

IDEA Part B Programmatic Monitoring Procedures

Special Education Services



West Virginia DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION

Effective August, 21, 2023

(updated for clerical issues 01/25/2024)



West Virginia Board of Education
2023-2024

L. Paul Hardesty, President
Nancy J. White, Vice President
F. Scott Rotruck, Financial Officer

Robert W. Dunlevy, Member
Victor L. Gabriel, Member
Daniel D. Snively, M.D., Member
Christopher A. Stansbury, O.D., Member
Debra K. Sullivan, Member
James S. Wilson, D.D.S., Member

Sarah Armstrong Tucker, Ph.D., Ex Officio
Chancellor

West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission
West Virginia Council for Community and Technical College Education

Michele L. Blatt, Ex Officio
State Superintendent of Schools
West Virginia Department of Education

IDEA Part B Programmatic Monitoring Procedures

Overview

States have a responsibility under federal law to have a system of general supervision to monitor the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) of 2004. The main purpose of the system is to monitor the implementation of IDEA by local educational agencies (LEAs), which are defined as a traditional public school district or public charter school. Using this system, states are accountable for enforcing requirements and ensuring continuous improvement. This system is designed to: a) improve educational results for students with disabilities and b) ensure compliance with federal and state regulations.

Public educational agencies responsible for special education and related services must abide by West Virginia State laws, policies, procedures, as well as federal regulations for IDEA Parts B and C. This includes the requirement for public charter schools to comply with Policy 2419, West Virginia's required implementation of IDEA Part B.

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide information that will be useful in understanding and preparing for special education monitoring conducted by the West Virginia Department of Education (WVDE), Office of Federal Programs & Support, Special Education Services (Special Education Team). The consistent implementation of monitoring procedures and practices allows monitoring teams to evaluate and document LEA adherence to IDEA by focusing on improving results and outcomes for children with disabilities and ensuring that public agencies meet the requirements of IDEA.

Objectives:

- » Increase results for students with exceptionalities by assisting the LEA in identifying potential root causes of low performance.
- » Provide information to the LEA to assure continued procedural compliance with state and federal laws and procedures and share strategies for improvement planning.
- » Review and evaluate critical elements of the LEA's special education services based upon the requirements of IDEA; W.Va. Code §18-20; Policy 2419: Regulations for the Education of Students with Exceptionalities, and State Performance Plan (SPP) Indicators.
- » Identify any child specific and/or systemic noncompliance related to students with exceptionalities.

Accountability and Monitoring

The WVDE special education team implements a tiered system of accountability and support to ensure all LEAs meet the requirements of IDEA. This system includes the following levels of monitoring:

- » Cyclical Monitoring (Universal)
- » Differentiated Monitoring (Universal)
- » Risk-Based Monitoring (Targeted)
- » Focused Monitoring (Intensive)
- » Special Circumstance Reviews (Intensive)

Cyclical Monitoring (Universal)

The WVDE special education team conducts universal cyclical monitoring on a four-year rotation to ensure that every LEA receives an on-site visit at least once every four years. Cyclical monitoring ensures that each LEA is examined regularly for compliance and results based on federal and state special education regulations.

The purpose of cyclical monitoring is to collect information and provide support for continuous improvement in results for students with disabilities, while simultaneously assuring compliance with IDEA and state special education regulations. The monitoring team will use data to select schools to visit in each LEA, determine interviewees, and identify areas that may need closer examination. While conducting the on-site review, the monitoring team will document findings of noncompliance and discuss the findings at the exit conference. The monitoring team will prepare a written report to be issued within 60 calendar days of the exit conference.

Cyclical monitoring procedures have been established so the on-site review process evaluates implementation of special education regulations in a uniform, consistent, unbiased, and expert manner. Monitors include employees of the WVDE, and guest monitors invited by WVDE staff.

Appendix A provides the tentative monitoring cycle on a four-year rotation. This is subject to realignment if risk factors make a more immediate monitoring review necessary in specific LEAs.

LEAs selected for cyclical monitoring will be identified as low, medium, high, or very high based on their risk determination for potential noncompliance. LEAs will receive differentiated monitoring based on their risk assessment classification (see Appendix G). Each LEA is notified of the upcoming monitoring visit and invited to a training and informational session to provide guidance and support to prepare for the monitoring visit. To review the LEA's special education program in its entirety, monitoring activities will include a monitoring entrance letter and on-site schedule, student file review, desk review, virtual entrance meeting, interviews, classroom observations, student input, parent input, exit meeting, and the LEA monitoring report.

The following charts describe the on-site monitoring process for the LEA:

<i>Low and Medium Risk</i>	
Day 1	Virtual entrance meeting
Day 2	Elementary & middle school on-site visit
Day 3	AM: High school on-site visit PM: Exit conference at central office or virtually on Day 4
Day 4	Used at the discretion of the monitoring team, as needed

High and Very High Risk	
Day 1	Virtual entrance meeting
Day 2	Elementary & middle school on-site visit
Day 3	AM: High school on-site visit PM: Exit conference at central office or virtually on Day 4
Day 4	Used at the discretion of the monitoring team, as needed

Monitoring Entrance Letter and Schedule

The LEA's superintendent will receive an entrance letter with a schedule of monitoring activities approximately one month prior to the on-site monitoring review. The LEA special education director will receive a list of student-WVEIS numbers that will be accessed for the IEP file reviews. The lead monitor will access the current IEPs directly from the WVEIS online IEP system as of the date on the entrance letter to ensure an accurate representation of county procedures and compliance. For each LEA review, WVDE conducts on-site visits for at least: one elementary school, one middle school, and one high school. Each selected school must upload required information specified in an email sent to the LEA special education director. Information requested will include at a minimum the following:

- » List of special education providers and their daily schedule, including student rosters per period;
- » Related service providers and their daily schedule, including student rosters per period;
- » School bell-to-bell schedule;
- » WVEIS condensed master schedules for middle/high schools highlighting special education teachers and co-teaching classrooms; and
- » School map with special education classrooms highlighted.

