

**Mt. Pleasant CSD**

**Special Education Service Delivery Plan**

**Participants of the Planning Team**

**Administration**

**Dr. John Roederer, Superintendent**  
**Pat Shier, Director of Instruction**

**Plan Facilitator**  
**Plan Facilitator**

**Jane Ragen, Harlan Elementary Principal**  
**Lori LeFrenz, Lincoln Elementary Principal**

**Great Prairie AEA**

**Michelle Earhart, Regional Director**  
**Heather Oleson, School Psychologist**

**Education Consultants**

**Dr. Deb Gallagher, UNI Professor**  
**Dr. Danielle Cowley, UNI Professor**

**Instructional Strategists**

Ivy Garmon- Strat. II teacher	Van Allen
Amanda Short - Strat. I teacher	Van Allen
Suzan Stott- Strat. 1 teacher	Salem
Tiffany Menke - Strat. II teacher	Harlan/Middle School
Tabby Schim - Strat I teacher	High School
Nicki Ensminger - Strat. 1 teacher	High School

**General Education Teachers**

Joni Manning - Gen. Ed teacher	Van Allen
Kelsey Fish- Gen. Ed teacher	Lincoln
Elisha McMullin - Gen. Ed teacher	Middle School
Jennifer Slagel - Gen. Ed teacher	High School

**Parent representatives**

Recommendations were given by special education teachers. Represented were parents of service Levels I,II,and III as well as elementary, middle school and high school attendance centers.

Matt Christner	Krystal Boyd
Melanie Patton	Shelley Anderson
Debra Ashton	Cindy Cotton
Alicia Yocum	Teresa Wichhart
Laura Wilson	Erin Foerch
Monica Mueller	

**Timelines 2016**

December 16, 2015

Interim Superintendent, John Roederer; Interim Director of Instruction, Pat Shier; AEA Regional Director, Michelle Earhart; Director of Special Education/Principal, Jane Ragen met to begin initial talks and state requirements.

January 7, 2016

Director of Instruction and Plan Facilitators met to determine structure of teams and planning process. An overview of the steps in planning, committee representation, content requirements and Two teams of teachers were initially formed. One team worked on the content describing the continuum of services, answering how services will be organized and provided to eligible individuals. Another team worked on caseloads, answering how caseloads of special education teachers will be determined and regularly monitored.

January 20, 2016

Special Education teachers, Director of Instruction, and Plan Facilitators met to review overview of state requirements, sample plans, CSIP, current delivery plan, and weighting matrix.

February 24, 2016

Content Team and Caseload Teams, and Administrators met to do initial work

March 11, 2016

Full Committee meeting to continue work from February meeting.

March 23, 2016

Full Committee meeting including administrators, AEA Regional Director, and parents. Letter was sent to parents with copy of draft to prepare for next meeting.

March 30, 2016

Full committee meets to review plan and make changes as needed.  
Focus: Parent review for input and clarification needed for understanding.  
Complete Caseload Matrix and scoring

April , 2016

Sent to GPAEA Regional Director Michelle Earhart for review

May. 2016

This plan was posted for 30 days beginning on

June

This plan is approved by the Board of Education on

June

This plan is submitted to the AEA Director of Special Education, Angela F----- on for approval.

July

Plan is inserted into Iowa Dept. of Education digital CSIP

August , 2016 initial implementation date.

Aug/Sept - Date and time for orientation of principals, special education teachers and general education teaching staff

Feb/March 2017 Review entire plan

Feb/March 2018 Review entire plan

**1. What process was used to develop the special education service delivery system for eligible individuals?**

The Mount Pleasant Community School District, together with parents, representatives from the Great Prairie AEA and the University of Northern Iowa collaborated over several months to create a special education service delivery plan that fosters inclusion and a sense of belonging for all students. Committee members included our administrators, special education teachers, general education teachers, AEA representatives UNI consultants, and parents. The plan was developed in accordance with Iowa codes. Several workshops with various stakeholders were held in order to create the service delivery plan. Several parent representatives were involved along the way and family-friendly/accessible materials were created by the district in order to foster communication and collaboration in the planning process. Our workshops with were particularly important. Parent representatives helped to create a service delivery plan that recognizes the importance of communication and collaboration. Several of their suggestions are represented throughout this document. Parents were excited about the focus on inclusion and belonging. Parents of graduating students expressed that they wished earlier service delivery plans had such as focus, as their children would have benefited from the model described below.

