



**OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION**

FINAL REPORT for State Complaint C-7514-13 against the  
Muskegon Heights School District and the  
Muskegon Heights Public School Academy  
March 28, 2013

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Date Filed: February 19, 2013  
Muskegon Intermediate School: Carolyn Smith-Gerdes  
District Investigator:  
MDE Case Manager: Susan Liebetreu  
Complainant: [REDACTED]  
Address: [REDACTED]  
Telephone: [REDACTED]  
Student: Multiple Students  
First Resident/Operating District: Muskegon Heights School District  
2011-2012 School Year  
Second Resident/Operating District: Muskegon Heights Public School Academy  
2012-2013 School Year  
Chartering Agency: Mosaica Education Group

**INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED**

1. Complainant
2. [REDACTED] Associate Superintendent for Special Education, Intermediate School District
3. [REDACTED] Former Special Education Administrator, Second District
4. [REDACTED] Mosaica Education Group's National Special Education Director, Second District
5. [REDACTED] Former Director of Behavior Support and Special Education for Mosaica Education Group, Second District
6. [REDACTED] Special Education Teacher, Second District
7. [REDACTED] Former Special Education Teacher, Second District
8. [REDACTED] Special Education Teacher, Second District
9. [REDACTED] Occupational Therapist, Second District
10. [REDACTED] Occupational Therapist, Second District
11. [REDACTED] Special Education Teacher, Second District
12. [REDACTED] School Social Worker, Second District
13. [REDACTED] School Social Worker, Second District
14. [REDACTED] Resource Program Teacher, Second District
15. [REDACTED] Speech Pathologist, Second District
16. [REDACTED] Resource Program Teacher, Second District

## DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Special Education Files for Students Enrolled in the Muskegon Heights Public School Academy
2. State Complaint C-7237-12
3. Service Logs
4. Project Find Referrals
5. TIENET Reevaluation Report and Annual Review IEP Report
6. Letters of Findings in the District CIMS Workbook
7. Staff Surveys regarding Classroom Materials

## ALLEGATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion	Allegation	
Noncompliant	Allegation 1	Whether the first and second district provided speech and language, occupational therapy, physical therapy, orientation and mobility services; and teacher consultant services for visual impairment, hearing impairment, physical impairment and autism spectrum disorder as required by each student's individualized education program (IEP)
Noncompliant	Allegation 2	Whether the first and second district completed initial evaluations for students referred for a special education evaluation and 3-year reevaluations for each eligible student in a timely manner
Noncompliant	Allegation 3	Whether the first and second district considered extended school year services during the development of each IEP between January 4, 2012 and January 3, 2013
Dismissed	Allegation 4	Whether the Mosaica Education Group had the right to require students with an IEP to apply and only if accepted enroll in the district at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year
Noncompliant	Allegation 5	Whether the Mosaica Education Group developed an IEP within 30 school days for each student with an IEP who enrolled in the district at the beginning of the 2012-13 school year
Noncompliant	Allegation 6	Whether the second district documents the process to determine if a student is eligible for special education as a student with a specific learning disability
Noncompliant	Allegation 7	Whether the second district published information on its website describing how families can refer a student suspected of a disability for special education evaluation
Noncompliant	Allegation 8	Whether students with an IEP have access to instructional materials, including Assistive Technology, needed to make progress in grade level content expectation standards and Michigan Merit Curriculum in the second district

Noncompliant	Allegation 9	Whether the second district developed a timely annual IEP for each student
Noncompliant	Allegation 10	Whether the second district provided notice before reducing or eliminating a student's special education services or before exiting a student from special education
Noncompliant	Allegation 11	Whether the first district provided each student a summary of the student's academic achievement and functional performance upon graduation

**Corrective action and proof of compliance for the district's noncompliance is directed in the attached document entitled *Corrective Action and Proof of Compliance*.**

### INVESTIGATION

**Allegation 1: Whether the first and second district provided speech and language, occupational therapy, physical therapy, orientation and mobility services; and teacher consultant services for visual impairment, hearing impairment, physical impairment and autism spectrum disorder as required by each student's IEP**

Rule for Allegation 1:

R 340.1722(2) of the Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education requires a district provide special education and related services to a student in accordance with the student's IEP.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 1:

Appendix I identifies students who were not consistently provided with the speech and language, occupational therapy, physical therapy, orientation and mobility services; and teacher consultant services for visual impairment, hearing impairment, physical impairment and autism spectrum disorder as required by each student's IEP. Thus the district is noncompliant with R 340.1722(2).

