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**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT**

**Wakefield 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:

College, Career and Technical Education (OCCTE)

* college, career and 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 and civil rights programs include:

Self-Assessment Phase:

* District/school review of special education and civil rights 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 two 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 college, career and 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 four-member Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education team visited Wakefield Public Schools during the week of January 30, 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 11 administrative staff.
* Interviews of 46 teaching and support services staff across all levels.
* Interviews of two parent advisory council (PAC) representatives.
* Interviews as requested by persons from the general public.
* Student record reviews: Samples of 21 special education student records and 12 English learner education student records.
* Surveys of parents of students with disabilities: 50 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. Seventeen of these parent surveys were returned to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for review.
* Surveys of parents of ELE students: 25 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. Five of these parent surveys were returned to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for review.
* Observation of classrooms and other facilities. A sample of 18 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 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 must indicate the steps the district will continue to take in order to fulfill the regulatory requirements. Districts 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. |

**Wakefield 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 19,  SE 20, SE 21, SE 22, SE 24, SE 25,  SE 25A, SE 25B,  SE 26, SE 27, SE 29, 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 59 | CR 3, CR 6, CR 7A, CR 7B, CR 8, CR 9, CR 10, CR 10B,  CR 11A, CR 12A,  CR 13, CR 14, CR 15, CR 16, CR 18,  CR 18A, CR 20,  CR 21, CR 23,  CR 26A | ELE 1, ELE 2, ELE 3, ELE 4, ELE 5, ELE 6, ELE 7, ELE 8, ELE 9, ELE 10, ELE 11,  ELE 12, ELE 13,  ELE 14, ELE 15, ELE 16 |
| **PARTIALLY**  **IMPLEMENTED** | SE 7, SE 18B, SE 32, SE 55, SE 56 | CR 7, CR 7C,  CR 10A, CR 10C,  CR 17A, CR 22,  CR 24, CR 25 | ELE 18 |
| **NOT IMPLEMENTED** |  |  | ELE 17 |
| **OTHER CRITERIA**  **REQUIRING**  **RESPONSE** |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **SPECIAL EDUCATION**  **LEGAL STANDARDS,**  **COMPLIANCE RATINGS AND**  **FINDINGS** | |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 7** | Transfer of parental rights at age of majority and student participation and consent at the age of majority   1. At least one year prior to the student reaching age 18, the district informs the student and the parent/guardian of the rights that will transfer from the parent/guardian to the student upon the student’s 18th birthday. The notification provided to both the student and the parent/guardian must explicitly state that all rights accorded to parents under special education law will transfer to the 18 year old. 2. Upon reaching the age of 18, the school district implements procedures to obtain consent from the student with decision-making authority to continue the student’s special education program. 3. The district continues to send the parent written notices and the parent will have the right to inspect the student’s records, but the parent will no longer have decision-making authority, except as provided below:    1. If the parent has sought and received guardianship from a court of competent jurisdiction, then the parent retains full decision-making authority. The parent does not have authority to override any decision or lack of decision made by the student who has reached the age of majority unless the parent has sought or received guardianship or other legal authority from a court of competent jurisdiction.    2. The student, upon reaching the age of majority and in the absence of any court actions to the contrary, may choose to share decision-making with his or her parent (or other willing adult), including allowing the parent to co-sign the IEP. Such choice is made in the presence of the Team and is documented in written form. The student’s choice prevails at any time that a disagreement occurs between the adult student and the parent or other adult with whom the student has shared decision-making.    3. The student, upon reaching the age of majority and in the absence of any court actions to the contrary, may choose to delegate continued decision-making to his or her parent, or other willing adult. Such choice is made in the presence of at least one representative of the school district and one other witness and is documented in written form and maintained in the student record. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.07(5) | | 34 CFR 300. 320(c), 300.520 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the district does not consistently inform students and parents at least one year prior to the student reaching age 18 of the rights that will transfer from the parent to the student upon the student's 18th birthday.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| SE 18B | Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent   1. At the Team meeting, after the IEP has been fully developed, the Team determines the appropriate placement to deliver the services on the student’s IEP. 2. Unless the student’s IEP requires some other arrangement, the student is educated in the school that he or she would attend if the student did not require special education. 