**2. How will services be organized and provided to eligible individuals?**

In accordance with state policy, the Mount Pleasant Community School District bases the Least Restrictive Environment on the presumption that the general education classroom should be the initial placement for educating students with disabilities. The focus of the continuum outlined below is to provide students with disabilities the maximum interaction with students who do not have identified disabilities, the optimal education, and supports and services needed for success in the general education classroom. Supplementary aides and services provided by MPCSD should enable students with disabilities to be educated with students without disabilities to the maximum extent appropriate. However, MPCSD's continuum of services reflects placements outside the general education environment as well. It is important to note that in accordance with state policy, students with disabilities should only be removed from the general education classroom when data indicate her/his needs cannot be satisfactorily met, with supplementary aids and services. Parent communication, engagement, and collaboration are essential to this process. Any decisions and/or changes to how special education services will be organized and provided for an individual student should involve parent communication and involvement. See notes below for examples how how parental communication might occur at MPCSD.

**Regular Early Childhood Program with Teacher Dual Endorsements:** (i.e., Endorsement 100: Teacher-Prekindergarten through grade three, including special education). The child is

served in the regular early childhood classroom with a teacher who holds a valid practitioner's license issued by the Board of Educational Examiners that includes prekindergarten and early childhood special education. The teacher is responsible for direct instruction, preparation of materials, adaptations and accommodations and specified in the IEP. The teacher with the dual endorsement is responsible for implementing and monitoring the child's progress according to the IEP.

- MPCSD will provide access to a continuum of Early Childhood Special Education services (i.e., more than 50% of children eligible for special education, including those with support only IEPs) for all eligible individuals based upon their IEP. Services may be provided within the district or through contractual agreement with other districts and/or agencies.
- MPCSD offers ECSE and regular early childhood programs that provide instructional services to children with IEPs that meet the following Preschool Program Standards as defined by the Iowa Department of Education: Iowa Quality Program Standards and Head Start Program Performance Standards.

**General Education with Consultation:** The student is served in the general education classroom with consultation and support provided by the special education teacher. The general education teacher is responsible for direct instruction, testing, grading and behavioral management as specified in the IEP. The special education teacher support may include assisting the general education teacher with the design and preparation of materials, inclusive teaching practices and arrangements, adaptations and accommodations. The special education teacher is responsible for monitoring the student's progress on IEP goals.

- At MPCSD, this may include the following: meeting with general education teachers to provide input on best teaching practices such as universal design for learning and differentiated instruction, achieving goals, providing accommodations and modifications; integrating IEP goals into the general education curriculum and instructional practices; instructional coaching in areas including, but not limited to: peer-tutoring, cooperative learning, disability acceptance, increasing accessibility, best practices for MTSS, reading strategies, behavior supports, progress monitoring (this can include general education work products), etc.

**General Education with Collaborative Special Education Support Inside General Education Classroom:** The student receives special education support for progressing through the general education curriculum in the general education setting. The special education teacher, support service provider, and/or trained paraprofessional will provide services in the general education classroom such as direct instruction, instructional support, or other assistance to the student or a group of students, through models such as co-teaching (examples described below). The special education teacher is responsible for monitoring the student's progress on IEP goals.

- Examples of co-teaching models used at MPCSD:
  - **Parallel teaching:** a heterogeneous class is split in two for a better student-teacher ratio. Students work on similar learning objectives, but the process might be different. An example of this at MPCSD is the use of novel study.
  - **Station teaching:** a heterogeneous class is split into groups. Adults co-plan and each lead a station with students rotating throughout. An example of this at MPCSD is reading rounds or math centers.

