Ohio School Boards Association
Capital Conference and Trade Show

November 13 – 16, 2011

Greater Columbus Convention Center
Columbus, Ohio

Parental access in the classroom

Student Issues
Monday, November 14, 2011
9:00 a.m.
C 114—115

Susan Clark, professor, University of Akron
Valerie Riedthaler, director of pupil services, Woodridge Local (Summit)

Online payment program

OSBA, BASA, and OASBO have partnered with Esber Cash Register to offer the PayForIt online payment system to school districts.

PayForIt provides tangible benefits to both district administrators and to parents. For administrators, it offers a secure online payment program that simplifies payment, collection and balancing of school funds. For parents, it provides convenient access to pay online for school-related fees and manage their students' funds.

For more information about this new program or to sign up, contact Amanda Finney at (614) 540-4000 or (800) 589-OSBA.

Please complete an online conference evaluation either during or after the event at:
http://links.ohioschoolboards.org/CC11Evaluation

OSBA Mission

OSBA leads the way to educational excellence by serving Ohio's public school board members and the diverse districts they represent through superior service and creative solutions.

Ohio School Boards Association

8050 North High Street, Suite 100
Columbus OH 43235-6481
(614) 540-4000 fax (614) 540-4100
www.osba-ohio.org

OHIO SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION CAPITAL CONFERENCE

"Parental Access in the Classroom"

Susan G. Clark, Ph.D., J.D.
Professor, University of Akron

Valerie Riedthaler, Ph.D.
Director of Pupil Services, Woodridge Local Schools (Summit)

Columbus, OH
November 14, 2011

I. Introduction

II. General Framework

A. Fundamental Parental Rights

1. Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923). The Court invalidated, under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, a Nebraska law that forbade the teaching of foreign languages in private school. A parent has a constitutional liberty interest in bringing up her children and the law "materially interfered" with the "power of parents to control the education of their own children." (At 401)

2. Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925). The Supreme Court held that the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause affords parents a constitutional right to direct their children's education.

3. Blau v. Fort Thomas Public School District, 401 F.3d 381, 395 (6th Cir. 2005). "The U.S. Supreme Court has recognized a fundamental right of parents to make decisions concerning the care, custody, and control of their children. And while this right plainly extends to the public school setting, it is not an unqualified right. While parents have a fundamental right to decide whether to send their child to a public school, they do not have a fundamental

right generally to direct how a public school teaches their child. Whether it is the school curriculum, the hours of the school day, school discipline, the timing and content of examinations, the individuals hired to teach at the school, the extracurricular activities at the school or, a dress code, these issues of public education are generally committed to the control of state and local authorities." (Citations omitted).

4. Schmidt v. Des Moines Pub. Sch., (8th Cir. 2011). A noncustodial parent has no fundamental liberty interest to access to her children during school hours. The circuit court held that it was not clearly established that a parent's Fourteenth Amendment substantive due process right to a child's care, custody and management requires that the school grant the parent "unfettered access" to the child during the school day. School district policy provided that it follow court orders relative to custody orders and could be limited according to individual situations. In this case, the parents' divorce decree restricted her visitation rights and the school district required her to obtain the consent of the custodial parent. On numerous occasions, the mother attempted to visit the students at school and was denied.

B. Law and School Board Policy

1. O.R.C. §3313.20(A). The board of education of a school district or the governing board of an educational service center shall make any rules that are necessary for its government and the government of its employees, pupils of its schools, and all other persons entering upon its school grounds or premises. Rules regarding entry of persons other than students, staff, and faculty upon school grounds or premises shall be posted conspicuously at or near the entrance to the school grounds or premises, or near the perimeter of the school grounds or premises if there are no formal entrances, and at the main entrance to each school building.

2. Nichols v. Western Local Bd. of Edn., 127 Ohio Misc.2d 30 (2003). The court held that Ohio school boards may govern school activities and property without adopting formal rules on all aspects of such governance and that school authorities have the right to exclude persons other than students from school activities and property without a due process hearing. The court also held that parents of students have no constitutional "liberty interest" to attend school activities or be present on school property. Finally, the exclusion by school authorities of persons other than students from school activities and property without a due process hearing is not a "quasi-judicial" decision giving rise to an administrative

appeal to the court of common pleas under O.R.C. §2506.01.

