

Making Education Accessible in Neighborhood Schools (MEANS) Initiative

List of Non-Negotiables Phase I

Implications if Non-Negotiables for Phase I are Not Met

As a department, we fully understand the importance of the MEANS Initiative and support its implementation. It is an initiative that is consistent with best practices relative to inclusion, NCLB, IDEA, and COMAR. Additionally it directly aligns with our PGCPs's Balanced Score Card goal of increasing the percentage of students with disabilities in Environments A and B. Central to the successful implementation of this project is having met a list of requirements or "non-negotiables" that (we recommend) must be in place to successfully move forward.

<u>Non-Negotiables</u>	<u>Consequence if Non-Negotiable is Not Supported</u>
1. All staff (special educators, general educators, and related services) must be hired and/or reassigned as a member of a co-teaching team in the receiving schools by June 12, 2007.	1. Failure to have appropriate staff in place would result in the identified staff not being available to participate in summer professional development modules for co-teaching teams.
2. All professional development for co-teaching teams must be completed by July 27, 2007.	2. Failure to have staff appropriately trained would result in teaching teams being inadequately prepared to deliver special education and related services.
3. This MEANS Initiative's staffing realignment needs to occur simultaneously with the Highly Qualified Teacher Initiative.	3. If the two initiatives do not occur simultaneously, mandates of NCLB and IDEA might not be met.
4. Recognize this initiative as systemic and have it supported by all departments as outlined.	4. Moving forward with this initiative without systemic awareness and support would reduce the initiative's effectiveness.
5. Ensure cross-departmental ownership of the initiative, including funding (i.e., additional non-special education staff.)	5. Moving forward with this initiative without cross-departmental ownership, including funding, would result in partial implementation without collaborative supports.
6. Monitoring, on a monthly basis, by the Regional Office to ensure systemic implementation of initiative to transition identified students from CSEP to neighborhood school. Monitoring will include ensuring that the student-teacher ratio is maintained at 18:3 and that staff is utilized as intended.	6. Without ongoing monitoring by the Regional Office, the service delivery model as designed might not be appropriately supported by principals.
7. Create a reduced class size of 18 students. The composition will include up to 9 students with disabilities and 9 students without disabilities with a general education teacher, special education teacher, and paraeducator. The co-taught classroom must be heterogeneously grouped. Each receiving school will be assigned a .5 Crisis Intervention Resource Teacher.	7. Failure to have appropriate staff in place would result in the service delivery model not being provided and thereby constitute failure to implement the IEP as written. Lack of appropriate staffing (i.e., the general educator) would essentially create a self-contained class. No improvement in LRE A data would be realized.

List of Non-Negotiables Phase I

<u>Non-Negotiables</u>	<u>Consequence if Non-Negotiable is Not Supported</u>
8. Increase funding in subsequent years to continue to implement the remaining grades for the initiative.	8. Failure to provide additional funding in subsequent years might result in a failure to provide a continuum of services in K-3.
9. Four in-service days in August must be scheduled and funded, prior to the start of the school year, with per diem pay for teaching teams.	9. Failure to have staff appropriately trained would result in teaching teams being inadequately prepared to deliver special education and related services.
10. One monthly release day for professional development related to the initiative during the 2007-2008 school year must be established.	10. Failure to provide ongoing professional development would limit efforts to increase the knowledge base of teaching teams and the provision of technical assistance..
11. If school status changes after August 21, 2007, trained teacher teams will remain in place.	11. Removing assigned teaching teams would result in a failure to develop increased capacity in buildings.
12. If students transition out of the base school, realigned staffing must be maintained at the base school, and additional staffing created at the receiving school.	12. Removing assigned teaching teams would result in a failure to develop increased capacity in buildings.