- **Team teaching:** teachers share leadership in planning, instruction, and classroom activities. There is full collaboration and role-parity.
- **One teach – one assist:** One teacher takes the lead, while the other provides instructional supports to students. The instructional support role supports **all** students who may need it.
- **Paraprofessionals** may provide educational supports in the general education classroom as well. In accordance with state policy, paraprofessionals may reinforce the application of previously taught skills, reinforce previously provided specially designed instruction, generalize strategies (if the para is trained) to other subjects or settings, construct materials, assist the teacher with modifications, collect data (based on direction from a teacher), implement behavior plans (if trained), etc.
  - At MPCSD, paraprofessionals may support reading rounds, small group instruction, provide 1:1 academic or behavior support that is faded as appropriate, supporting **all** students who may need support, etc.

**General Education with Collaborative Special Education Support Outside the General Education Classroom:**

The student receives special education support for progressing through the general education curriculum outside the general education setting. When the services cannot be appropriately provided in the general education setting, the student may receive selected services or all services he/she needs in a separate educational setting (including, but not limited to special classes, special schools, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and treatment centers). This should occur on a limited basis and should reflect individual student need based on data, conversations, and documented evidence that a separate setting is needed. Reflection and discussion on student progress and re-integration should occur on an ongoing basis throughout the year. The special education teacher/service provider is responsible for monitoring the student’s progress on IEP goals. Supports outside of the general education classroom may be provided by various certified teachers and should be implemented in a collaborative manner.

- At MPCSD, this may include: specially designed instruction outside the general education classroom (i.e., small group instruction), social skill building in small groups, 1:1 academic and social/behavioral support, reading interventions in small groups, pre-teaching/re-teaching, targeted instruction, career-readiness, etc.

**Notes for Clarification:**

- Students may receive different services at multiple points along the continuum based on their IEPs.
- The district will provide access to this continuum for all eligible individuals based on their IEPs. Services may be provided within the district or through contractual agreement with other districts and/or agencies.
- The continuum includes services for eligible individuals ages 3-21.
- Family communication at MPCSD might look like the following, but it is important to note that this list is not all inclusive (any **major** changes are addressed in accordance with Federal Law and Iowa Regulations through the IEP amendment process):
  - Begin by asking families what they want communicated and how they want it communicated. Trusting, open-door relationships are key.

- IEP meetings can occur multiple times throughout the year, as needed.
  - IEP-at-a-Glance.
  - Communication notebooks or journals.
  - Emphasizing the importance of communication at IEP meetings and developing a meeting agenda that highlights family contributions and collaboration
  - Emails, phone calls, face-to-face conversations, Canvas (secondary students), etc. that share student-positive information, progress and milestones in addition to needs and/or concerns.
  - Family-friendly language in documents and at meetings.
- When determining a student's placement, her/his educational team must answer the following questions:
    - What accommodations, modifications and adaptations have been explored/informational resources consulted?
    - Based on that exploration, what accommodations, modifications, and adaptations, and best practices such as universal design for learning and differentiated instruction does the individual require to be successful in the general education environment?
    - Why is it not possible for these accommodations, modifications and adaptations be provided within the general education environment?
    - What supports are needed to assist the teacher and other personnel in providing best practices in the areas of: universal design for learning, differentiated instruction, and the use of accommodations, modifications and adaptations?
    - How will receipt of special education services and activities in the general education environment impact this individual?
    - How will the provision of special education services and activities in the general education environment impact other students?

**Question 3: How will caseloads of special education teachers be determined and regularly monitored?**

Caseloads will be tentatively set in the spring for the following year. Caseloads may be modified based on summer registration and actual fall enrollments. Caseloads will be reviewed at least twice during the school year by individual district special education teachers with their building principal.

A full teacher caseload is determined by the points generated using either the elementary or secondary caseload matrix. If a teacher's caseload exceeds the determined score, a 3 member team will review the caseload. The team may consist of any of the following participants: the teacher, a teacher from the team who developed the matrix, the director of instruction, or the principal, will meet to discuss whether the teacher is unable to provide the services and supports specified in his or her student's IEP and a plan of action will be developed. If the teacher is not satisfied that the plan of action will meet the requirements of his or her students' IEPs, the teacher may initiate the process for resolving caseload concerns that is described in this plan.

