaptive behavior deficit is at least three (3) or more standard deviations below the mean;
- A severe deficit exists in overall academic performance including acquisition, retention and application of knowledge; and
- Manifestation is typically during the developmental period

Mild Mental Disabilities

Per 707 KAR 1:002 Section 1, (37) in order for a child to be eligible under the mild mental disability (MMD) category the following criteria must exist:

- Cognitive functioning is at least two (2) but no more than three (3) standard deviations below the mean;
- Adaptive behavior deficit is at least two (2) standard deviations below the mean;
- A severe deficit exists in overall academic performance including acquisition, retention and application of knowledge; and
- Manifestation is typically during the developmental period.

Data Verification Report
Breckinridge Public Schools
Issued March 2, 2012

Multiple Disabilities

According to 707 KAR 1:002, Section 1 (39), multiple disabilities (MD) means “concomitant impairments that have an adverse effect on the child’s educational performance, the combination of which causes severe educational needs that cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for one (1) of the impairments. Examples of MD include mental disability-blindness, and mental disability-orthopedic impairment. Multiple Disabilities does not mean deaf-blindness nor does it mean a speech or language impairment in combination with another category of disability.”

Based upon the requirement that the impairments must cause “severe educational needs” that cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for one of the impairments, the DLS team must verify the student met eligibility requirements for all disability areas constituting the multiple disability. DLS must also look for verification that the student’s educational needs could not be met solely in a special education program for one of the impairments.

Examples of disability combinations that triggered increased scrutiny include OHI (ADHD)/EBD, OHI/MMD and OHI/SLD. In addition, some disability categories contain exclusionary factors which would ordinarily preclude some disability combinations. This includes combinations such as MMD/FMD, MMD/SLD and EBD/SLD.

Each file was considered by the review team on a case by case basis considering all data available to the team.

Other Health Impairment

Other Health Impairment (OHI), as defined by 707 KAR 1:002, Section 1 (42) means having limited strength, vitality or alertness, including a heightened alertness to environmental stimuli, that results in limited alertness with respect to the educational environment that:

- Is due to a chronic or acute health problem and
- Adversely effects a child’s educational performance

The review team paid particular attention to ARC discussions of how the identified health impairment affects the child’s educational performance. In cases where this is not documented by the ARC as required by the regulations, the DLS Review Team found the district to be out of compliance with IDEA.

Specific Learning Disability

Specific Learning Disability (SLD) is defined by 707 KAR 1:002 Section 1 (59) as a disorder that adversely effects the ability to acquire, comprehend, or apply reading, mathematical, writing, reasoning, listening, or speaking skills to the extent that specially designed instruction is required to benefit from education. The term does not include deficits that are the result of other primary determinant or disabling factors such as:

- Vision;
- Hearing;
- Motor impairment;
- Mental disability;
- Emotional-behavioral disability;
- Environmental or economic disadvantaged;
- Cultural factors;

Data Verification Report
Breckinridge Public Schools
Issued March 2, 2012

- Limited English proficiency; or
- Lack of relevant research-based instruction in the deficit area

The review team also considered the requirements of 707 KAR 3:10 Section 2 in evaluating compliance for eligibility under the SLD category. Examples of required documentation include:

- Appropriate instruction provided in regular education settings;
- Repeated assessments of achievement at reasonable levels reflecting formal assessment of student progress during instruction;
- Relevant behavior noted during observation(s) and relationship of that behavior to the child's academic functioning (Note: 707 KAR 1:310 Section 1(i) states "behavioral observations" meaning more than one);
- Educationally relevant medical findings, if any; or
- Whether the child does not achieve commensurate with the child's age and ability

Speech and Language Impairment

Speech and Language Impairment (SLI) is defined by 707 KAR 1:280 Section 1 (60) as a communication disorder, including stuttering, impaired articulation, a language impairment, delayed acquisition of language or an absence of language that adversely effects a child's educational performance.

The DLS Monitoring Team used the guidelines included in the Kentucky Eligibility Guidelines – Revised (KEG-R) document as an outline for determining compliance with eligibility for special education services under the SLI category.

Although the KEG-R is no longer referenced in the Kentucky Administrative Regulations (KAR), the KEG provides a systematic method for ensuring that all Kentucky Administrative Regulations pertinent to eligibility have been met and that there is consistency across the state.

Whether or not the district uses the KEG-R document, the district must ensure that all eligibility requirements have been met.

