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**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT**

**Somerset Public Schools**

**SCOPE OF COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEWS**

As one part of its accountability system, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education oversees local compliance with education requirements through the Coordinated Program Review (CPR). All reviews cover selected requirements in the following areas:

Special Education (SE)

* selected requirements from the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA-2004); the federal regulations promulgated under that Act at 34 CFR Part 300; M.G.L. c. 71B, and the Massachusetts Board of Education’s Special Education regulations (603 CMR 28.00), as amended effective March 1, 2007. The 2016 - 2017 Web-based Monitoring System (WBMS) districts conducted self-assessments across all criteria.

Civil Rights Methods of Administration and Other General Education Requirements (CR)

* selected federal civil rights requirements, including requirements under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, together with selected state requirements under M.G.L. c. 76, Section 5 as amended by Chapter 199 of the Acts of 2011 and M.G.L. c. 269 §§ 17 through 19.
* selected requirements from the Massachusetts Board of Education’s Physical Restraint regulations (603 CMR 46.00).
* selected requirements from the Massachusetts Board of Education’s Student Learning Time regulations (603 CMR 27.00).
* various requirements under other federal and state laws.
* The 2016 - 2017 Web-based Monitoring System (WBMS) districts conducted self-assessments across all criteria.

English Learner Education (ELE) in Public Schools

* selected requirements from M.G.L. c. 71A, the state law that governs the provision of education to limited English proficient students, and 603 CMR 14.00, as well as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. During the 2016 - 2017 school year, all districts that enroll limited English proficient students will be reviewed using a combination of updated standards and a self-assessment instrument overseen by the Department’s Office of Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement (OELAAA), including a request for information regarding ELE programs and staff qualifications.

Some reviews also cover selected requirements in:

Career/Vocational Technical Education (CVTE)

* career/vocational technical education programs under the federal Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 and M.G.L. c. 74.

Districts providing Title I services participate in Title I program monitoring during the same year they are scheduled for a Coordinated Program Review. Details regarding the Title I program monitoring process are available at: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/titlei/monitoring>.

**COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW ELEMENTS**

**Team:** Depending upon the size of a school district and the number of programs to be reviewed, a team of one to eight Department staff members conducts onsite activities over two to five days in a school district or charter school.

**Timing:** Each school district and charter school in the Commonwealth is scheduled to receive a Coordinated Program Review every six years and a mid-cycle special education follow-up visit three years after the Coordinated Program Review; approximately 66 school districts and charter schools are scheduled for Coordinated Program Reviews in 2016 - 2017, of which all districts participated in the Web-based Monitoring System (WBMS). The Department’s

2016 - 2017 schedule of Coordinated Program Reviews is posted on the Department’s web site at <<<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pqa/review/cpr/schedule.html>>>.  The statewide six-year Program Review cycle, including the Department’s Mid-cycle follow-up monitoring schedule, is posted at <<<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pqa/review/cpr/6yrcycle.html>>>.

**Criteria:** The Program Review criteria for each WBMS review, begins with the district/school conducting a self-assessment across all 56 current special education criteria and 26 civil rights criteria. The Office of Public School Monitoring through its Desk Review procedures examines the district/school’s self-assessment submission and determines which criteria will be followed–up on through onsite verification activities. For more details, please see the section on **The Web-based Approach to** **Special Education and Civil Rights Monitoring** at the beginning of the School District Information Package for Special Education and Civil Rights.

The requirements selected for review in all of the regulated programs are those that are most closely aligned with the goals of the Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993 to promote student achievement and high standards for all students.

**WBMS Methods:** Methods used in reviewing special education, civil rights and English learner education programs include:

Self-Assessment Phase:

* District/school review of special education, civil rights and English learner education documentation for required elements including document uploads. Upon completion of this portion of the district/school’s self-assessment, it is submitted to the Department for review.
* District/school review of a sample of special education student records selected across grade levels, disability categories and level of need. Additional requirements for the appropriate selection of the student record sample can be found in **Appendix II: Student Record Review Procedures** of the School District Information Package for Special Education.

Upon completion of these portions of the district/school’s self-assessment, it is submitted to the Department for review.