In addition to the file review and on-site activities, the monitoring process also includes a desk review. All desk review documentation will be due to the WVDE special education team at least one week prior to the monitoring visit.

Student File Reviews

The special education team will review randomly selected student files based on the size of student enrollment as identified in the end-of-year data collection for special education students:

District Enrollment <i>(based on the 2nd month report including gifted)</i>	General IEP File Review	Transition File Review	Discipline File Review	Summary of Performance
(0-1500)	15	10	10	5
(1501-3000)	20	15	10	5
(3001-4500)	25	20	10	5

The IEPs reviewed will be the most current IEP as of the date of the notification letter. Appendix B contains the File Review Checklists which will be used to assess IEP compliance using the WVEIS IEP Program. LEAs **must upload** the following with each IEP selected:

- » Meeting notice, signed attendance page from the two most recent IEPs, signed prior written notice including, if appropriate, information related to any amendment for the current IEP;
- » If the IEP was developed in conjunction with an initial or reevaluation, the eligibility committee documentation, (i.e., Reevaluation Determination Plan, Parental Consent, EC Report, Eligibility Determination Checklist);
- » Permission to invite outside agency, when appropriate; and,
- » Personalized Education Plan (PEP) and any other requested documentation (schedule, transcript, etc.) to verify alignment with the transition section of IEP.

Desk Review

The following items **must be uploaded** to the WVDE as part of the special education team desk review (Appendix C):

- » five most recent purchase orders, including requisitions, invoices and cut check for payment (please upload in this order);
- » latest financial audit report (special education component only);
- » LEA Plan/budget spreadsheet with names of all staff paid using federal IDEA funds, documentation includes the most recently completed time and effort documentation;
- » documentation of private school consultation;
- » most current job postings for long term substitutes;
- » school bell to bell schedules and requested bus schedules for schools visited during monitoring;
- » Appropriate documentation for Sign Support Specialists and Interpreters to include waiver requests and a two-year professional development plan, when appropriate, as well as Interpreter 1 renewals and Interpreter 2 certifications;
- » If a waiver for the newly implemented audio in self-contained restroom has been secured, please upload a copy of your approved waiver;
- » five summary of performance documents for students who graduated or aged out during the previous school year; and
- » WVEIS Discipline Report with names of the last 10 students with disabilities suspended beyond 10 days (up to 10 files maximum including current and previous school year as necessary).

The following items will also be reviewed using data maintained at the WVDE:

- » WVEIS caseload report (unduplicated caseloads to include all special education teachers and related-service providers),
- » list of all special education providers with corresponding certification.

Entrance Call or Conference

LEAs will participate in an entrance call or conference at least one day prior to the on-site school visits. The entrance call will take approximately 45 minutes to complete and will include the LEA special education director reviewing the LEA's Targeted Systemic Improvement Plan (TSIP) as summarized on the Improving Results for Students with Disabilities Worksheet (Appendix D). This presentation should not exceed 20 minutes. WVDE monitors will review the upcoming on-site schedule, the special education monitoring on-site preparation list (Appendix E) and will be available

to answer questions as needed. Following the completion of the entrance call, the lead monitor will call the LEA special education director to conduct an interview.

Interviews

Interview questions are designed to collect information regarding the LEA's special education programming through the responses of educators, administrators, parents, and students either in a panel discussion or individual interviews. A panel of teachers will be selected for each school by the WVDE monitoring team. Baseline questions are utilized to help guide team members during the interview process. The monitoring team is seeking informal responses that demonstrate clear understanding of special education processes rather than rehearsed answers, therefore additional questions may be included during the interview when appropriate.

Classroom Observations

School walk-throughs and classroom observations are other components used to gather evidence that will support or disprove monitoring findings. During the walk-throughs and classroom observations, the monitoring team will review instructional practices, the level of student engagement, content of teacher lesson plans, determine whether technology is available and utilized, as well as assess whether classroom locations and work areas are comparable to general education classrooms. In addition, required cameras in self-contained classrooms will be checked for functionality, unobstructed views of the entire classroom, and compliance with viewing requirements as per §18-20-10.

Prior to the school visits, principals should notify staff to have a physical or electronic copy of lesson plans available in the classroom for the team to review during classroom observations. Based on the observation results, specific questions may be formulated to gather additional information or clarification during the on-site visit.

Student Focus Group

Student input is an important tool that can help provide the special education team with information from a variety of perspectives regarding the LEA's special education programs. Monitoring visits will include a student focus group at the high school with students randomly selected for participation in a group discussion.

Prior to the on-site visit, the monitoring team will notify the LEA special education director to:

- » Secure an accessible room for the student meeting at the high school

Parent Focus Group

Parents are an integral part of the successful education process. Monitoring visits will include parent input via a survey followed by an opportunity for any interested parent to participate in a face-to-face meeting. This is an important tool that can help provide information from a variety of perspectives regarding the LEA's special education programs.

Prior to the on-site visit, the monitoring team will notify the LEA special education director to:

- » Disseminate a parent survey; and
- » Secure an accessible room for the parent meeting at the high school

At the parent meeting, monitoring team members will:

- » Introduce all team members;
- » Monitor time allotted for each question or topic related to special education;
- » Act as a facilitator;
- » Keep the discussions focused; and,
- » Provide parents with information and resources, as appropriate

LEA Monitoring Report and Corrections of Noncompliance

The LEA monitoring report specifies the findings of noncompliance for individual students as well as identifies systemic issues. The LEA monitoring report includes the following components: required corrections for administrative findings, file review summary, individual student corrections required, recommendations, and corrections necessary for school wide improvement. WVDE must ensure that corrections of noncompliance and administrative findings are completed as soon as possible, and in no case later than one year (365 days) after the State's written notification via the monitoring report. (OSEP QA 23-01 issued July 24, 2023)

Once the LEA has submitted corrections for both individual student and systemic levels, the monitoring team will verify that the LEA has corrected all instances of noncompliance through a new data pull and/or on-site review. (OSEP QA 23-01 issued July 24, 2023)

Monitoring Satisfaction Survey

Following the exit meeting, the monitoring team will distribute a satisfaction survey to be completed by the LEA (Appendix F). This is an evaluation of the performance of the WVDE monitoring team and the effectiveness of the monitoring activities. This information will be used for continuing improvement of the monitoring process.