Least Restrictive Environment

As outlined in 707 KAR 1:350, Section 1, the DLS Review Team verified documentation by reviewing documentation of Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) considerations by the ARC. In making the determination of the setting in which a student's IEP is to be implemented, the district must ensure:

- Special classes, separate schooling, or other removal from the regular education environment occurs only if education in the regular education environment with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be satisfactorily achieved due to the nature or severity of the disability.
- A continuum of alternative placements is available to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related services
- A child with a disability is not removed from education in age-appropriate regular classrooms solely because of needed modifications in the general curriculum.

Data Verification Report
Breckinridge Public Schools
Issued March 2, 2012

Summary of KDE Team's Findings and District Compliance Status

The team reviewed current conference summaries and IEPs to ensure these regulatory requirements were met. Any concerns noted in this area are specified in the student-specific feedback below.

Table 1 on the following pages displays the results from the individual *Compliance Record Review Documents* used by the KDE Review Team to determine the status of the student records reviewed. See Appendix A at the end this report for a list of the items reviewed. Under separate cover the Director of Special Education will receive the names of each student in order to match the code used in the table with the student record.

Table 1 – *Compliance Record Review Results*

(See Following 3 Pages)

Data Verification Report
 Breckinridge Public Schools
 Issued March 2, 2012

Entered	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Item	Student 1	Student 2	Student 3	Student 4	Student 5	Student 6	Student 7	Student 8	Student 9	Student 10
Disability	EBD	MMD	EBD	DD	SL	SLD	MMD	OHI	OHI	AUT
52	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
53	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
61	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
61a	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
61a(1)										
61b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
61b(1)										
61b(2)										
61b(3)										
61c	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
61c(1)										
61c(2)										
61c(3)										
62	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
62(1)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
62(2)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
62(3)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
63	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
64	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
65	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
66	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
67	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
68	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
69a	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
69a(1)										
69a(2)										
69a(3)										
69a(4)										
69b	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
69b(1)										
69b(2)										
Eligibility	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Eligibility Concerns by Item Number	No Eligibility Determination Documented			3, 6		2A, 6, 7, 10		3, 6	1, 2, 3, 6	
Items Found Non-Compliant	7	0	2	3	1	1	0	3	5	0
Items Found Compliant	3	10	8	7	9	9	10	7	5	10
Measured Items	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Student Compliance Rate	30.00%	100.00%	80.00%	70.00%	90.00%	90.00%	100.00%	70.00%	50.00%	100.00%
Student Corrections Required?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No

Data Verification Report
 Breckinridge Public Schools
 Issued March 2, 2012

Entered	YES	YES	YES	YES						
Item	Student 11	Student 12	Student 13	Student 14	Student 15	Student 16	Student 17	Student 18	Student 19	Student 20
Disability	SLD	SL	MMD	AUT	OHI	MD	SLD	FMD	MD	OHI
52	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
53	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
61	NA	NA	NA	NA						
61a	NA	NA	NA	NA						
61a(1)										
61b	NA	NA	NA	NA						
61b(1)										
61b(2)										
61b(3)										
61c	NA	NA	NA	NA						
61c(1)										
61c(2)										
61c(3)										
62	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
62(1)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
62(2)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
62(3)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
63	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
64	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
65	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
66	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
67	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
68	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes						
69a	NA	NA	NA	NA						
69a(1)										
69a(2)										
69a(3)										
69a(4)										
69b	NA	NA	NA	NA						
69b(1)										
69b(2)										
Eligibility	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eligibility Concerns by Item Number						1	Transfer from Hardin Co			
Items Found Non-Compliant	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
Items Found Compliant	10	10	10	10	8	9	9	10	10	10
Measured Items	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Student Compliance Rate	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	80.00%	90.00%	90.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%
Student Corrections Required?	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No