**Allegation 2: Whether the first and second district completed initial evaluations for students referred for a special education evaluation and 3-year reevaluations for each eligible student in a timely manner**

Rule for Allegation 2:

Rule 340.1721b(1) of the MARSE specifies the time from receipt of parental consent for an evaluation to notice of an offer of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) or the determination of ineligibility shall not be more than 30 school days. 34 CFR § 300.303 of the federal regulations implementing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act requires a school district conduct a reevaluation if the district determines the educational or related service needs warrant, if the student's parent or teacher requests a reevaluation,

and at least once every three years unless the parent and district agree that a reevaluation is unnecessary.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 2:

State complaint C-7237-11 found the first district did not consistently complete initial evaluations and/or reevaluations in a timely manner from January 4, 2012 until the issuance of the complaint on April 4, 2012. This noncompliance was addressed in the corrective action and proof of compliance for C-7237-11. The proof of compliance for this case is currently being submitted and monitored by the ISD and the Office of Special Education.

Interviews with the second district indicated that both initial evaluations and reevaluations have not been completed in a timely manner. Student data in TIENET and Appendixes I, II, and III indicate students are not consistently receiving timely initial evaluations and/or reevaluations. Thus the second district is noncompliant with R 340.1721b(1), and 34 CFR § 300.303.

**Allegation 3: Whether the first and second district considered extended school year services during the development of each IEP between January 4, 2012 and January 3, 2013**

Rule for Allegation 3:

R 340.1721e(1)(b) requires an IEP team include in writing a statement documenting that extended school year services were considered during the development of each IEP.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 3:

Appendix I indicates the first and second district did not consistently include a written statement documenting extended school year services were considered during the develop of each IEP. Thus the district is noncompliant with R 340.1721e(1)(b).

**Allegation 4: Whether the Mosaica Education Group had the right to require students with an IEP to apply and only if accepted enroll in the district at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year**

Rule for Allegation 4:

R 340.1701(c) identifies the authority of a state complaint.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 4:

The complainant indicated that when the first district closed, the second district required parents to enroll every student who attended school in the first district and then wait to learn if the student had been accepted. The complainant further indicated this provided an undue hardship to families who reside in the district and whose children were previously enrolled in the first district. Finally the complainant indicated this is discrimination against families of students who reside in the area. Hardship and

discrimination are not within the authority of a state complaint as defined in R 340.1701a(c). Thus the allegation is dismissed.

**Allegation 5: Whether the Mosaica Education Group developed an IEP within 30 school days for each student with an IEP who enrolled in the district at the beginning of the 2012-13 school year**

Regulation for Allegation 5:

34 CFR § 300.323(e) requires a district provide a student, who transfers into a district from a previous district in the same state, with a FAPE by either adopting the student's IEP from the previous district or developing a new IEP. 34 CFR § 300.503(a) requires a district provide written notice whenever the district proposes or refuses to initiate or change the provision of a FAPE to a student. R 340.1721b(5) requires a district make a decision within 30 school days regarding implementation of the student's IEP from the previous district or the development of a new IEP.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 5:

The complainant indicated the second district did not provide written notice of the district's intent to implement the student's IEP or develop a new IEP and provide written notice for the provision of special education following student's enrollment in the second district. Appendix I indicates the second district did not consistently make a decision within 30 school days regarding implementation of the student's IEP from the previous district and provide notice or the development of a new IEP. Thus the second district is noncompliant with 34 CFR §§ 300.323(e) and 300.503(a) and R 340.1721b(5).