**Question 4: What procedures will a special education teacher use to resolve caseload concerns?**

A scheduled review of teacher caseloads will be conducted by the building principal as follows:

1. At the beginning of the school year.
2. Within a 30 day period either side of the semester end date.
3. By April 1 to plan for the following school year.

Upon review, if there appears to be an overload, the teacher may request and the principal will arrange a Caseload Review meeting. The Review team will consist of the four teachers from the team of teachers who created the matrix listed on the front of this document (an alternate teacher may be chosen by the rest of the team, should one or more of the initial teachers may no longer be with the district), a building administrator, an AEA representative, and the director of instruction. This team will make recommendations regarding a need for adjustments to a teacher's schedule or roster. At any time, a teacher may request a caseload review by submitting, in writing, the request to the building principal. The building principal must convene the above mentioned team within 5 school days. A resolution and written decision must be made available to the teacher within 5 school days after this meeting is held.

**Question 5: How will the delivery system for eligible individuals meet the targets identified in the state's performance plan? How will the delivery system for eligible individuals address needs identified by the state in any determination made under Chapter 41? What process will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the delivery system for eligible individuals?**

Mount Pleasant Community School District will need to determine if our service delivery system is effective. We will need to determine if it is improving educational outcomes for eligible individuals. To do this we will review individual student progress on IEP goals on a regular and on-going basis in collaboration with students, families, educators, and administrators. Grade level teams including special education and general education teachers will also discuss, on a regular basis, the performance of students with disabilities. And at a district level, the district leadership team will review IEP data on an annual basis. Subgroup achievement, growth, and the achievement gap will be included as items for discussion and planning. If the service delivery system is not effective, we will collaborate with the Great Prairie AEA to revise our plan as needed.

**Appendix A: Considerations for Developing an Inclusive Service Delivery Model**  
(Giangreco & Sutter, 2015; McKlesky, Waldron, Spooner, & Algozzine, 2014; Theoharis & Causton, 2014)

**Least Restrictive Environment/Continuum of Services**

- Best practices indicate that students with disabilities should begin their services in the general education classroom. This is to be considered their "home" classroom, but

flexibility throughout the day as far and type and location of services should be based on individual student needs.

- A family-centered process with student-driven data can be used to determine the appropriate LRE for a student. Pull out instruction should occur only if you consider less intrusive options first.
- Heterogeneous classrooms are also a best practice with proportions as close to natural as possible.
- Caseload considerations should also be made. It is not beneficial to have special education teachers spread across too many classrooms or grade levels. Population bubbles or classroom-intensive supports would need to be addressed each year as necessary. Students with disabilities actually get more time with their special education teacher if s/he has a smaller caseload, is spread across fewer classrooms, and spends more time in the general education classroom.

### **Roles and Responsibilities**

- Special Educators can provide in class supports such as co-teaching, creative problem-solving, and co-planning for Universal Design, differentiated instruction, inclusive strategies and arrangements, and instructional adaptations. Special Educators should be considered key, classroom-based team members.
- General Educators are also key, classroom-based team members who can also help build capacity in areas of content, instruction, and delivery. All team members have educational ownership of all students in the classroom.
- Paraprofessionals can support students with and without disabilities as long as they are following a student's Individualized Educational Program. Supports can be provided in a natural manner and should be faded as necessary. Ideally, students with disabilities should be spending as much instructional time with certified teachers as meets the student's needs.

## **Appendix B: Inclusive Research and Regulations**

### **The State of Research on Inclusive Education**

Research consistently shows that it is not the case that inclusive education detracts from the education of students without disabilities. In fact, just the opposite is true. In inclusive classrooms, achievement and learning opportunities are strengthened for all students because teachers work to create strength-based classrooms, increase student access to resources and technology, implement differentiated instruction, and teach skills for collaboration and interdependence.