Differentiated Monitoring (Universal)

Each LEA participates in universal differentiated monitoring to determine their risk of non-compliance. Risk is based on both program and fiscal factors, and each is rated on a continuum of criteria that range from "low risk" to "very high risk." Please note that some risk factors are weighed more heavily than others. Each LEA receives points for each risk factor. The sum is then calculated and based on the annual risk assessment score; the LEA will be classified into one of the following risk categories:

- » Low potential of risk
- » Medium potential of risk
- » High potential of risk
- » Very High potential of risk

Any LEA not identified for cyclical monitoring will participate in a monitoring activity that corresponds to its level of risk. Very high-risk LEAs will require on-site monitoring, while a desk review will be required for high-risk LEAs. Medium risk LEAs may require a desk review if determined by the support team, and low risk LEAs will have no additional monitoring requirement.

<i>Risk Determination</i>	<i>Monitoring Activities</i>	<i>Risk Score</i>
Very High Risk	On-site monitoring required	24 – 30 points
High Risk	Desk review required	21 – 23 points
Medium Risk	Desk review need determined by support team	18 – 20 points
Low Risk	No additional monitoring required	0 – 17 points

Please see Appendix G LEA Risk Assessment Matrix for criteria and scoring details.

Risk-Based Monitoring (Targeted)

LEAs identified as high and very high risk on the LEA Risk Assessment will receive an in-depth targeted review of the factors used in determining their risk status, including an on-site visit as described in the cyclical monitoring process. The WVDE special education team will work with the LEA using their targeted systemic improvement plan (TSIP) data to identify root causes and solutions for reducing risk factors.

Focused Monitoring (Intensive)

Focused monitoring is a process where the LEA may receive an on-site visit based on identified need, or information collected from data sources such as long-standing noncompliance, LEA determinations, parent calls, or specific issues brought to the attention of the WVDE. This process may occur concurrently with any other monitoring activity or as an independent activity. The WVDE special education team will work with the LEA to identify root causes and solutions for improving outcomes. Focused monitoring is individualized to each LEA based on one or more of the following:

- » performance related to SPP/APR targets;
- » trend data;
- » LEA demographics;
- » annual determination status;
- » student enrollment;
- » special education enrollment;
- » issues identified through state complaints and/or Due Process Hearings; and/or
- » identification as a high or very high-risk LEA.

Special Circumstance Reviews (Intensive)

In addition to the scheduled cyclical monitoring and risk-based monitoring, special education staff may be invited to participate in a special circumstance review if the LEA has been identified as needing assistance or intervention in the state accountability system. The special education team will work with the Office of Support and Accountability to identify areas of concern and assist LEAs in accessing resources and technical assistance necessary to provide a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) to students with disabilities in West Virginia.

Appendix A

Cyclical Monitoring Schedule

This monitoring cycle is based on a four-year rotation and is subject to realignment if risk factors require more immediate actions regarding monitoring in specific LEAs.

<i>Cyclical On-Site Monitoring 2022-2023</i>	<i>Cyclical On-Site Monitoring 2023-2024</i>
Brooke	Barbour
Doddridge	Braxton
Grant	Calhoun
Hampshire	Clay
Jackson	Eastern Prep Academy
Jefferson	Lewis
ODTP	Marshall
Pocahontas	Mineral
Nicholas	Mingo
Pleasants	Monroe
Taylor	Pendleton
Wayne	Mercer
Webster	Roane
Wetzel	Tucker
WVSDB	Wood
	WV Academy

<i>Cyclical On-Site Monitoring 2024-2025</i>	<i>Cyclical On-Site Monitoring 2025-2026</i>
Berkeley	Boone
Cabell	Hardy
Fayette	Harrison
Gilmer	Lincoln
Greenbrier	Logan
Hancock	Marion
Kanawha	Mason
McDowell	Monongalia
Morgan	Putnam
Ohio	Raleigh
Preston	Ritchie
Randolph	Summers
Virtual Prep Acad. WV	Tyler
Wirt	Upshur
Wyoming	
WV Virtual Academy	
WIN Academy	

Appendix B

File Review Checklists

GENERAL FILE REVIEW – CHECKLIST (2023)

Item Key = IEP – General Requirements / LRE – Placement / SR – IEP Services / AS – Assessments / MN – Meeting Notice / GS – General Supervision / EL – Eligibility (Evaluation)

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
MN1	IDEA §300.322(a)(1) 126 CSR 16-Ch.10 §4	8 Day Notice	8-day Notice observed or waived per documentation.	8-day Notice not documented.	NA is not an option for this item.	Meeting Notice is 8 days prior to IEP meeting
MN2	IDEA §300.322(b)(1)(i) 126 CSR 16-Ch.10 §4	Reason for Meeting / Invited Members	The meeting purpose and applicable subtype is selected. The meeting purpose is aligned with required members.	The appropriate meeting purpose was not selected, or the required members did not align with the meeting purpose.	NA is not an option for this item.	Meeting notice form
MN3	IDEA §300.504 126 CSR 16-Ch.10 §2(B)	Procedural Safeguards	One of the boxes indicating method of delivery must be checked on meeting notice or other evidence of procedural safeguard provided to the parent.	The box was not checked, and no other evidence of procedural safeguard provided to the parent.	NA is not an option for this item.	Meeting Notice Form
MN4	IDEA §300.322(d) 126 CSR 16-Ch.10 §5	Parent Invitation	Parent response to invitation is recorded OR documentation of reasonable (2 or more) attempts to contact the parent is documented. The LEA documented parent response/options.	Parent response not recorded OR insufficient documentation of attempts.	NA is not an option for this item.	Meeting Notice Form
GS1	IDEA §300.324(a)(6) 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §3(B)	IEP Amendments	IEP amendment addresses required components and there is evidence the parent was provided a copy of the amended IEP.	The amendment does not address required components; no evidence parent was provided a copy of the amended IEP.	No amendment was documented.	Prior written notice includes: • date of the amendment • a listing of what was changed • Verification of how parent input was obtained (phone, email, in-person, etc.)
GS2	IDEA §300.504(c)(2) 126 CSR 16-Ch.10 §3	Prior Written Notice	Addresses all required components and justifies the action taken by the IEP team as documented within the IEP.	Contains “N/A” or blank fields.	NA is not an option for this item.	Prior Written Notice Documentation