**Allegation 6: Whether the second district documents the process to determine if a student is eligible for special education as a student with a specific learning disability**

Regulation for Allegation 6:

34 CFR § 300.311(a)(7)(ii) requires parents are notified whether the district participates in a process that assesses the student's response to scientific, research-based intervention as a method of determining whether the student is a student with a specific learning disability.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 6:

The second district indicated they did not post or make public the process or combination of processes used to determine the existence of a specific learning disability at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year. Thus the second district is noncompliant with 34 CFR § 30.311(a)(7)(ii).

**Allegation 7: Whether the second district published information on its website describing how families can refer a student suspected of a disability for special education evaluation**

Regulation for Allegation 7:

34 CFR § 300.111(a)(1) requires a district have a process in place to identify, locate, and evaluate students who are in need of special education.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 7:

The second district indicated they did not have a process in place to identify, locate, and evaluate a student who is suspected of being a student with a disability. Thus the district is noncompliant with 34 CFR § 300.111(a)(1).

**Allegation 8: Whether students with an IEP have access to instructional materials, including Assistive Technology, needed to make progress in grade level content expectation standards and Michigan Merit Curriculum in the second district**

Regulation for Allegation 8:

34 CFR § 300.17 requires a district provide a student with a FAPE including special education and related services provided at no charge. The Analysis of Comments and Changes indicates that accessibility to instructional materials is an inherent component of a district's obligation to provide a FAPE.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 8:

District staff members from the second district indicated they did not have access to the instructional materials needed at the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year. Thus the second district is noncompliant with 34 CFR § 300.17.

**Allegation 9: Whether the second district developed a timely annual IEP for each student**

Regulation for Allegation 9:

34 CFR § 300.324(b)(1)(ii) requires the district review a student's IEP periodically, but not less than annually, and revise the IEP as appropriate.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 9:

Appendix I indicates the district has not consistently reviewed each student's IEP at least annually. Thus the district is noncompliant with 34 CFR § 300.324(b)(1)(ii).

**Allegation 10: Whether the second district provided notice before reducing or eliminating a student's special education services or before exiting a student from special education**

Regulation for Allegation 10:

34 CFR § 300.503(a)(1) requires that written notice must be given to the parents of a child with a disability a reasonable time before the public agency proposes to initiate or change the provision of a FAPE to the student.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 10:

Appendix V indicates the second district indicated the district has not consistently provided notice prior to a change to the provision of a FAPE to a student. Thus the second district is noncompliant with 34 CFR § 300.503(a)(1).

**Allegation 11: Whether the first district provided each student a summary of the student's academic achievement and functional performance upon graduation**

Regulation for Allegation 11:

34 CFR § 300.305(e)(3) requires districts to provide a summary of achievement and functional performance to students who are graduating or leaving school due to exceeding the age eligibility.

Findings of Fact and Conclusion for Allegation 11:

Appendix VI indicates the first district did not consistently provide students with a summary of achievement and functional performance upon graduation. Thus the district is noncompliant with 34 CFR § 300.324(b)(1)(ii).



**Corrective Action and Proof of Compliance**

District: Muskegon Heights School District and Muskegon Heights Public School Academy  
 State Complaint: C-7514-13  
 Final Report Date: March 28, 2013

Pursuant to R 340.1854, § 300.151(b), and the State Complaint Procedures, the Office of Special Education directs the district to implement the corrective action specified below. The intermediate school district is responsible for assisting the district and for monitoring progress of the corrective action.