C. Sex Offender Background Checks

1. O.R.C. § 109.575 provides that "At the time of a person's initial application to an organization or entity to be a volunteer in a position in which the person on a regular basis will have unsupervised access to a child, the organization or entity shall inform the person that, at any time, the person might be required to provide a set of impressions of the person's fingerprints and a criminal records check might be conducted with respect to the person. Not later than thirty days after the effective date of this section, each organization or entity shall notify each current volunteer who is in a position in which the person on a regular basis has unsupervised access to a child that, at any time, the volunteer might be required to provide a set of impressions of the volunteer's fingerprints and a criminal records check might be conducted with respect to the volunteer."

2. Meadows v. Lake Travis Indep. Sch. Dist., (5th Cir. 2010). The Fifth Circuit Court held that the school district's policy requiring all visitors to its schools to undergo an electronic sex offender background check before obtaining access to the school did not violate parents' Fourteenth Amendment substantive due process right to direct their children's education. The Fifth Circuit affirmed stating that even if unfettered access was a fundamental right of parents, the school district's policy would pass strict scrutiny because the school district had a compelling governmental interest in protecting students by determining if a visitor is a registered sex offender prior to allowing that visitor unfettered access to all areas of its schools. The policy was narrowly tailored to achieve that interest because the electronic system used by the district took "only the minimum information necessary to determine sex-offender status, identify the visitor, and ensure the lack of false positives."

III. Parents as Partners

A. Parent involvement policy requirements are stated in O.R.C. Sections 3313.472 (A), 3324.04 and 3324.06; The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (No Child Left Behind (NCLB)), Title I, Section 1118; Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) 2004 Sections 650 and 664.

B. O.R.C. 3313.472(A) requires the board of education of each city, exempted village, local, and joint vocational school district shall adopt a

policy on parental involvement in the schools of the district.

C. The Ohio Department of Education ("ODE") requires that a Parental Involvement Policy/Plan shall include a School-Parent Compact, which is a written agreement of what schools and parents are each supposed to do to help students achieve. A School-Parent Compact is a component of the school-level parental involvement policy/plan which describes, among other things, communication between teachers and parents about reasonable access to staff and classroom volunteering, participation, and observation opportunities. Available at: http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=129&ContentID=2292&Content=92072

D. The ODE provides sample best practices for parental involvement in schools based on the National Parent-Teacher Association ("PTA") six national standards to promote effective schools through strong family and school partnerships. Available at: http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEDetail.aspx?page=3&TopicRelationID=428&ContentID=80852&Content=100179

E. PTA National Standards are available at: http://www.pta.org/Documents/National_Standards_2-handout.pdf

1. Standard 1: Welcoming all families into the school community—Families are active participants in the life of the school, and feel welcomed, valued, and connected to each other, to school staff, and to what students are learning and doing in class.

2. Standard 4: Speaking up for every child—Families are empowered to be advocates for their own and other children, to ensure that students are treated fairly and have access to learning opportunities that will support their success.

Goal 1: Understanding How the School System Works

a. Do parents know how the local school and district operate and how to raise questions or concerns about school and district programs, policies, and activities?

b. Do they understand their rights and responsibilities under federal and state law as well as local ordinances and policies?

IV. Special Education - Parental/Expert Access to School Campus - Generally

A. The IDEA contemplates parental participation in the child's education; however, neither the IDEA nor its implementing regulations give parents the right to observe their children in class.

1. The IDEA specifically provides, in part, that the parents of a child with disabilities have an opportunity to participate in meetings with respect to the identification, evaluation, and educational placement of their child, and the provision of a free appropriate public education to their child, 34 C.F.R. §§300.501(b), 300.344(a)(1), and 300.517; O.A.C. 3301-51-05(F)(2).

B. Case Law/OSEP Letters

1. Letter to Mamas, 42 IDELR 10 (OSEP 2004). The federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) wrote that, "While the IDEA expects parents of children with disabilities to have an expanded role in the evaluation and educational placement of their children and be participants, along with school personnel, in developing, reviewing, and revising the IEPs for their children, neither the statute nor the regulations implementing the IDEA provide a general entitlement for parents of children with disabilities, or their professional representatives, to observe their children in any current classroom or proposed educational placement."