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
GS3	IDEA §300.305(e)(3) 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §1(C)(2)	Summary of Performance (SoP)	An exit meeting was held to review summary of performance no earlier than 45 days, and no later than 7 days, prior to graduation or reaching the end of the school year following the student's 21st birthday OR Waiver was requested and approved by WVDE.	No exit meeting was held or exit meeting was held outside of the state timelines. OR No summary of performance was developed.	Student still receiving services, SoP not developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of performance document from previous school exit data • WVDE waiver • Meeting notice for exit meeting
EL1	IDEA §300.300 126 CSR 16-Ch.3 §3(B)	Parental consent for initial evaluation or reevaluation	Signed consent form on file with date preceding initial evaluation. (For reevaluation, signed consent or at least 3 documented contact attempts within previous 30 days).	Appropriate procedures not followed.	Initial or Reevaluation not addressed during the current school year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consent form • Documentation of attempts • Prior written notice if no parent consent
EL2	IDEA §300.305(a)(1)(i) 126 CSR 16-Ch.4 §1	Parent input was used in determining eligibility and gathering relevant functional/developmental information	Parent signature on eligibility document, evidence of parental input, or evidence of attempts made to obtain parental input for evaluation.	No evidence of parental input.	Initial or Reevaluation not addressed within the previous 365 days.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eligibility Committee Form Signatures • Parent input component of evaluation
EL3	IDEA §300.304 126 CSR 16-Ch.3 §4	Evaluation Procedures	Evidence that each noted areas of concern has been evaluated and is documented in the evaluation report(s).	No evidence that each noted areas of concern was evaluated and documented in the evaluation report(s).	Initial or Reevaluation not addressed within the previous 365 days.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison of consent to evaluate form • Evaluations reviewed as documented on EC determination form
EL4	IDEA §300.306 126 CSR 16-Ch.4	Evaluation documentation consistent with eligibility criteria	Eligibility determination is supported by, and consistent with, the information contained in the evaluation report(s).	Appropriate procedures not followed.	Initial or Reevaluation not addressed within the previous 365 days.	Evidence that outcome of primary disability category was documented in the evaluation report

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
EL5	IDEA §300.303 126 CSR 16-Ch.3 §2	Evaluation documentation meets required timelines	Initial evaluations have been completed within established state time frame of 80 days OR Reevaluations have been completed within 3 years or the parent and LEA agree that a reevaluation is unnecessary.	Initial evaluations have been completed within established state time frame of 80 days OR Reevaluations have been completed within 3 years or the parent and LEA agree that a reevaluation is unnecessary.	NA is not an option for this item.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WVEIS data for timelines • Agreement to evaluate or prior written notice if no parent consent
IEP1	IDEA §300.324 (b) (3)(1) IDEA §300.320 (b) 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §1(C)(2)	The current IEP has been reviewed within one year from the date of the previous IEP.	IEP has been updated within 365 days	IEP dates exceed 365 days	Initial IEP Only	IEP dates (Current and previous)
IEP2	IDEA §300.321 (a)(4) 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §1(D)	The IEP Team consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General education teacher of the student, • Special education teacher of the student, and • Representative of the LEA (administrator or designee qualified to provide or supervise special education) 	Documentation of attendance of required members at meeting or written agreement, signed by parent and LEA representative, indicating excusal was approved with input from the excused member. (In Lieu of Attendance form)	Documentation of attendance of required members and/or procedurally correct excusal form was unavailable.	NA is not an option for this item.	IEP Team membership and excusal forms
IEP3	IDEA §300.106 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(H)	ESY Services	ESY services are related to the critical skills identified in the previous IEP or IEP team determined need(s).	ESY services are not related to the critical skills identified in the previous IEP or IEP team determined need(s).	Student does not need ESY services.	Critical Skills from Previous and/or current IEP
IEP4	IDEA §300.320(c) 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(F)	Parent and student are informed no later than the student's 17th birthday of transfer of educational rights	At least one year before the student turned 18, the student and parent were informed that rights under Part B will transfer on 18th birthday. Documentation found in file and/or student initials found on IEP.	Completed after the 17th birthday OR no documentation found.	Student is not age appropriate for transfer of educational rights.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP Age of Majority field is checked • Prior written notice documentation if parent is not present at meeting

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
IEP5	IDEA §300.320 (1) (i-ii) 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(D)	Present Levels: Impact Statement	Present levels include how the disability affects involvement/ progress in general curriculum. (If preschool, how disability affects participation in appropriate activities.)	Present levels do not include how the disability affects involvement/ progress in general curriculum.	If the PLEPs are general, there is no impact statement.	IEP review
IEP6	IDEA §300.29 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(D)	Present Levels: Communication is clear	Written in objective, measurable terms and easy-to-understand non-technical language.	Not written in objective, measurable terms and easy-to-understand non-technical language.	NA is not an option for this item.	IEP review
IEP7	IDEA §300.29 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(D)	Present Levels: Performance Gaps	Articulate gaps between student's grade level expectations and their demonstrated performance.	Does not articulate gaps between student's grade level expectations and their demonstrated performance.	NA is not an option for this item.	IEP review
IEP7.1	IDEA §300.320 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(D)	Present Levels: Predetermination of Placement Language	PLEP DOES NOT include language that might be considered as a predetermination of placement.	PLEP includes language that might be considered as a predetermination of placement.	NA is not an option for this item.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP Present Levels section • IEP LRE/Placement section
IEP7.2	IDEA §300.160 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(D)	Targeted standard selected from one of the following: WV College & Career-Readiness Standards, Alternate Academic Achievement Standards or Early Learning Standards Framework	The IEP contains at least one targeted standard for each English Language Arts & Math when identified as an area of service in the IEP.	The IEP does not contain at least one targeted standard for each English Language Arts & Math when identified as an area of service in the IEP.	The IEP area of need selected is NOT English Language Arts or Math.	IEP review
IEP8	IDEA §300.160 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(D)	Progress Reporting to Parents	The IEP specifies how and when the progress toward the IEP annual goals and objectives will be reported to the parent.	The IEP does not specify how and when the progress toward the IEP annual goals and objectives will be reported to the parent.	NA is not an option for this item.	IEP review of progress monitoring section and alignment with goals
IEP9	IDEA §300.157 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(D)	Annual goal: Critical Skills	The IEP contains at least one critical skill.	The IEP does not contain at least one critical skill.	The student is identified as Gifted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP review of Annual Goals • SMART Goal format