Data Verification Report
 Breckinridge Public Schools
 Issued March 2, 2012

Records:	20					Types of Records by Disability	
Item	NA	Non-Compliant	Compliant	Measured Items	Percent Compliant	Disability	Count
52	0	2	18	20	90.00%	AUT	2
53	0	6	14	20	70.00%	DB	0
61	20	0	0	0	NA	DD	1
61a	20	0	0	0	NA	EBD	2
61a(1)	0	0	0	0	0.00%	FMD	1
61b	20	0	0	0	NA	HI	0
61b(1)	0	0	0	0	0.00%	MD	2
61b(2)	0	0	0	0	0.00%	MMD	3
61b(3)	0	0	0	0	0.00%	OHI	4
61c	20	0	0	0	NA	OI	0
61c(1)	0	0	0	0	0.00%	SL	2
61c(2)	0	0	0	0	0.00%	SLD	3
61c(3)	0	0	0	0	0.00%	TBI	0
62	0	2	18	20	90.00%	VI	0
62(1)	0	2	18	20	90.00%	TOTAL	20
62(2)	0	2	18	20	90.00%		
62(3)	0	2	18	20	90.00%		
63	0	3	17	20	85.00%		
64	0	2	18	20	90.00%		
65	0	1	19	20	95.00%		
66	0	0	20	20	100.00%		
67	0	1	19	20	95.00%		
68	0	3	17	20	85.00%		
69a	20	0	0	0	NA		
69a(1)	0	0	0	0	0.00%		
69a(2)	0	0	0	0	0.00%		
69a(3)	0	0	0	0	0.00%		
69a(4)	0	0	0	0	0.00%		
69b	20	0	0	0	NA		
69b(1)	0	0	0	0	0.00%		
69b(2)	0	0	0	0	0.00%		
Eligibility	0	6	14	20	70.00%		
Districtwide All Items Measured All Records							
		Compliant Records	Items Measured	Percent of Items Compliant			
		174	200	87.00%			
Student Records 100% Compliant							
		Compliant Student Folders	Folders Reviewed	Percent of Records Compliant			
		10	20	50.00%			

Data Verification Report
 Breckinridge Public Schools
 Issued March 2, 2012

Table 2 – Student Specific Feedback

Student Specific Feedback	
Student 1	<p>This student transferred into the district from another state at the start of the 2011-2012 school year. While there is evidence that the student had an evaluation completed in another state, the only ARC Notice to the parents was to develop, review, revise and IEP and make placement decisions. The section of the ARC Conference Summary that documents eligibility or continued eligibility was left blank. There was no documentation in the folder that the ARC ever reviewed evaluation information to determine if the child met eligibility criteria for eligibility in Kentucky.</p> <p>The Conference Summary lacks specificity in explanation of why the student's needs could not be met in general education classroom.</p> <p>The LRE cannot be contingent upon the student's behavior on any given occasions. It must be established and implemented by the ARC. Any and all changes must occur within the purview of the ARC.</p>
Student 2	File is in compliance for eligibility and LRE.
Student 3	<p>Student is removed from general education "every time he is defiant or disruptive" despite 2011 re-evaluation data reflecting low average/average academic scores.</p> <p>The LRE cannot be contingent upon the student's behavior on any given occasions. It must be established and implemented by the ARC. Any and all changes must occur within the purview of the ARC.</p> <p>Little triangulation of data to determine adverse effect was present. There is conflicting information regarding adverse effect based on classroom observations.</p>
Student 4	<p>No documentation of LRE considerations was evident in the student file.</p> <p>No documentation of adverse effect was evident in the student file, including how the disability affects the student's performance to be significantly and consistently below that of same aged peers.</p>
Student 5	<p>Re-evaluation was not completed within 3 years as required.</p> <p>Student's evaluation plan is inconsistent with the evaluations that were conducted.</p>
Student 6	Little triangulation of data to determine adverse effect was present.
Student 7	File is in compliance for eligibility and LRE.
Student 8	<p>ARC meeting was held to discuss change of placement due to behavioral concerns. Provided documentation lacks specificity in explanation as to why the student's needs could not be met in general education classroom.</p> <p>Little triangulation of data to determine adverse effect was evident in the student file.</p>