The district must submit the proof of compliance specified below to the Office of Special Education and the intermediate school district as evidence the district corrected the noncompliance. The proof of compliance must be submitted under the joint signatures of the administrator primarily in charge of special education programs and services, the chief administrative officer, and the president of the board of education. The proof of compliance must be submitted to:

Supervisor, Program Accountability  
 Office of Special Education  
 P.O. Box 30008  
 Lansing, Michigan 48909

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b>Proof of Compliance</b>	<b>Due Date:</b>
<p>Allegation 1 through 3 and 5 through 11:            Pursuant to Rules 340.1722(2), 340.1721b(1), 340.1721e(1)(b), 340.1721b(5) of the Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education and 34 CFR §§ 300.303, 300.323(e), 300.503(a), 300.311(a)(7)(ii), 300.111(a)(1), 300.17, 300.324(b)(ii), 300.503(a)(i) and 300.305(e)(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the district shall:</p>	<p>The district shall submit:</p> <p>1. A written statement that assures that, for</p>	<p>May 3, 2013</p>

District: Muskegon Heights School District  
 State Complaint: C-7514-13  
 Final Report Date: March 28, 2013

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b>Proof of Compliance</b>	<b>Due Date:</b>
<p>free appropriate public education (FAPE) as defined by the IDEA and the MARSE.</p> <p>Allegation 1 through 3 and 5 through 11:            Pursuant to Rules 340.1722(2), 340.1721b(1), 340.1721e(1)(b), 340.1721b(5) and 34 CFR §§ 300.303, 300.323(e), 300.503(a), 300.311(a)(7)(ii), 300.111(a)(1), 300.17, 300.324(b)(ii), 300.5039a)(i) and 300.305(e)(3), the district shall:</p> <p>2. With the assistance of the intermediate school district develop written procedures to ensure that, for this and all students, the district implements the provision of IDEA and MARSE specific to:</p> <p>a. The evaluation and reevaluation requirements found in 34 CFR §§ 300.300 through 300.306 and 300.307 through 300.311 and Rules 340.1721, 340.1721a, and 340.1721b.            b. The IEP requirements found in 34 CFR §§ 300.320 through 300.323 and Rule 340.1721e and 340.1722.            c. The notice provisions found in 34 CFR § 300.503.</p> <p>The procedures must include a description of:</p> <p>a. How the district will implement the rule and/or regulation.</p>	<p>this and all students, the district shall provide students with a free appropriate public education (FAPE) as defined by the IDEA and the MARSE.</p> <p>The district shall submit:</p> <p>2. A copy of the procedures the district reviewed and if necessary revised to ensure compliance with:</p> <p>a. The evaluation and reevaluation requirements found in 34 CFR §§ 300.300 through 300.306 and 300.307 through 300.311 and Rules 340.1721, 340.1721a, and 340.1721b.            b. The IEP requirements found in 34 CFR §§ 300.320 through 300.323 and Rule 340.1721e and 340.1722.            c. The notice provisions found in 34 CFR § 300.503.</p> <p>The documentation must include documentation of:</p> <p>a. How the district will implement the rule and/or regulation.            b. When the procedure will be</p>	
		<p>The procedures will be submitted to the Office of Special Education on or before June 1, 2013 for approval. The Office of Special Education will review the procedures and provide feedback on any required changes to the district by June 22, 2013. All required changes will be made and the procedures resubmitted to the Office of Special Education by July 13, 2013. The Office of Special Education will send any revision to the district by July 27, 2013.</p>