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
IEP10	IDEA §300.157 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(E)	Annual goal: timeframe	Timeframe included and does not exceed one year.	Timeframe is NOT included or exceeds one year.	NA is not an option for this item.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP review of Annual Goals • SMART Goal format
IEP11	IDEA §300.157 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(E)	Annual goal: specially designed instruction for student performance	Identifies the circumstances under which the action will occur and the specially designed instruction necessary for the student to perform the action.	Circumstances are NOT stated or do not describe specially designed instruction necessary for the student to perform the action.	NA is not an option for this item.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP review of Annual Goals • SMART Goal format
IEP12	IDEA §300.157 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(E)	Annual goal: observable, measurable actions for student performance	Stated in positive terms, the action refers to observable, measurable actions the student will perform.	Not stated or does not state in positive terms with the action in observable, measurable terms.	NA is not an option for this item.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP review of Annual Goals • SMART Goal format
IEP13	IDEA §300.157 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(E)	Annual goal: expectations for student growth	Specifies the expected amount of growth or level of performance (how much, how often and to what standards) required to achieve the goal.	Not stated or does not specify the expected amount of growth.	NA is not an option for this item.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP review of Annual Goals • SMART Goal format
IEP14	IDEA §300.157 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(E)	Annual goal: specific evaluation methods	Identifies the specific evaluation method(s) required to determine whether the goal/objective has been attained.	Not stated or does not identify the specific evaluation method(s) required to determine whether the goal/objective has been attained.	NA is not an option for this item.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP review of Annual Goals • SMART Goal format
SR1	IDEA §§300.42 107, 117 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Supplementary Services: Identified	Supplementary Services are identified appropriately within the PLEP narratives.	Supplementary Services are NOT identified appropriately within the PLEP narratives.	Student does not require supplemental services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP Supplemental Services Review for PLEP narratives

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
SR2	IDEA §§300.42 107, 117 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Supplementary Services: Location	Supplementary Services are identified appropriately within the GEE or other appropriate environments to enable students to be educated with students without disabilities.	Supplementary Services are NOT identified appropriately within the GEE or other appropriate environments to enable students to be educated with students without disabilities.	Student does not require supplemental services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP Supplemental Services Review • Look fors include appropriate use of the following codes: ALL, GEE, and GEES (no minutes)
SR3	IDEA §§300.42 107, 117 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Supplementary Services: Extent/ Frequency	A specific quantitative amount of time or a specific description of instructional/ environmental circumstances.	Amount of time or circumstance is not specific.	Student does not require supplemental services.	IEP Supplemental Services Review
SR4	IDEA §§300.42 107, 117 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G) 126 CSR 16-Ch.10 §3(B)	Supplementary Services: Initiation Date	Initiation date is NOT less than 5 days after the IEP Team meeting date or documentation that 5 days have been waived AND includes month, day and year.	Initiation date is less than 5 days after the IEP meeting or no evidence of documentation that 5 days has been waived and/or does not include month, day, and year.	Student does not require supplemental services.	IEP Supplemental Services Review
SR5	IDEA §§300.42 107, 117 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Supplementary Services: Duration Date	Duration date must include month and year.	Duration date is missing month and/ or year.	Student does not require supplemental services.	IEP Supplemental Services Review
SR6	IDEA §300.39 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Special Education Services: Identified	Appropriate Special Education Services are identified and justified within the PLEP.	Special Education Services are not identified and justified within the PLEP.	NA is not an option for this item.	IEP Special Education Services Review
SR7	IDEA §300.39 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Special Education Services: Location	Special Education Services location(s) are identified.	Special Education Services location(s) are NOT identified.	NA is not an option for this item.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP Special Education Services Review • Look fors include appropriate use of WEIS codes (such as ALL, GEE, SEE, etc.)

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
SR8	IDEA §300.39 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Special Education Services: Extent/Frequency	A specific quantitative amount of time or a specific description of instructional/ environmental circumstances is stated.	Amount of time or circumstance is not specifically stated.	NA is not an option for this item.	• IEP Special Education Services Review
SR9	IDEA §300.39 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G) 126 CSR 16-Ch.10 §3(B)	Special Education Services: Initiation Date	Initiation date is not less than 5 days after the IEP Team meeting date or documentation that 5 days have been waived AND includes month, day, and year.	Initiation date is less than 5 days after the IEP meeting or no evidence of documentation that 5 days has been waived and/or does not include month, day, and year.	NA is not an option for this item.	• IEP Special Education Services Review
SR10	IDEA §300.39 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Special Education Services: Duration Date	Duration date must include month and year.	Duration date is missing month and/ or year.	NA is not an option for this item.	IEP Special Education Services Review
SR11	IDEA §300.34 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Related Services: Identified	Appropriate Related Services are identified and justified within the PLEP.	Related Services are not identified and justified within the PLEP.	Student does not require related services.	IEP Special Education Services Review
SR12	IDEA §300.34 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Related Services: Location	Related Services location(s) are identified.	Related Services location(s) are NOT identified.	Student does not require related services.	IEP Special Education Services Review
SR13	IDEA §300.34 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Related Services: Extent/Frequency	A specific quantitative amount of time or a specific description of instructional/ environmental circumstances is stated.	Amount of time or circumstance is not specifically stated.	Student does not require related services.	IEP Special Education Services Review
SR14	IDEA §300.34 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Related Services: Initiation Date	Initiation date is not less than 5 days after the IEP Team meeting date or documentation that 5 days have been waived AND includes month, day, and year.	Initiation date is less than 5 days after the IEP meeting or no evidence of documentation that 5 days has been waived and/or does not include month, day, and year.	Student does not require related services.	IEP Related Services Review