2. Murphy v. Arlington Cent. Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ., 402 F.3d 332, 338 (2d Cir. 2005). "Expert testimony is often critical in IDEA cases, which are fact-intensive inquiries about the child's disability and the effectiveness of the measures that school boards have offered to secure a free appropriate public education. The IDEA's procedural safeguards ensure that children and parents can realize whatever benefits are due. Thus, for example, parties to IDEA proceedings have 'the right to be accompanied and advised by counsel and by individuals with special knowledge or training with respect to the problems of children with disabilities...'."

V. Special Education - Events Triggering Observation Issues

A. Independent Educational Evaluation (IEE)/ Evaluation/Reevaluation

1. Independent Educational Evaluation

a. O.A.C. 3301-51-05(A)(30). "Independent educational evaluation" means an evaluation conducted by a qualified

examiner who is not employed by the school district responsible for the education of the child in question.

b. Letter to Mamas, 42 IDELR 10 (OSEP 2004). OSEP opined that the school district may need to provide outside evaluators access to its classrooms if the parents invoke their right to an independent educational evaluation (IEE) and the evaluation requires observing the student in her educational placement.

c. School Bd. of Manatee County v. L.H *ex rel.* D.H., 53 IDELR 149, 2009 WL 3231914 (M.D. Fla. 2009). The district court affirmed a due process decision that ordered the school district to permit at least a two-hour observation of the middle school student with Asperger Syndrome by the parent's independent psychologist. The court noted that the school district had the right to limit the psychologist's access to the classroom based on state or local policies. In this case, the school district violated the IDEA by imposing restrictions on the independent evaluation. The school district permitted its own evaluators to observe students with disabilities in the classroom. The court noted that IEEs are to be conducted using the same criteria as the district's. The court found no distinction between IEEs that were paid for by the district or by the parent when determining whether an evaluator should have classroom access. The court did note that a district's right to limit classroom access to a private psychologist will turn on state or local policies. However, in this case, the IEE observation was necessary.

B. Initial Evaluation/Reevaluation

1. O.A.C. 3301-51-06(F)(1). As part of an initial evaluation, if appropriate, and as part of any reevaluation under this rule, the evaluation team shall develop an evaluation plan that will provide for the following *** and, in relevant part, review existing evaluation data on the child, including:

a. Evaluations and information provided by the parents of the child;

b. Current classroom-based, local, or state assessments, and classroom-based observations;

c. Observations by teachers and related services providers.

2. O.A.C. 3301-51-06(H)(4). Additional procedures for identifying children with specific learning disabilities ensure that the child is observed in the child's learning environment, including the regular classroom setting, to document the child's academic performance and behavior in the areas of difficulty.

   a. The group described in paragraph (G) of this rule, in determining whether a child has a specific learning disability, must decide to:

      (i) Use information from an observation in routine classroom instruction and monitoring of the child's performance that was done before the child was referred for an evaluation; or

      (ii) Have at least one member of the group described in paragraph (G) of this rule conduct an observation of the child's academic performance in the regular classroom after the child has been referred for an evaluation and parental consent, consistent with OAC 3301-51-05 is obtained.

3. O.A.C. 3301-51-11(C)(1). Preschool child eligibility for special education and related services as a preschool child shall be determined on the basis of multiple sources of information, including (in part), but not limited structured observations in more than one setting and in multiple activities.

C. Before IEP development

Board of Educ. of the Carmel Cent. Sch. Dist., 48 IDELR 144 (SEA NY 2007). A state review officer ruled that the school district did not violate IDEA when it denied a parent's request to observe her 11-year old in a full day of classes. The parent was given permission to observe, for 39 minutes, a single class that the district selected. She subsequently attended and participated in three IEP meetings that resulted in the development of the student's sixth-grade IEP. However, the parent asserted that the observation of her child with cerebral palsy and vision impairment was "useless" because the student took a test that period, and she filed a due process complaint alleging she needed to observe a full day of classes, including transitions between classes, to evaluate the full extent of the student's mobility impairments and academic needs. She argued that she was at a disadvantage at IEP meetings because she was the only team member unable to observe the student in a school setting. The district stated that, by limiting the observation to a 39-minute period, it

properly balanced its own interest in limiting disruptions with the parent's interest in observing her daughter in school. Because the parent received regular reports about the student's progress and communicated with school staff whenever she had questions about her daughter's program, no violation was found.