Data Verification Report
 Breckinridge Public Schools
 Issued March 2, 2012

Student Specific Feedback	
Student 9	<p>Student is receiving services under the eligibility category of OHI. The ARC does not document limited strength, vitality, or alertness and does not discuss the impact on educational performance. No documentation of adverse effect was evident in the student file, including how the disability affects the student's performance to be significantly and consistently below that of similar aged peers.</p> <p>LRE section of conference summary states "Due to academic reasons student is in a full-time resource setting. Setting will be changed next year." Lacks specificity in explanation of why the student's needs could not be met in general education classroom.</p> <p>LRE cannot be predetermined. It is to be determined at <u>each</u> ARC meeting.</p>
Student 10	File is in compliance for eligibility and LRE requirements.
Student 11	Lacks specificity in explanation of why the student's needs could not be met in general education classroom.
Student 12	File is in compliance for eligibility and LRE requirements.
Student 13	File is in compliance for eligibility and LRE requirements.
Student 14	File is in compliance for eligibility and LRE requirements.
Student 15	Lacks specificity in explanation of why the student's needs could not be met in general education classroom.
Student 16	Child is receiving services as MD as their eligibility category. However, one of the eligibility sheets was not completed, so there is no documentation of there being a qualifying disability of MD at that time. Re-evaluation for MD in 2011 stated only that the student continued to be MD eligible. 2011 eligibility sheet was complete but had no new information other than a reference to a medical diagnosis.
Student 17	<p>Student was a transfer student. Documentation or information regarding evaluation planning for determining eligibility was not evident in the student file.</p> <p>An evaluation planning form or parental consent for evaluation was not evident in the file. Unable to determine if evaluation plan matches what was actually assessed in multi-disciplinary evaluation report dated November 16, 2010.</p>
Student 18	Lacks specificity in explanation of why the student's needs could not be met in general education classroom.
Student 19	Student file is in compliance for eligibility and LRE requirements.
Student 20	Student file is in compliance for eligibility and LRE requirements.

Data Verification Report
Breckinridge Public Schools
Issued March 2, 2012

The district is cited relative to student-specific violations related to placement decisions/LRE (707 KAR 1:350)

The district is cited relative to student-specific violations related to evaluation/reevaluation (707 KAR 1:300).

The district is cited relative to student-specific violations related to determination of eligibility (707 KAR 1:310).

Corrective Action Plan Requirements

707 KAR 1:380 specifies that, after an off-site or on-site review, KDE must issue a written report. Deficiencies (instances of noncompliance) specified in the report shall be the basis for the district to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) for review and approval by KDE. The district has the opportunity to submit additional information or to verify or clarify issues related to the report (prior to the development of the CAP).

Each CAP must be monitored and enforced by KDE.

The district must submit its CAP to KDE no later than 30 business days after the district receives the report. Business day means Monday through Friday except for federal and state holidays as defined by 707 KAR 1:002 (6).

The CAP must include:

- A statement of the matter to be corrected
- The steps the LEA shall take to correct the problem and document compliance

DLS will send a CAP template to the Director of Special Education for development of the district's CAP.

Within 30 business days of receiving the CAP, KDE must notify the district of the status of the CAP. If KDE rejects the CAP, the district has up to 15 business days to submit a new CAP. A CAP, once approved by KDE must be monitored and is an official document requiring the district to meet the specified activities.

KDE will not initiate further sanctions during the time period specified in the CAP unless requested by the district. Any noncompliance found during monitoring must be corrected within one year. The U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) specifies the one-year timeline runs from the date KDE notifies the district in writing of the noncompliance until KDE notifies the district in writing that the noncompliance has been corrected.

Data Verification Report
Breckinridge Public Schools
Issued March 2, 2012

Student Level and Systemic Noncompliance

KDE tracks findings of noncompliance and requires correction at the individual student level as required by OSEP. KDE also looks for compliance at a systemic level. For the purposes of KDE monitoring, *systemic* means findings of noncompliance where related issue(s) are occurring more than once. Examples might include:

- Noncompliance across disability categories where documentation of interventions and appropriate research-based instruction did not occur prior to referral.
- The use of only one classroom behavior observation (subsequent to September 7, 2010).

In cases where systemic noncompliance is noted, the district must not only correct the individual student files as necessary, but must also determine the cause(es) for the noncompliance and take steps in the CAP to correct these issues.

Table 3 below includes any student-specific issues that must be addressed through the CAP process. Table 4 includes any systemic issues that must also be addressed.

The district shall be required to submit corrective action plan status reports using the space provided in the electronic CAP template on a quarterly basis to the DLS Team Leader. It is strongly recommended that the district submit copies of student-specific corrections as they occur in order for the team leader to review and provide timely feedback to the district.