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
SR15	IDEA §300.34 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(G)	Related Services: Duration Date	Duration date must include month and year.	Duration date is missing month and/or year.	Student does not require related services.	IEP Related Services Review
AS1	IDEA §300.320 (a) (6) Policy 2340	All Statewide assessments of WV Measures of Academic Progress (MAPS) contain appropriate accommodations based on documented student needs.	Testing accommodations are aligned with IEP services and/or Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance.	Testing accommodations are NOT aligned with IEP services and/or Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance.	No accommodations are necessary per the IEP. OR Student is enrolled in a non-summative testing grade.	Accommodations page in the IEP
AS2	IDEA §300.160 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(I)	Students on Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (WVAAS)	Student's IEP aligns with documentation for receiving instruction through alternate standards.	Student's IEP does NOT align with documentation for receiving instruction through alternate standards. OR No evidence is available documenting student's instructional standards.	Student is receiving instruction through College and Career Readiness Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IEP Standards Type • IEP Alternate Standards Guidelines
LRE1	IDEA §300.114 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(J)	Placement: Extent of participation with non-exceptional students.	Explains the extent, if any, to which the student will not participate in the general education classroom, the general education curriculum, or extracurricular or other non-academic activities OR 100% GEE	Does not explain the extent.	NA is not an option for this item.	Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Section IEP Review
LRE2	IDEA §300.320 (a) (4) 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(I)	Placement: Percentage of Time	Percentage of time in special education and general education is indicated or students 3-5 must include hours per week in regular early childhood program.	Percentage of time NOT indicated	NA is not an option for this item.	Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Section IEP Review

<i>Item</i>	<i>AUTHORITY</i>	<i>COMPLIANCE ITEM</i>	<i>MONITORING CRITERIA</i>			<i>DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED</i>
			<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>NA</i>	
LRE3	IDEA §300.320 (a) (4) 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(J)	Placement: Options (LRE Code)	An appropriate placement option (LRE Code) is selected	An inappropriate placement option (as compared to percentage code) or no placement option is selected.	NA is not an option for this item.	Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Section IEP Review
LRE4	IDEA §300.300 (b)(2) 126 CSR 16-Ch.5 §2(K)	Initial Placement: Parental Consent	LEA/agency obtained parental consent for initial placement.	LEA/agency did not obtain parental consent for initial placement prior to IEP implementation.	Not an initial IEP	Parent consent for initial services

Item Key = IEP – General Requirements / LRE – Placement / SR – IEP Services / AS – Assessments / MN – Meeting Notice / GS – General Supervision / EL – Eligibility (Evaluation)

Pages 21-23 have been
updated and removed.

The current Secondary Transition
File Review Checklist document
can be found on the web page for

[WV Guideposts to Graduation](#)

DISCIPLINE FILE REVIEW – CHECKLIST (2023)

The information from this file review will be included into the final monitoring report

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
DC 1.1	Policy 2419 Chapter 7 WVBE Policy 4373	WVEIS Discipline Data Entry	All disciplinary actions resulting in removal from classroom setting are accurately entered AND there is a match between student discipline and attendance records in WVEIS AND WVBE Policy 4373 has been followed specific to the application of appropriate consequences for inappropriate behavior.	Disciplinary actions resulting in removal from classroom setting are NOT accurately entered OR there is NO match between student discipline and attendance records in WVEIS OR WVBE Policy 4373 has NOT been followed specific to the application of appropriate consequences for inappropriate behavior.	NA is not an option for this item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WVEIS Attendance Record • WVEIS Discipline Records • Individualized Education Program (IEP) <p>Note: The Discipline File Review Form will be used to document specific steps involved to ensure that LEA policies, procedures and practices related to potential significant discrepancy in suspension and expulsion (SPP/APR indicator 4A/4B) meet compliance requirements.</p>
DC1	34 CFR §300.536 126 CSR 16-Ch. 7 §2	Change of Placement: Determination	On the Disciplinary Action Review Form (DARF), EITHER the change of placement Box A or Box B, was checked, OR no change of placement was identified and Section 5 was completed requiring teacher consultation and specific services to be provided to the student starting after the 10th day of suspension.	On the DARF, NEITHER of the change of placement box-es (A or B) were checked AND Section 5 was not completed.	NA is not an option for this item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary Action Review Forms • Documentation of services provided beginning with the 11th day of suspension.

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
DC2	34 CFR §300.504 34 CFR §300.350(h) 126 CSR 16-Ch.7 §2(B)	Change of Placement: Procedural Safeguards	<p>If school personnel determined the removal was a change of placement, the parent DID receive ALL of the following on the same day the suspension was determined:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Same day written notice of the removal 2. Prior written notice (PWN) 3. The procedural safeguards 	<p>If school personnel determined the removal was a change of placement, the parent DID NOT receive ALL of the following on the same day the suspension was determined:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Same day written notice of the removal 2. Prior written notice (PWN) 3. The procedural safeguards 	School personnel determined the removal was NOT a change of placement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disciplinary Action Review Forms • Written Suspension Notification Letters • Prior Written Notices • Documentation that Procedural Safeguards were sent same day (including date and method of delivery)
DC3	34 CFR §300.350(e)(1) 126 CSR 16-Ch.7 §2(C)	Change of Placement: Manifestation Determination Review (MDR)	<p>If school personnel determined the removal was a change of placement, ALL of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The MDR was held within 10 school days 2. Parents were notified in writing of the MDR meeting 3. MDR team included appropriate members 4. All pertinent information in the student's file was considered. 5. Decision made by team if the conduct was caused by or had a direct and substantial relationship to the student's disability. 6. Decision made by team if the conduct was a direct result of the LEAs failure to implement the IEP. 	<p>If school personnel determined the removal was a change of placement and ONE or MORE of the "YES" criteria was NOT met</p>	School personnel determined the removal was not a change of placement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discipline Action Review Forms • Written documentation the parent/guardian was invited to and participated in the MDR. • MDR Prior Written Notice. • Targeted IEP if MDR was conducted within an IEP meeting.