D. Placement/Change of placement

1. L.M. *ex rel.* Sam M. v. Capistrano Unified Sch. Dist., 50 IDELR 181, 556 F.3d 900 (9th Cir. 2009), *cert. denied* 130 U.S. 90 (2009). The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals concluded that the school district violated the state education code when it allowed the parent's pediatric neurologist to observe a 3-year old autistic child's proposed placement only in 20-minute increments. Under California's education code, independent evaluators must have an equal opportunity to assess a proposed placement. However, the court held that the procedural violation did not result in a denial of FAPE because the time limit set on the observation did not prevent the neurologist from forming an opinion about the appropriateness of the placement. The neurologist was able to provide the parents with an informed and independent opinion, and the parents presented that opinion during the due process hearing; thus, the parents had a meaningful opportunity to present their views on the placement and the court concluded that the district's procedural error was harmless. Thus, the district's limitation on the observation did not significantly restrict the parents' right to participate in their child's IEP. Notably, the district observed the child in his private education program for up to three hours.

2. Hanson ex rel. Hanson v. Smith, 212 F. Supp.2d 474 (D. Md. 2002). In preparation for an IEP meeting in which a placement change – from a private school at district expense to a new program in the public school – might be recommended, the parents requested that they be permitted to visit and observe the proposed placement in advance of the IEP meeting. But arrangements were never made during the school year for them to attend and observe. After the placement decision became contentious, the parents filed due process claiming that the placement offer was predetermined. However, no predetermination was found where the district came to IEP meetings with "open minds" because several placement options were discussed and considered. The parents had attended all IEP meetings and participated. The fact that they were not able to visit and observe the proposed placement was not found to be a procedural violation. There was no language in the IDEA requiring that parents be allowed to visit the school of the proposed placement.

VI. Related Issues

A. Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)

1. FERPA does not specifically prohibit a parent or professional working with the parent from observing the parent's child in the classroom.

2. FERPA generally prohibits a teacher from disclosing information from a child's education records to other students in the classroom or to the parents of another child who might be observing the classroom.

3. FERPA does not protect the confidentiality of information in general; rather, FERPA applies to the disclosure of tangible records and of information derived from tangible records.

4. Santamaria v. Dallas Indep. Sch. Dist., 106 LRP 32273 (N.D. Tex. 2006). The court granted a discovery request and allowed a parent's expert to conduct classroom observation at an elementary school as part of a lawsuit concerning alleged disparate instruction and segregation of Latino students. The district objected to the request on several grounds, one of which was that it would implicate FERPA rights. The court disagreed and granted the request for observation. Its order prohibited the purported expert from accessing student records or personally identifiable information, stating she would be present to "merely observe." It said that if all parties followed the terms of the order, the observer would not acquire directory information during the visits or be exposed to student education records. However, to protect against her "direct exposure to directory information, as well as any incidental exposure to education records and personally identifiable information," the court issued its order pursuant to FERPA's judicial exception, which authorizes disclosure of education records in compliance with a judicial order; however, the district first must make a reasonable effort to notify the parent (or eligible student) of the order in advance of compliance. 34 CFR §99.31 (a)(9). Accordingly, the court directed the district to provide such notice.

B. Collective Bargaining Agreements

Hernando County (Fla.) Sch. Dist., 103 LRP 11429 (OCR, Atlanta, Jan. 17, 2003). Among other complaints, the parent asserted a violation of Section 504 when the district refused to allow the complainant in the

student's classroom. The negotiated Agreement stated that "Observation of classes by persons other than school and/or District personnel shall be allowed only after consent has been granted by the building principal. The principal, in a meeting with the bargaining member, will determine the day, time, and duration of visits to all classrooms with 24 hours advance notification." The Agreement also provided that "the teacher may, if he/she chooses, have a representative present during an observation by persons other than building or District Personnel." Two observations were arranged for which the parent never came. OCR determined that there was insufficient evidence to show that the school district refused to allow the complainant to observe the student's classroom. While there was conflicting testimony between the parent and district about the schedule for the observation visit to the classroom in April 2002, evidence revealed that the parent did observe the student's classroom in May 2002.

C. Surreptitious Audiotaping

Atlanta Indep. Sch. Sys. v. S.F., *ex rel.* M.F. and C.F., 55 IDELR 97 (N.D. Ga. 2010), *aff'd*, 110 LRP 69129 (N.D. Ga. 2010).