On-site Verification Phase: Includes activities selected from the following;

* Interviews of administrative, instructional, and support staff consistent with those criteria selected for onsite verification.
* Interviews of parent advisory council (PAC) representatives and other telephone interviews, as requested, by other parents or members of the general public.
* Review of student records for special education: The Department may select a sample of student records from those the district reviewed as part of its self-assessment, as well as records chosen by the Department from the special education student roster. The onsite team will conduct this review, using standard Department procedures, to determine whether procedural and programmatic requirements have been implemented.
* Surveys of parents of students with disabilities: Parents of students with disabilities whose files are selected for the record review, as well as the parents of an equal number of other students with disabilities, are sent a survey that solicits information regarding their experiences with the district’s implementation of special education programs, related services, and procedural requirements.
* Observation of classrooms and other facilities: The onsite team visits a sample of classrooms and other school facilities used in the delivery of programs and services to determine general levels of compliance with program requirements.
* Review of additional documents for special education or civil rights.

**Methods for all other programs in the Coordinated Program Review:**

* Review of documentation about the operation of the charter school or district's programs.
* Interviews of administrative, instructional, and support staff across all grade levels.
* Telephone interviews as requested by other parents or members of the general public.
* Review of student records for English learner education and career/vocational technical education:  The Department selects a representative sample of student records for the onsite team to review, using standard Department procedures, to determine whether procedural and programmatic requirements have been implemented.
* Surveys of parents of English learners whose files are selected for the record review are sent a survey of their experiences with the district's implementation of the English learner education program and related procedural requirements.
* Observation of classrooms and other facilities: The onsite team visits a sample of classrooms and other school facilities used in the delivery of programs and services to determine general levels of compliance with program requirements.

**Report:** **Preparation:**

At the end of the onsite visit, the onsite team will hold an informal exit meeting to summarize its comments for the superintendent or charter school leader and anyone else he or she chooses. Within approximately 45 business days of the onsite visit, the onsite chairperson will forward to the superintendent or charter school leader (and collaborative director where applicable) a Draft Report containing comments from the Program Review. The Draft Report comments for special education and civil rights are provided to the district/school on-line through the Web-based Monitoring System (WBMS). These comments will, once the district has had a chance to respond, form the basis for any findings by the Department. The district (and collaborative) will then have 10 business days to review the report for accuracy before the publication of a Final Report with ratings and findings (see below). The Final Report will be issued within approximately 60 business days of the conclusion of the onsite visit and posted on the Department’s website at <<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pqa/review/cpr/reports/>>.

**Content of Final Report:**

*Ratings.* In the Final Report, the onsite team gives a rating for each compliance criterion it has reviewed; those ratings are “Commendable,” “Implemented,” “Implementation in Progress,” “Partially Implemented,” “Not Implemented,” and “Not Applicable.” “Implementation in Progress,” used for criteria containing new or updated legal requirements, means that the district has implemented any old requirements contained in the criterion and is training staff or beginning to implement the new requirements in such a way that the onsite team anticipates that the new requirements will be implemented by the end of the school year.

*Findings.* The onsite team includes a finding in the Final Report for each criterion that it rates “Commendable,” “Partially Implemented,” “Not Implemented,” or “Implementation in Progress,” explaining the basis for the rating. It may also include findings for other related criteria.

**Response:** Where criteria are found “Partially Implemented” or “Not Implemented,” the district or charter school must propose corrective action to bring those areas into compliance with the relevant statutes and regulations.  This corrective action plan (CAP) will be due to the Department within 20 business days after the issuance of the Final Report and is subject to the Department’s review and approval. Department staff will offer districts and charter schools technical assistance on the content and requirements for developing an approvable CAP.

Department staff will also provide ongoing technical assistance as the school or district is implementing the approved corrective action plan. **School districts and charter schools must demonstrate effective resolution of noncompliance identified by the Department as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the issuance of the Department’s Final Program Review Report.**

# **INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL REPORT**

# 

A three-member Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education team visited Somerset Public Schools during the week of January 23, 2017 to evaluate the implementation of selected criteria in the program areas of special education, civil rights and other related general education requirements, and English learner education. The team appreciated the opportunity to interview staff and parents, to observe classroom facilities and to review the programs underway in the district.