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b>Proof of Compliance</b>	<b>Due Date:</b>
<p>b. When the procedure will be implemented.</p> <p>c. The staff member responsible for implementing the procedure.</p> <p>d. How the person implementing the procedure will document implementation.</p> <p>e. The staff members responsible for monitoring implementation of the procedure.</p> <p>f. Frequency with which implementation of the procedure will be monitored.</p> <p>g. How the person monitoring implementation of the procedure will document doing so.</p>	<p>implemented.</p> <p>c. The staff member responsible for implementing the procedure.</p> <p>d. How the person implementing the procedure will document implementation.</p> <p>e. The staff member responsible for monitoring implementation of the procedure.</p> <p>f. Frequency with which implementation of the procedure will be monitored.</p> <p>g. How the person monitoring implementation of the procedure will document doing so.</p>	
<p>Allegation 1 through 3 and 5 through 11: Pursuant to Rules 340.1722(2), 340.1721b(1), 340.1721e(1)(b), 340.1721b(5) and 34 CFR §§ 300.303, 300.323(e), 300.503(a), 300.311(a)(7)(ii), 300.111(a)(1), 300.17, 300.324(b)(ii), 300.5039a)(i) and 300.305(e)(3), the district shall:</p> <p>3. Following approval of the procedures by the Office of Special Education, provide in-service training to all special education teachers, service providers, and building principals specific to:</p> <p>a. The approved procedures.</p> <p>b. The educational benefit review process.</p>	<p>The district shall submit:</p> <p>3. Documentation that all involved staff members were provided training specific to:</p> <p>a. The approved procedures.</p> <p>b. The educational benefit review process.</p> <p>The documentation must include the date of the training, names of the participants, a copy of the training agenda, and copies of all written material distributed during the meeting.</p>	<p>Training must be provided before the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year. Documentation of the training must be submitted to the Office of Special Education by September 15, 2013.</p>
<p>Allegation 1 through 3 and 5 through 11: Pursuant to Rules 340.1722(2), 340.1721b(1), 340.1721e(1)(b), 340.1721b(5) and 34 CFR §§</p>	<p>The district shall submit:</p>	

Corrective Action	Proof of Compliance	Due Date:
<p>300.303, 300.323(e), 300.503(a), 300.311(a)(7)(ii), 300.111(a)(1), 300.17, 300.324(b)(ii), 300.5039a(i) and 300.305(e)(3), the district shall:</p> <p>4. On a quarterly basis, the district shall submit to the Office of Special Education and the intermediate school district a copy of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The documentation used to monitor implementation of the procedure.</li> <li>One educational benefit review from each of the school buildings within the district including the preschool program.</li> </ol>	<p>4. A copy of the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation used to monitor implementation of the procedure.</li> <li>A copy of the educational benefit review from each school building and the preschool program.</li> </ol>	<p>Quarterly beginning November 30, 2013 for the duration of the 2013-2014 school year.</p>
<p>Allegation 1 through 3 and 5 through 11: Pursuant to Rules 340.1722(2), 340.1721b(1), 340.1721e(1)(b), 340.1721b(5) and 34 CFR §§ 300.303, 300.323(e), 300.503(a), 300.311(a)(7)(ii), 300.111(a)(1), 300.17, 300.324(b)(ii), 300.5039a(i) and 300.305(e)(3), the district shall:</p> <p>5. Submit a copy of the first five IEP reports completed following training by each staff member in the district who facilitates the IEP process. The copy shall include all components of the respective IEP including if appropriate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A multidisciplinary evaluation team (MET) report.</li> <li>All evaluation reports used for the development of the MET.</li> <li>A review of existing evaluation data report (REED).</li> </ol>	<p>The district shall submit:</p> <p>5. A copy of the first five IEP reports completed following training by each staff member in the district who facilitates the IEP process. The copy shall include all components of the respective IEP including if appropriate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A multidisciplinary evaluation team (MET) report.</li> <li>All evaluation reports used for the development of the MET.</li> <li>A review of existing evaluation data report (REED).</li> </ol>	<p>Monthly beginning on September 30, 2013 throughout the 2013-2014 school year. The Office of Special Education will review and develop a summary for each IEP reviewed. The summary will be sent to the district within two weeks of receipt of the IEP. The summary will document</p>