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
DC4	IDEA §300.350(e)	Manifestation of the student's disability	If school personnel determined the removal was a manifestation:	If school personnel determined the removal was a manifestation and ONE or MORE the "YES" criteria was NOT met OR The student was suspended a second time for the <u>same</u> type of incident that has already been determined to be a manifestation based on a causal relationship to the student's disability.	School personnel determined the removal was not a manifestation of the student's disability.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discipline Action Review Forms • Targeted IEP Reviews • MDR/IEP Prior Written Notice • Attendance Record • Incident Discipline Record
	IDEA §300.350(f) IDEA §145(k)(1)(F) 126 CSR 16-Ch.7 §2(C)		1. A functional behavior assessment (FBA) was initiated with parent consent and completed. 2. A behavior improvement plan (BIP) was developed or and existing BIP was reviewed and revised, as needed, to address the current behavior(s) so they do not reoccur; and 3. The student was returned to the previous placement the next school day (except drugs, weapons, or serious bodily injury removals) unless the parent and LEA mutually agree to change the student's placement. 4. If the behavior in question involved weapons, drugs or serious bodily injury(ies) the student was placed in an Interim Alternate Educational Setting. AND an IEP meeting was held to change the student's least restrictive educational placement to Out-of-School environment.			

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
DC5	34 CFR §300.530(c) 34 CFR §300.530(d) (i) 34 CFR §300.530(d) (ii) 126 CSR 16-Ch.7 §2(C) WVBE Policy 4373	Not a manifestation of the student's disability	If school personnel determined the removal was not a manifestation: 1. Disciplinary action was administered 2. Documentation available describing the specific educational services enabling the student to continue to participate in the general curriculum, although in another setting, and to progress toward IEP goals; and 3. Documentation that an IEP, FBA or BIP was updated or initiated, as appropriate.	If school personnel determined the removal was not a manifestation and ONE or MORE of the "YES" criteria was NOT met.	School personnel determined the removal was not a change of placement, or it was a manifestation of the student's disability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discipline Action Review Form • Student's targeted or subsequent IEP. • FBA • BIP
DC6	34 CFR §300.530(d) (4) 126 CSR 16-Ch.7 §2(C)	Teacher consultation	For this suspension and each subsequent removal beyond 10 cumulative school days that is not a change of placement school personnel, in consultation with at least one teacher of the student, determined the extent services were needed to enable the student to continue to participate in the general education curriculum, although in another setting, and to make progress toward IEP goals.	If school personnel determined the removal was NOT a change of placement and the "YES" criteria were NOT met	NA is not an option for this item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discipline Action Review Forms • Documentation that the agreed services were provided.

Item	AUTHORITY	COMPLIANCE ITEM	MONITORING CRITERIA			DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED
			Yes	No	NA	
DC7	34 CFR §300.530(d) (ii) 126 CSR 16 7 §2(C)	Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS)	The student's file provides evidence that the IEP Team consistently revised the IEP to include use of PBIS and other strategies (i.e., PLEPs, annual goals, services, and/or BIPs) to address continued impeding behavior(s) when appropriate; OR strategies have been documented as part of a schoolwide PBIS system of supports for all students.	The student's file does NOT provide evidence that the IEP Team consistently revised the IEP to include use of PBIS and other strategies (i.e., PLEPs, annual goals, services, and/or BIPs) to address continued impeding behavior(s) when appropriate; OR strategies have been documented as part of a schoolwide PBIS system of supports for all students.	NA is not an option for this item	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School PBIS Plan • Student's IEP

Appendix C

Desk Review Checklist



Desk Review Checklist

LEA: _____

Date Received: _____

Special Education Monitoring Team Lead: _____

1. Copies of five most recent purchase orders, including requisitions, invoices and cut check:

Preliminary Findings: _____

2. Latest Finance Audit Report (pages related only to special education financial audit):

Preliminary Findings: _____

3. LEA/Plan budget detail with positions with corresponding list of federally paid staff names/positions and time and effort documentation for the most recent completed time period:

Preliminary Findings: _____

4. Most current job postings for special education long term substitutes.

Preliminary Findings: _____

5. Appropriate documentation for Sign Support Specialists and Interpreters to include waiver requests and a two-year professional development plan, when appropriate, as well as Interpreter 1 renewals and Interpreter 2 certifications.

Preliminary Findings: _____

6. School Bell to Bell schedules / Bus schedules for schools included in the on-site monitoring:

Preliminary Findings: _____

7. Private School consultation.

Preliminary Findings: _____

8. WWEIS Discipline Report with names for students with disabilities suspended beyond 10 days (up to 10 files maximum).

Appendix D

Improving Results for Students with Disabilities Worksheet

Improving Results for Students with Disabilities Worksheet



Purpose: This worksheet is designed to assist LEAs in summarizing the process utilized for designing and evaluating initiative(s) to improve results for students with disabilities. The initiative being discussed will be found in the Target Systemic Improvement Plan (TSIP).

Processes for Designing /Evaluating Initiatives	
Selecting Steering Committee Members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the process used in determining the members of the committee assisting in identifying the area for improvement. 	
Identifying the Focus Area for Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the ADA indicator selected for improvement. 	
Developing Goals for Improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss the big picture and give a general statement of intent for the area identified. 	
Developing Objectives for the focus area that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific • Measurable • Attainable • Realistic • Timely 	
Analyzing Trend Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify data that is meaningful to the indicator and • Analyze the data and explain trends in data 	
Determining Improvement activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale • Activities • Sustainability 	
Timeline and Person(s) Responsible <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss when the activities will take place and • Who will be involved in the activities 	
Evaluating the Effectiveness of the activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss how the plan will be evaluated and ultimately increase student achievement. 	