The Department is submitting the following Coordinated Program Review Report containing findings made pursuant to this onsite visit. In preparing this report, the team reviewed extensive written documentation regarding the operation of the district's programs, together with information gathered by means of the following Department program review methods:

* Interviews of ten administrative staff.
* Interviews of 27 teaching and support services staff across all levels.
* Interviews of four parent advisory council (PAC) representatives.
* Interviews of two English Language Education Parents.
* Student record reviews: Samples of nine special education student records and seven English learner education student records.
* Surveys of parents of students with disabilities: 35 parents of students with disabilities were sent surveys that solicited information about their experiences with the district’s implementation of special education programs, related services and procedural requirements. Twelve of these parent surveys were returned to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for review.
* Surveys of parents of ELE students: 15 parents of ELE students were sent surveys that solicited information about their experiences with the district’s implementation of English learner education programs, services, and procedural requirements. One of these parent surveys was returned to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for review.
* Observation of classrooms and other facilities. A sample of 14 instructional classrooms and other school facilities used in the delivery of programs and services was visited to examine general levels of compliance with program requirements.

The report includes findings in the program areas reviewed organized under nine components. These components are:

**Component I: Assessment of Students**

**Component II: Student Identification and Program Placement**

**Component III: Parent and Community Involvement**

**Component IV: Curriculum and Instruction**

**Component V: Student Support Services**

**Component VI: Faculty, Staff and Administration**

**Component VII: Facilities**

**Component VIII: Program Evaluation**

**Component IX: Recordkeeping and Fund Use**

|  |
| --- |
| The district conducted a self-assessment and the Department reviewed all of the criteria in the specific program areas. The Coordinated Program Review Report includes those criteria that were found by the team to be implemented in a “Commendable” manner, as well as criteria receiving a rating of "Partially Implemented," "Not Implemented," or “Implementation in Progress.” (Refer to the “Definition of Compliance Ratings” section of the report.) **Program Review Reports no longer include criteria receiving a rating of “Implemented” or “Not Applicable.”** This change will allow the district or charter school and the Department to focus their efforts on those areas requiring corrective action. For those criteria receiving a rating of “Partially Implemented” or “Not Implemented,” the district or charter school must propose to the Department corrective actions to bring those areas into compliance with the controlling statute or regulation. For any criteria receiving a rating of “Implementation in Progress,” the district or charter school must indicate the steps it will continue to take in order to fulfill the regulatory requirements. Districts and charter schools are expected to incorporate the corrective actions into their district and school improvement plans, including their professional development plans. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DEFINITION OF COMPLIANCE RATINGS** | |
|  | |
| **Commendable** | Any requirement or aspect of a requirement implemented in an exemplary manner significantly beyond the requirements of law or regulation. |
|  | |
| **Implemented** | The requirement is substantially met in all important aspects. |
|  | |
| **Implementation in Progress** | This rating is used for criteria containing new or updated legal requirements and means that the district has implemented any old requirements contained in the criterion and is training staff or beginning to implement the new requirements in such a way that the onsite team anticipates that the new requirements will be implemented by the end of the school year. |
|  | |
| **Partially Implemented** | The requirement, in one or several important aspects, is not entirely met. |
|  | |
| **Not Implemented** | The requirement is totally or substantially not met. |
|  | |
| **Not Applicable** | The requirement does not apply to the school district or charter school. |