During the 2008-09 academic year, the parents of S.F., a non-verbal ten-year-old boy with autism, raised concerns with his safety, his placement, and the actions of his special education classroom teacher. They alleged that he suffered significant injuries at school and failing to receive a satisfactory explanation for those injuries, S.F.'s mother sent him to school with a recording device sewn into his shirt collar so that she could record his school day. The recording allegedly captured his teacher discussing alcohol, male genitalia, and other inappropriate topics in the classroom. Additionally, the parents alleged that the recording captured the teacher allowing S.F. to eat garbage from the trash can, taunting and ridiculing him, and ultimately beating him. The parents alleged that after the school administrator became aware of the recording, she never sought a copy of it and failed to remedy the concerns raised by the recording.

The court found that S.F. did not have the capacity to consent to his mother's recording of his school day, and there was no indication that he knew of the presence of the digital recorder or understood what its purpose was. The court opined that while an adult or child in a classroom may have no expectation that conversations that occur therein will not be heard by others in the classroom – a private place under state law - they are reasonably entitled to remain free from the surveillance and recording of those conversations. The court applied a Fourth Amendment analysis to find that school district policy prohibiting students from photographing, videotaping, recording, or reproducing ... any student or staff member while on school system premises without the express prior permission of the student or staff member created a subjective expectation of privacy

that society is prepared to recognize as reasonable given the indiscriminate recording of restroom activities, etc. Thus, the court held that the mother violated state eavesdropping laws and that her possession of the eavesdropping device was a felony under Georgia law.

D. Videotaping

1. Toledo Pub. Sch., SE 1872-2006 (Ohio SEA 2007). The parents wanted to videotape the student with multiple disabilities at school so that they could see "what was going on in the classroom" and were denied by district officials on the ground that to do so would be disruptive to the classroom and a violation of other students' rights to privacy. In lieu of videotaping, district officials offered the parents opportunities to observe OT, PT, speech, and other instructional sessions on a monthly or weekly schedule. District policy did not permit videotaping; however, the negotiated Agreement permitted videotaping only with the mutual consent of the teacher and parent. Finding the IDEA did not provide parents the right to videotape their child in the classroom, and that videotaping was the school district's decision, the SEA held that the parents failed to prove that they had a legal right to videotape the student's instruction or therapy, or that a refusal of permission was a denial of a FAPE. Videotaping was ordered only if there was mutual agreement per the Agreement, if the taping was done in a separate room, and so long as there was no change to the existing student-staff ratio in the classroom. If those conditions could not be met, videotaping would not be permitted.

2. J.P. v. County School Bd. of Hanover Cty., 447 F. Supp. 2d 553, (E.D. Va. 2006). The court rejected the parents' argument that they were denied the opportunity to participate in their child's education because the school did not allow the parents to videotape their child in the classroom. The court opined that the IDEA was silent on videotaping, and that the IDEA did not afford a right to parents to be present in the classroom during instruction. Thus, the IDEA could not be construed to support the parents' denial of parental involvement claim. The court noted that the school district's policy stated that it "invites and encourages parents to be involved closely with their students' education, including making visits to classrooms to view the academic environment. . . ." However, the court deemed this to be a discretionary policy that "accords a privilege to parents, not a right; and that privilege may be circumscribed in the manner chosen by [the school district] so long as [the school district] does not violate any other existing right."

E. Section 504 Retaliation Claims

1. Through the Title VI, 34 C.F.R. Section 100.7(e), and incorporated by reference into Section 504, 34 C.F.R. §104.61 and the ADA regulation at 28 C.F.R. §35.134, it is prohibited to retaliate against an individual who exercises his or her rights by filing a complaint, or by participating in an investigation or proceeding.

2. Sandoval (Ill.) Community Unit Sch. Dist. #501, 30 IDELR 60 (OCR 1998). The OCR set forth the elements of a retaliation claim as follows: 1) the parent participated in a protected activity; 2) the recipient was aware that the parent engaged in a protected activity; 3) the recipient subjected the parent to adverse action following the protected activity; and 4) there is a causal connection between the protected activity and the recipient's adverse action. All four of these conditions must be met."