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b>Proof of Compliance</b>	<b>Due Date:</b>
<p>d. A Manifestation Determination Review (MDR).            e. An Interim Alternative Education Service (IAES) report.            f. Any functional behavior evaluation assessments, behavior plans, assistive technology plans, transition plans, etc. that are included in the IEP.</p> <p>Allegation 1 through 3 and 5 through 11: Pursuant to Rules 340.1722(2), 340.1721b(1), 340.1721e(1)(b), 340.1721b(5) and 34 CFR §§ 300.303, 300.323(e), 300.503(a), 300.311(a)(7)(ii), 300.111(a)(1), 300.17, 300.324(b)(ii), 300.5039a)(i) and 300.305(e)(3), the district shall:</p> <p>6. With the assistance of the intermediate school district, select a random representative sample of 10% of students with an IEP and review to ensure the following components are complete including documentation:</p> <p>a. That procedures were followed when a request for an initial evaluation is received.            b. Of a full and complete evaluation and/or reevaluation.            c. Of a multidisciplinary, full and individual evaluation completed in a timely manner.            d. An appropriate eligibility determination.            e. That the least restrictive environment was considered at each IEP team meeting.            f. That the IEP was implemented fully including provision of services, accommodations,</p>	<p>d. A Manifestation Determination Review (MDR).            e. An Interim Alternative Education Service (IAES) report.            f. Any functional behavior evaluation assessments, behavior plans, assistive technology plans, transition plans, etc. that are included in the IEP.</p> <p>The district shall submit:</p> <p>6. A checklist documenting compliance or noncompliance for each student record reviewed including documentation:</p> <p>a. That procedures were followed when a request for an initial evaluation is received.            b. Of a full and complete evaluation and/or reevaluation.            c. Of a multidisciplinary, full and individual evaluation completed in a timely manner.            d. An appropriate eligibility determination.            e. That the least restrictive environment was considered at each IEP team meeting.            f. That the IEP was implemented fully</p>	<p>any noncompliance noted and provide guidance for resolving the noncompliance.</p> <p>Quarterly beginning November 30, 2013 for the duration of the 2013-2014 school year.</p>

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b>Proof of Compliance</b>	<b>Due Date:</b>
<p>location, intensity, and frequency.</p> <p>g. Of prior written notice provided to parents.</p> <p>h. Of the provision of progress reports provided to parents in a timely manner.</p>	<p>including provision of services, accommodations, location, intensity, and frequency.</p> <p>g. Of prior written notice provided to parents.</p> <p>h. Of the provision of progress reports provided to parents in a timely manner.</p>	
<p>Allegation 1: Pursuant to R 340.1722(2):</p> <p>7a. For all students who did not receive speech and language, occupational therapy, physical therapy, orientation and mobility services; and teacher consultant services for visual impairment, hearing impairment, physical impairment and autism spectrum disorder as required by each student's IEP, contact each parent via certified mail with a second copy of the letter sent via first class mail and inform the parent:</p>	<p>The district shall submit:</p> <p>7a. A copy of the letter sent to parents of the students who did not receive speech and language, occupational therapy, physical therapy, orientation and mobility services; and teacher consultant services for visual impairment, hearing impairment, physical impairment and autism spectrum disorder.</p>	<p>May 4, 2013</p>
<p>a. The Office of Special Education found the district noncompliant because the district did not provide IEP required services.</p> <p>b. Under 34 CFR § 300.151(b)(1) of the IDEA remedies for denial of services may be available if there has been a loss of educational services.</p> <p>c. The parent must contact the district within 15 calendar days if the parent wants to address a possible educational loss and create a plan to address the loss.</p>		
<p>7b. Contact the parents who indicate they wish to</p>		

District: Muskegon Heights School District  
 State Complaint: C-7514-13  
 Final Report Date: March 28, 2013