- Benefits students with and without disabilities (Baker, Wang and Wahlberg 1994; Fisher, Pumpian, & Sax, 2000; McDonnell, Thorson, Disher, Mathot-Buckner, 2001; Waldron & McLeskey, 1998).
- For students with disabilities, both the IEP goals and academic learning are achieved at a greater rate (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008).
- Positive outcomes for students with disabilities when supported in general education rather than “pulled out” (Fisher & Meyer, 2002; Reynolds & Wang, 1983; Wang & Birch, 1984).
- Children with even severe disabilities learn best in settings with their general education peers (Causton-Theoharis & Theoharis, 2008; Peterson & Hittie, 2002).
- When students with intellectual disabilities are educated in segregated settings, their access to and progress in the general education curriculum is significantly less when compared to peers with intellectual disabilities in inclusive settings (Soukup, Wehmeyer, Bashinski, & Bovaird, 2007; Wehmeyer, 2003).
- Cosier, Causton-Theoharis, & Theoharis (2013) found that regardless of disability label, the greatest predictor of math and reading achievement for students with disabilities was the amount of time spent in the general education classroom.
- Instructional time is lost when students are pulled out for special education (Allan & Cunningham, 2002). At least 10 minutes of instruction are lost each day in transition to segregated settings, resulting in approximately four full days of instruction lost per year. When services are provided inclusively, students with disabilities spend a greater amount of time with content and curriculum.

### **The State of Regulations on Inclusive Education**

1. The Least Restrictive Environment clause of the IDEA states that to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities are educated with children who are not disabled, and special classes, separate schooling, and other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education with supplementary aides and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily (IDEA, 2004).

- According to the Iowa Department of Education, the LRE is based on the presumption that the general education environment is the first choice for educating all individuals.
- According to the Iowa Department of Education, removal from the general education environment can occur only when it has been conclusively demonstrated and documented that the specific needs of the student cannot be met in the general education environment. According to the Iowa Department of Education a district must answer the following questions regarding LRE: 1) What accommodations, modifications and adaptations does the individual require to be successful in the general education environment? 2) Why is it not possible for these accommodations, modifications and adaptations be provided within the general education environment? 3) What supports are needed to assist the teacher and other personnel in providing these accommodations, modifications and adaptations? 4) How will receipt of special education services and activities in the

general education environment impact this individual? 5) How will the provision of special education services and activities in the general education environment impact other students?

- IMPORTANT NOTE - The above questions cannot be addressed and answered unless you begin in the general education environment.
- In the court case of *Daniel R.R. v Rochester* (1989) it was ruled that: You should answer these two questions in order to remain in compliance and you can't answer them without trying the regular education environment first:
  - Can education in the regular classroom with the use of supplementary aides and services be achieved satisfactorily?
  - If it cannot, has the school included the child to the maximum extent appropriate?
- In the court case of *Oberti v. Clementon* (1992), the ruling stated that: You must demonstrate that reasonable efforts were made to accommodate the student in the general education classroom with supplementary aides and services.

2. Special education services are to be portable: services should be brought to the child, rather than the child brought to specialized or segregated settings (*Roncker v. Walter*, 1983).

- If supports provided in a segregated setting can be provided in an integrated setting, then the integrated setting is where education should occur.
- You cannot know if those supports work in an integrated setting without trying the integrated setting first. Districts should make this determination and demonstrate that supports can or cannot be provided in the general education classroom.
- The continuum is fluid and dynamic. Decisions of placement and services are based on collaborative discussions that reflect data, exploration of options, and evidence that inclusive teaching practices and arrangements have been accessible. These decisions are to be made by the entire team.

3. 2004 amendments to the IDEA emphasize the importance of co-teaching and shared responsibility.

4. Iowa Department of Education has defined the following improvement activities regarding LRE:

- LEAs and AEAs are to use compliance data to improve LRE.
- Districts will provide the full continuum of services and supports for students, allowing students to move along the continuum and increase time spent in the least restrictive environment.

5. Schools and districts across the state are consistently recognized by the state for the efforts toward inclusive services. In 2014, the Iowa Department of Education has defined the following indicators of a "Top Notch School":

- Co-teaching, minimum pull-out
- Professional Learning Communities

- “Our kids” philosophy
- Multi-Tiered System of Supports
- Iowa Core
- Set-aside time for intervention/enrichment for all
- Positive teacher-student relationships