Appendix E

Special Education Monitoring On-Site Preparation List

Special Education Monitoring School Level On-Site Preparation List



The following is an abbreviated list of activities/documents which will assist your preparation for the on-site monitoring visit:

- ☐ Distribute the monitoring schedule to principals and other appropriate LEA personnel.
- ☐ Interview preparation: Prepare a space for interviews and provide staff availability and coverage.
- ☐ Prepare a space for parent/student focus group discussions.
- ☐ List of special education teachers and related service providers by school.
- ☐ Direct schools to make available the following: school schematic (highlight special education classrooms on schematics and label with teacher name).
- ☐ WVEIS Per Period Class Rosters middle/high schools (upon request with identification of both integrated and co-taught classes)
- ☐ Elementary teacher schedules available at each school scheduled to be visited (include student names, student grade level, class start/end times, subject taught).
- ☐ Master Schedule for middle and high schools with co-teaching classes highlighted.
- ☐ All related service provider schedules available at each school scheduled to be visited (include student names, start/end times of service).
- ☐ For each school, the WVDE special education team will select three student files for service verifications. Please have the school bell to bell schedule, teacher's schedule, master schedule for middle and high school and any schedules for related services such as OT, PT, O&M, Speech, Gifted, etc. The monitoring Lead will request specific student files, middle & high school student WVEIS schedules and any consultation logs for those students who have indirect services.

If you have any questions, please contact:

WVDE Special Education Monitoring Team
304-558-2696

Appendix F

Monitoring Satisfaction Survey

Special Education Monitoring Satisfaction Survey

LEA: _____

School Year: _____

Special Education Director: _____

The WVDE special education on-site monitoring visit is to review the LEA's implementation of IDEA, WV State Code and Policy 2419. The WVDE special education team appreciates the LEA's work toward continuous improvement of the monitoring process.

Please rate your level of satisfaction with the on-site monitoring activities:

1. Did the WVDE monitoring team attempt to gain your trust and confidence prior to the visit?
☐ Not at all satisfied ☐ Somewhat satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Very satisfied ☐ Extremely satisfied
2. At the entrance conference, did the monitoring team clearly outline the procedures and team activities for the visit?
☐ Not at all satisfied ☐ Somewhat satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Very satisfied ☐ Extremely satisfied
3. Were staff interviews and focus group sessions conducted in a professional manner?
☐ Not at all satisfied ☐ Somewhat satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Very satisfied ☐ Extremely satisfied
4. At the exit conference, did the members of the monitoring team present them-selves as fair and impartial and address preliminary compliance findings objective-ly?
☐ Not at all satisfied ☐ Somewhat satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Very satisfied ☐ Extremely satisfied
5. Did the LEA staff have ample time to ask questions?
☐ Not at all satisfied ☐ Somewhat satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Very satisfied ☐ Extremely satisfied
6. Did the team clearly describe the follow up monitoring activities?
☐ Not at all satisfied ☐ Somewhat satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Very satisfied ☐ Extremely satisfied
7. Do you feel comfortable contacting the monitoring team with any follow up questions?
☐ Not at all satisfied ☐ Somewhat satisfied ☐ Satisfied ☐ Very satisfied ☐ Extremely satisfied
8. What are some ways that we can improve the monitoring process?
9. Do you believe that you have the capacity to correct all findings?
10. What additional support would you like from the WVDE Special Education team?
11. Was there any additional information that would have been beneficial prior to the monitoring?
12. What do you believe are the greatest obstacles for your LEA to improving student achievement? What resources are needed to assist you in overcoming those barriers?
13. Do you have any additional comments?

Appendix G

LEA Risk Assessment Matrix



LEA Risk Assessment Matrix

LEA: _____

Reviewer: _____

Year: _____

Criteria Reviewed (Program Factors = 1-5; Fiscal Factors = 6-10)	Risk Factor	Level of Risk	Points
1. Most recent LEA Determinations	Needs Substantial Intervention Needs Intervention Needs Assistance Meets Requirements	Very High High Medium Low	6 4 2 0
2. LEA has new key personnel (Special Education Director, Treasurer/CSBO, and/or Superintendent)	Multiple new key personnel in the past year One new key personnel in the past year Any new key personal in the past 3 years No new key personnel in the past 3 years	Very High High Medium Low	6 4 2 0
3. Special education population is higher than the state average	10 points or more over state average 5 to 9 points over state average 1 to 4 points over state average At or under state average	Very High High Medium Low	3 2 1 0
4. Number of violations of noncompliance from due process and state complaints	9 or more in the past 3 years 4 to 8 in the past 3 years 1 to 3 in the past 3 years None in the past 3 years	Very High High Medium Low	3 2 1 0
5. County Support and Accountability for Student Academic Achievement and Success Identification (per Policy 2322)	Intensive Support On Watch No Identification	Very High High Medium Low	3 2 1 0
6. LEA total IDEA subgrant amount (Section 611 and 619)	Greater than \$3,000,000 \$1,750,000 to \$2,999,999 \$500,000 to \$1,749,999 Less than \$500,000	Very High High Medium Low	3 2 1 0
7. LEA failed to spend or encumber an appropriate amount of funds through June 30th	Over 50% remaining 40-49% remaining 30-39% remaining Under 30% remaining	Very High High Medium Low	3 2 1 0
8. LEA failed to meet MOE compliance requirements	Did not meet any MOE test Met one MOE test, with reductions Met one MOE test, without reductions Met multiple MOE tests	Very High High Medium Low	3 2 1 0
9. LEA has had special education related single audit findings	Repeatedly in the past 3 years Once in the past year Once in the past 3 years None in the past 3 years	Very High High Medium Low	3 2 1 0
10. LEA has been identified as having significant disproportionality (CCEIS)	Yes No, but has in the past 3 years No, but is at risk No	Very High High Medium Low	6 4 2 0

Total Score: _____

Risk Level

Low (0-17)
 Medium (18-20)
 High (21-23)
 Very High (24-30)



Michele L. Blatt
West Virginia Superintendent of Schools

 **/WVEducation**  **@wveducation**
wvde.us