Somerset Public Schools

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Special Education** | **Civil Rights and Other General Education Requirements** | **English Learner Education** |
| **IMPLEMENTED** | SE 1, SE 2, SE 3, SE 3A, SE 4, SE 5, SE 6, SE 8, SE 9, SE 9A, SE 10,  SE 11, SE 12, SE 13,  SE 14, SE 15, SE 16,  SE 17, SE 18A, SE 18B, SE 19, SE 20, SE 21,  SE 22, SE 24, SE 25,  SE 25A, SE 25B, SE 26, SE 27, SE 29, SE 32,  SE 33, SE 34, SE 35,  SE 36, SE 37, SE 38,  SE 39A, SE 39B, SE 40, SE 41, SE 42, SE 43,  SE 44, SE 45, SE 46,  SE 47, SE 48, SE 49,  SE 50, SE 51, SE 52,  SE 52A, SE 53, SE 54, SE 55, SE 56, SE 59 | CR 3, CR 6, CR 7,  CR 7A, CR 7B, CR 8, CR 10A, CR 10B,  CR 10C, CR 11A,  CR 12A, CR 13,  CR 14, CR 15,  CR 18A, CR 20,  CR 21, CR 22, CR 23, CR 24, CR 25, CR 26A | ELE 1, ELE 2, ELE 3, ELE 4, ELE 7, ELE 8, ELE 9, ELE 10, ELE 11, ELE 12, ELE 13,  ELE 14, ELE 15,  ELE 16, ELE 18 |
| **PARTIALLY**  **IMPLEMENTED** |  | CR 17A, CR 18 | ELE 5, ELE 6 |
| **NOT IMPLEMENTED** |  |  | ELE 17 |
| **NOT APPLICABLE** | SE 7 | CR 7C, CR 9, CR 10, CR 16 |  |
| **OTHER CRITERIA**  **REQUIRING**  **RESPONSE** |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **CIVIL RIGHTS**  **METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION (CR)**  **AND**  **OTHER RELATED GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS**  **LEGAL STANDARDS,**  **COMPLIANCE RATINGS AND**  **FINDINGS** | |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| CR 17A | Use of physical restraint on any student enrolled in a publicly-funded education program   1. Public education programs must develop and implement written restraint prevention and behavior support policy and procedures consistent with new regulations 603CMR 46.00 regarding appropriate responses to student behavior that may require immediate intervention.    1. restraint prevention and behavior support policy and procedures shall be annually reviewed and provided to program staff and made available to parents of enrolled students.    2. restraint prevention and behavior support policy and procedures shall include, but not be limited to: methods for preventing student violence, self-injurious behavior and suicide; methods for engaging parents and youth in discussions about restraint prevention and use; a description and explanation of the program’s alternatives to physical restraint and method of physical restraint in emergency situations; a statement prohibiting: medication restraint, mechanical restraint, prone restraint unless permitted pursuant to 603 CMR 46.03(1)(b), seclusion, and the use of restraint inconsistent with 603 CMR 46.03; a description of the program’s training requirements, reporting requirements, and follow-up procedures; a procedure for receiving and investigating complaints; a procedure for conducting periodic review of data and documentation on the program’s use of restraint; a procedure for implementing the reporting requirements; a procedure for making both oral and written notification to the parent; and a procedure for the use of time-out. 2. Each principal or director shall determine a time and method to provide all program staff with training regarding the program’s restraint prevention and behavior support policy and requirements when restraint is used. Such training shall occur within the first month of each school year and, for employees hired after the school year begins, within a month of their employment. 3. At the beginning of each school year, the principal of each public education program or his/her designee shall identify program staff who are authorized to serve as a school-wide resource to assist in ensuring proper administration of physical restraint. Such staff shall have in-depth training on the use of physical restraint. 4. The program administers physical restraint on students only in emergency situations of last resort when needed to protect a student and/or member of the school community from assault or imminent, serious, physical harm and with extreme caution in order to prevent or minimize any harm to the student as a result of the use of physical restraint.. | | | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71, § 37G; 603 CMR 46.00 effective January 1, 2016 | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that training regarding the district's physical restraint policy is not provided within one month for employees hired after the school year begins.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | CIVIL RIGHTS METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION (CR)AND OTHER RELATED GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS **VI. FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATION** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **CR 18** | Responsibilities of the school principal   1. Instructional support. The principal in each of the district’s schools promotes instructional practices responsive to student needs and ensures that adequate instructional support is available for students and teachers. Instructional support includes remedial instruction for students, consultative services for teachers, availability of reading instruction at the elementary level, appropriate services for linguistic minority students, and other services consistent with effective educational practices and the requirements of M.G.L. c. 71B, §2. The principal consults with the Administrator of Special Education regarding accommodations and interventions for students. Such efforts and their results are documented and placed in the student record. Additionally, when an individual student is referred for an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education, the principal ensures that documentation on the use of instructional support services for the student is provided as part of the evaluation information reviewed by the Team when determining eligibility. 2. Curriculum Accommodation Plan. The principal implements a curriculum accommodation plan developed by the district’s general education program to ensure that all efforts have been made to meet the needs of diverse learners in the general education program. The plan assists the regular classroom teacher in analyzing and accommodating diverse learning styles of all children in the regular classroom and in providing appropriate services and support within the general education program including, but not limited to, direct and systematic instruction in reading and provision of services to address the needs of children whose behavior may interfere with learning. The plan includes provisions encouraging teacher mentoring and collaboration and parental involvement. (*The plan may be part of a multi-year strategic plan.)* 3. Coordination with special education. The principal with the assistance of the Administrator of Special Education coordinates the delivery and supervision of special education services within each school building. 