

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION SUMMARY

COMPLAINT NUMBER:	2259.05
COMPLAINT INVESTIGATOR:	Alexandra Curlin
DATE OF COMPLAINT:	June 3, 2005
DATE OF REPORT:	June 24, 2005
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION:	no
DATE OF CLOSURE:	July 19, 2005

COMPLAINT ISSUES:

Whether Nettle Creek Community Schools violated:

511 IAC 7-27-7(a) by failing to implement the Student's IEP as written, specifically by failing to monitor assignments and completed work.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. The Student has been identified as having a learning disability and has been determined eligible for special education and related services.
2. The Student's IEP does specify that the Basic Skills Teacher is to monitor assignments and completed work.
3. The Student was assigned a Final Project in choir class in which the Choir Teacher gave three choices for completion. Student could write a paper, create a storyboard, or make a musical instrument. Student chose to write the paper.
4. The requirements for the paper were that it was at least three typed and double-spaced pages and students were to use three sources. The Internet could only be one of the three sources. The Teacher also gave the Student a plagiarism packet describing plagiarism and forbidding it.
5. The Student was given the same plagiarism packet in her science class when assigned a science project on two previous occasions.
6. The Student had been informed that plagiarism is unacceptable.
7. The Student completed the assignment and turned it in to the appropriate teacher but plagiarized the report by verbatim copying of a report on the internet.
8. When monitoring assignments, the TOR checks to see whether assignments are being completed and turned in to the appropriate teacher. The TOR also checks assignments for accuracy when requested by a parent or student. The TOR has done this for the Student.
9. When the Choir Teacher found out about the plagiarism, the Student was given a "zero" for the assignment. The TOR then arranged for the student to work on an on-line plagiarism program that is

designed to help students identify different aspects of plagiarism. Upon completion of the program, the Student was given the opportunity to re-do the assignment for half credit, which she did.

10. The Student received a grade of A- in the class.

CONCLUSION:

Findings of Fact #'s 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 indicate that School did monitor Student's assignments pursuant to Student's IEP. Therefore, a violation of 511 IAC 7-27-7(a) is not found.

The Department of Education, Division of Exceptional Learners requires no corrective action based on the Findings of Fact and Conclusions listed above.