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b>Proof of Compliance</b>	<b>Due Date:</b>
<p>develop a written plan that identifies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Whether the student experienced an educational loss because of the district's failure to provide speech and language, occupational therapy, physical therapy, orientation and mobility services; and teacher consultant services for visual impairment, hearing impairment, physical impairment and autism spectrum disorder.</li> <li>b. The amount of loss if the student experienced an educational loss.</li> <li>c. Appropriate remedies for the loss identified above in (a) and (b).</li> </ul>	<p>7b. Documentation of the contact made to parents who responded and indicated they wish to develop a plan that addresses educational loss.</p>	<p>May 4, 2013</p>
<p>7c. If the parent does not contact the district within 2 weeks of receipt of the letter, the district must contact the parent to clarify whether parent is interested in pursuing remedy for loss of services. The contact must be documented and will be subsequently submitted to the Office of Special Education.</p>	<p>7c. A list of all parents who did not respond to the letter, documentation of the second contact, and the results of the second contact.</p>	<p>May 17, 2013</p>
<p>7d. If the parties are able to agree on the written plan described above, the complainant shall sign the plan indicating agreement, and the administrator primarily in charge of special education programs and services for the district shall sign indicating both agreement with and intent to implement the plan.</p>	<p>7d. A copy of the agreed upon plan signed by both the complainant and district.</p>	<p>May 31, 2013</p>
<p>7e. If the complainant and the district are unable to agree on any item in (a) through (c), the</p>	<p>7e. A copy of the district proposal for the loss</p>	

District: Muskegon Heights School District  
 State Complaint: C-7514-13  
 Final Report Date: March 28, 2013

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b>Proof of Compliance</b>	<b>Due Date:</b>
<p>district will inform the OSE in writing about the specific item or items in which agreement was not reached and the district's proposal regarding appropriate remedy for loss of services. The OSE will then direct final corrective action and proof of compliance with respect to the specific item or items.</p> <p>7f. The district shall collect documentation specific to the services provided.</p>	<p>of educational services. The OSE will then contact the complainant and direct the corrective action and proof of compliance for the specific student.</p> <p>7f. For all students provided with education services, the district shall submit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Attendance records.</li> <li>b. Documentation of the student's progress toward achieving his/her goals and objectives during the sessions.</li> </ul>	<p>September 6, 2013</p>
<p>Allegation 2: Pursuant to R 340.1721b(1) and 34 CFR § 300.303:</p> <p>8a. If the district has not already done so, immediately complete an initial evaluation for all students referred for special education since the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year.</p> <p>8b. If the district has not already done so, immediately determine if the educational or related service needs warrant a reevaluation or the parent requests a reevaluation according to the provision of 34 CFR §§ 300.303 through 300.306, and complete the required evaluation and IEP.</p>	<p>The district shall submit:</p> <p>8a. A copy of the initial IEP including a copy of the initial multidisciplinary evaluation team report.</p> <p>8b. A copy of the reevaluation IEP including a copy of the documentation of the review of existing evaluation data and the multidisciplinary evaluation team report.</p>	<p>September 6, 2013</p> <p>September 6, 2013</p>
<p>Allegation 3: Pursuant to R 340.1721e, the district</p>		

District: Muskegon Heights School District  
 State Complaint: C-7514-13  
 Final Report Date: March 28, 2013

Corrective Action	Proof of Compliance	Due Date:
<p>shall:</p> <p>9. If the district has not already done so, develop an IEP for the student that documents consideration of extended school year services for the student.</p>	<p>9. A copy of an IEP for each student from Appendix I where it has been indicated that the student's IEP does not include consideration of extended school year services.</p>	<p>June 21, 2013</p>
<p>Allegation 6: Pursuant to 34 CFR § 300.311(a)(7)(ii), the district shall:</p> <p>10. Publically post on its website, or make public through other means, the process or combination of process which will be used to determine the existence of a specific learning disability.</p>	<p>The district shall submit:</p> <p>10. Documentation of the process used to determine the existence of a specific learning disability including the location of the public posting and the date it was posted.</p>	<p>May 4, 2013</p>
<p>Allegation 7: Pursuant to 34 CFR § 300.111(a)(1)(ii), the district shall:</p> <p>11. Make public the procedure developed in Activity 2a that outlines the process the district will use to identify, locate, and evaluate a student who is suspected of being a student with a disability.</p>	<p>11. Documentation of the procedure developed in Activity 2a that outlines the process the district will use to identify, locate, and evaluate a student who is suspected of being a student with a disability.</p>	<p>May 4, 2013</p>