   The school district took action to restrict a parent from being on school property due to his disruptive behavior and his failure to follow the school's visitation policy and his intimidating behavior toward District staff. The conduct included verbal abuse and disruption of the educational program; refusal to provide advance notice of visits to the school; visiting a teacher's classroom without permission; entering the gym while classes were in session; interrogating students and interrupting classes. However, the parent previously filed a due process complaint. The OCR found that there was no retaliation because the evidence showed that the district had made efforts to restrict the parent's access to school grounds before he filed the due process complaint.

3. Ash Fork (AZ) Joint Unified Sch. Dist., 106 LRP 35222 (OCR, Denver, 2005). Arizona state law required all visitors must sign in at the office upon arrival. District staff warned the student's mother verbally and in writing that she must comply with the visitor policy. The parent alleged retaliation under Section 504 for advocating for her child claiming she was restricted in her access to the school and its teachers. OCR found no evidence that the district applied its visitor sign-in policy differently to the mother than other visitors to the school. Additionally, the superintendent wrote to the parents and informed them that staff members complained about receiving calls from them at their homes and requested that they discuss school matters with district staff at school in accordance with district policy. Nonetheless, the mother continued to discuss educational concerns regarding the student with staff in meetings and school hallways. OCR found no evidence that the staff was instructed not to talk to the parents

outside of scheduled meetings. Thus, having to comply with the sign-in policy and communicate with staff in the school setting did not significantly disadvantage the mother or preclude her from further protected activity/advocacy for her son.

4. School Dist. of Philadelphia (PA), 106 LRP 35878 (OCR April 25, 2006). The OCR found no retaliation against the mother for her advocacy actions because the school district had articulated a legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for its actions. It advised the mother that she could not continue her status as school visitor because she had violated the rules for school visitors on more than one occasion. Several school staff members noted, and the parent's own statements to OCR demonstrated that she spoke out in the classroom, including talking to other children besides her own child, in violation of the visitor's policy. As a solution, the district offered the parent the opportunity to become a "school volunteer," with the added benefits of school access and the requirement of background clearances which was within its responsibility to maintain a non-disruptive and secure educational environment.

5. Juniata County (PA) Sch. Dist., 109 LRP 32698 (OCR June 17, 2007). The school district agreed to resolve the parent's complaint of discrimination and retaliation by ensuring that the parent would be permitted to visit her daughter's regular education and special education classrooms in accordance with the district's current visitor's policy. The district was required to report its activities to OCR for monitoring.

6. Arlington (VA) Pub. Schs., 109 LRP 54762 (OCR May 18, 2009). OCR found that there was some indication that the school's enforcement of the visitor policy was not enforced consistently, but did not amount to retaliation because it had been enforced against parents of general education students as well as the parent of the student with disabilities. Nevertheless, the school district was advised that its procedures for visitation at the school were to be applied and enforced consistently at all times regardless of the nature of the visit.

VII. Considerations

A. Know district guidelines for on-campus visitation and observation, including audio and video taping, and sex offenders.

B. Notify parents of the visitor policy at least annually.

C. Respond to the parental request and schedule the observation in a timely fashion, preferably in writing.

D. Limit the number of guests to minimize distraction (e.g., no more than two).

E. Choose an agreeable day that is a school typical day (not a field trip, state testing, or assembly) and identify the exact location (math instruction, music class, cafeteria).

F. Agree on a reasonable length of time to conduct the observation to ensure there is enough time for the parent or expert to develop an informed opinion.

G. Explain to the students that there will be guests, and go over expectations with the students for when there are guests in the room.

H. Explain to the parent/observer that the teacher will be teaching and that questions will have to wait until a follow-up meeting is scheduled.

I. Have the teacher remove any IEPs, records, assessments, etc. from plain view.

J. When the parent/observer arrives, the parent/observer must follow the building policy of signing in and obtaining a name badge.

K. Remind the parent/observer to remain silent during the observation to minimize any disruption, e.g., no participation, no questioning the teacher, no interactions with students.

L. Explain to the parent/observer that any observation that causes disruption will be terminated immediately by the administrator.

M. Request that the parent/observer sign out when he/she leaves.

N. Schedule a follow-up meeting with the parent to answer any questions or to address any concerns.

O. Ensure that the visitor's policy is applied equally and consistently to all visitors.

VIII. Conclusion