Data Verification Report
 Breckinridge Public Schools
 Issued March 2, 2012

Table 3

Required Student-Specific Corrective Action, if Applicable	
Student 1	<p>The ARC must be convened to review existing data to determine if there is sufficient documentation to confirm triangulated data showing an adverse effect caused by the disability that is significantly and consistently below that of similar-aged peers.</p> <p>If so, the adverse effect must be explicitly stated by the ARC. If no adverse effect can be determined, the ARC must release the student from special education.</p> <p>The ARC must determine and appropriately document LRE considerations for the student.</p>
Student 2	None required
Student 3	<p>The ARC must be convened to review existing data to determine if there is sufficient documentation to confirm triangulated data showing an adverse effect caused by the disability that is significantly and consistently below that of similar-aged peers.</p> <p>If so, the adverse effect must be explicitly stated by the ARC. If no adverse effect can be determined, the ARC must release the student from special education.</p> <p>The ARC must determine and appropriately document LRE considerations for the student.</p>
Student 4	<p>The ARC must be convened to review existing data to determine if there is sufficient documentation to confirm triangulated data showing an adverse effect caused by the disability that is significantly and consistently below that of similar-aged peers.</p> <p>If so, the adverse effect must be explicitly stated by the ARC. If no adverse effect can be determined, the ARC must release the student from special education.</p> <p>The ARC must determine and appropriately document LRE considerations for the student.</p>
Student 5	<p>The ARC must be convened to review existing data to determine if there is sufficient documentation to confirm triangulated data showing an adverse effect caused by the disability that is significantly and consistently below that of similar-aged peers.</p> <p>If so, the adverse effect must be explicitly stated by the ARC. If no adverse effect can be determined, the ARC must release the student from special education.</p> <p>The ARC must determine and appropriately document LRE considerations for the student.</p>

Data Verification Report
 Breckinridge Public Schools
 Issued March 2, 2012

Required Student-Specific Corrective Action, if Applicable	
Student 6	<p>The ARC must be convened to review existing data to determine if there is sufficient documentation to confirm triangulated data showing an adverse effect caused by the disability that is significantly and consistently below that of similar-aged peers.</p> <p>If so, the adverse effect must be explicitly stated by the ARC. If no adverse effect can be determined, the ARC must release the student from special education.</p>
Student 7	None required.
Student 8	The ARC must determine and appropriately document LRE considerations for the student.
Student 9	<p>The ARC must be convened to review existing data to determine if there is sufficient documentation to confirm triangulated data showing an adverse effect caused by the disability that is significantly and consistently below that of similar-aged peers.</p> <p>If so, the adverse effect must be explicitly stated by the ARC. If no adverse effect can be determined, the ARC must release the student from special education.</p> <p>The ARC must determine and appropriately document LRE considerations for the student.</p>
Student 10	None required.
Student 11	The ARC must determine and appropriately document LRE considerations for the student.
Student 12	None required.
Student 13	None required.
Student 14	None required.
Student 15	The ARC must determine and appropriately document LRE considerations for the student.
Student 16	<p>The ARC must be convened to review existing data to determine if there is sufficient documentation to confirm triangulated data showing an adverse effect caused by the disability that is significantly and consistently below that of similar-aged peers.</p> <p>If so, the adverse effect must be explicitly stated by the ARC. If no adverse effect can be determined, the ARC must release the student from special education.</p>
Student 17	<p>The ARC must be convened to review existing data to determine if there is sufficient documentation to confirm triangulated data showing an adverse effect caused by the disability that is significantly and consistently below that of similar-aged peers.</p> <p>If so, the adverse effect must be explicitly stated by the ARC. If no adverse effect can be determined, the ARC must release the student from special education.</p>

Data Verification Report
 Breckinridge Public Schools
 Issued March 2, 2012

Required Student-Specific Corrective Action, if Applicable	
Student 18	The ARC must determine and appropriately document LRE considerations for the student.
Student 19	None required.
Student 20	None required.

Table 4

Required Corrective Action Steps to Address Systemic Noncompliance, if Applicable
<p>Prior to the correction of individual student files, the district must obtain KDE-approved training for the Director of Special Education, District Special Education Consultants, ARC Chairpersons, evaluation personnel, and special education providers to cover the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • district evaluation procedures • eligibility requirements • LRE consideration requirements <p>The training(s) must be conducted and evidence provided to KDE no later than August 31, 2012.</p>
<p>The district must develop and implement a system of random record reviews of no less than 10% of the special education enrollment.</p> <p>A summary of record reviews and corrections of noncompliance must be provided to KDE quarterly until the CAP has been deemed by KDE to be completed.</p>
<p>On a quarterly basis, the district shall provide written documentation to KDE showing the progress being made by the district in correcting eligibility and LRE issues. This documentation shall include, but is not limited to, copies of ARC evaluation planning meeting summaries, evaluation reports, eligibility determination meeting documents, and revised IEPs.</p>