4. Educational services in home or hospital. Upon receipt of a physician’s written order verifying that any student enrolled in a public school or placed by the public school in a private setting must remain at home or in a hospital on a day or overnight basis, or any combination of both, for medical reasons and for a period of not less than fourteen school days in any school year, the principal arranges for provision of educational services in the home or hospital. Such services are provided with sufficient frequency to allow the student to continue his or her educational program, as long as such services do not interfere with the medical needs of the student. The principal coordinates such services with the Administrator for Special Education for eligible students. Such educational services are not considered special education unless the student has been determined eligible for such services, and the services include services on the student’s IEP. | | | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71, § 38Q ½; 603 CMR 28.03(3) | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the district does not currently have a curriculum accommodation plan in place.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **ENGLISH LEARNER EDUCATION**  **LEGAL STANDARDS,**  **COMPLIANCE RATINGS AND**  **FINDINGS** | |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | ENGLISH LEARNER EDUCATION **II. STUDENT IDENTIFICATION AND PROGRAM PLACEMENT** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 5 | **Program Placement and Structure**   1. The district uses assessment data to plan and implement educational programs for students at different instructional levels. 2. G.L. c. 71A, **§** 5 requires that students classified as ELs be educated either in a Sheltered English immersion (SEI) program or Two-Way Immersion program (TWI), unless a program waiver is sought for another ELE program model, such as Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE). The requirement to provide English language development services to ELs applies to all districts that enroll one or more EL students. 3. Core academic teachers in ALL of these programs are expected to hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement and to shelter the content for ELs to make the content of their lessons more comprehensible and to promote the development of academic language needed to successfully master content standards by providing English language development (ELD) to ELs. 4. Districts are required to include ESL instruction in the implementation of their ELE program to advance English language development and promote academic achievement of ELs.   **Authority: Title VI; EEOA; G.L. c. 71A, §§ 2, 4, 7; 603 CMR 7.15; 603 CMR 14.07** | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the district is planning to adopt new elementary ELA and math curricula that also include resources to support English learners (EL). While these materials can be used as resources, they cannot replace an ESL curriculum that is integral to an effective ELE program in which ELs become English proficient at a rapid pace. Please see* [*http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/guidance/default.html*](http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/guidance/default.html)*.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | ENGLISH LEARNER EDUCATION **II. STUDENT IDENTIFICATION AND PROGRAM PLACEMENT** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 6 | **Program Exit and Readiness**   1. Each school district shall establish criteria, in accordance with Department of Elementary and Secondary Education guidelines, to identify students who may no longer be English learners. 2. The district does not reclassify an English Learner (EL) as Former English Learner (FEL) until he or she is deemed English proficient and can participate meaningfully in all aspects of the district’s general education program without the use of adapted or simplified English materials. 3. Districts do not limit or cap the amount of time in which an EL can remain in a language support program. An EL only exits from such a program after he or she is determined to be proficient in English.   **Authority: Title VI; EEOA; G.L. c. 71A, § 4; 603 CMR 14.02** | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *The "Process for Transferring a Student from the ELE program" document submitted by the district indicated that student classroom performance can be the criterion considered for reclassification when identified learning disabilities have an impact on student performance. Although the district does not currently have a Former English Learner (FEL), the district's reclassification procedures are not in compliance with 603 CMR 14.02 that requires districts to establish exit criteria in accordance with the Department's guidelines. Please see the "Guidance on Identification, Assessment, Placement, and Reclassification of English Language Learners" as found at* [*http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/guidance/guidance.pdf*](http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/guidance/guidance.pdf)*.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | ENGLISH LEARNER EDUCATION **VIII. PROGRAM PLAN AND EVALUATION** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 17 | **Program Evaluation**  The district conducts periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of its ELE program in developing students' English language skills and increasing their ability to participate meaningfully in the educational program. Where the district documents that the program is not effective, it takes steps to make appropriate program adjustments or changes that are responsive to the outcomes of the program evaluation.  **Authority: Title VI; EEOA. Title III § 3121** | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Not Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the district does not have a comprehensive process to evaluate the effectiveness of its ELE programming in developing students' English language skills and increasing their ability to participate meaningfully in the district's educational program. Please see* [*http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/resources/ProgramEvaluation.pdf*](http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/ProgramEvaluation.pdf)*.* |

|  |
| --- |
| This Coordinated Program Review Final Report is also available at:  <http://www.doe.mass.edu/pqa/review/cpr/reports/>.  Profile information supplied by each charter school and school district, including information for individual schools within districts, is available at  <http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/>. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| WBMS Final Report WBMS Final Report 2017 | |
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