3. The decision regarding placement is based on the IEP, including the types of related services that are to be provided to the student, the type of settings in which those services are to be provided, the types of service providers, and the location at which the services are to be provided. 4. Reserved 5. Immediately following the development of the IEP, the district provides the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement along with the required notice, except that the proposal of placement may be delayed according to the provisions of 603 CMR 28.06(2)(e) in a limited number of cases. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.05(6) and (7); 28.06(2) | | 34 CFR 300.116; 300.325 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that parents leave with summary notes at the conclusion of the IEP Team meeting, which include a completed IEP service delivery grid describing the types and amounts of special education and related services proposed by the school and a statement of the major goal areas associated with these services. However, the district does not consistently provide the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement along with the required notice within two calendar weeks of the Team meeting.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 32** | Parent advisory council for special education   1. The school district has established a district-wide parent advisory council on special education. 2. Membership on the council is offered to all parents of students with disabilities and other interested parties. 3. The parent advisory council duties include but are not limited to: advising the district on matters that pertain to the education and safety of students with disabilities; meeting regularly with school officials to participate in the planning, development, and evaluation of the school district’s special education programs. 4. The parent advisory council has established by-laws regarding officers and operational procedures. 5. The parent advisory council receives assistance from the school committee without charge, upon reasonable notice, and subject to the availability of staff and resources. 6. The school district conducts, in cooperation with the parent advisory council, at least one workshop annually within the district on the rights of students and their parents and guardians under the state and federal special education laws. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71B, § 3;  603 CMR 28.03(1)(a)(4); 28.07(4) | |  | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff and parent interviews indicated that the parent advisory council for special education has not established by-laws regarding officers and operational procedures, does not advise the district on matters that pertain to the education and safety of students with disabilities, and does not meet regularly with school officials to participate in the planning, development, and evaluation of the school district's special education programs.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | SPECIAL EDUCATION **VII. SCHOOL FACILITIES** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 55** | Special education facilities and classrooms  The school district provides facilities and classrooms for eligible students that   1. maximize the inclusion of such students into the life of the school; 2. provide accessibility in order to implement fully each student’s IEP; 3. are at least equal in all physical respects to the average standards of general education facilities and classrooms; 4. are given the same priority as general education programs in the allocation of instructional and other space in public schools in order to minimize the separation or stigmatization of eligible students; and 5. are not identified by signs or other means that stigmatize such students. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.03(1)(b) | | Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *Observations indicated that a substantially separate classroom at the Galvin Middle School is identified as “Life Skills” with a permanently installed sign, thereby stigmatizing students attending the program.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | SPECIAL EDUCATION **VIII. PROGRAM PLAN AND EVALUATION** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 56** | Special education programs and services are evaluated  Special education programs and services are regularly evaluated. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71B, section 2 | |  | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *Staff interviews indicated that although special education staff members informally analyze outcome data to assess student progress by placement and make programmatic changes as a result, a review of documents indicated that the district does not regularly evaluate its special education programs and services.* |

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

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | CIVIL RIGHTS METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION (CR) **AND OTHER RELATED GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS**  **III. PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **CR 7** | Information to be translated into languages other than English   1. Important information and documents, e.g. handbooks and codes of conduct, being distributed to parents are translated into the major languages spoken by parents or guardians with limited English skills; the district has established a system of oral interpretation to assist parents/guardians with limited English skills, including those who speak low-incidence languages. 2. School or program recruitment and promotional materials being disseminated to residents in the area served by the school or program are translated into the major languages spoken by residents with limited English skills. | | | |
|  | Title VI; EEOA: 20 U.S.C. 1703(f); M.G.L. c. 76, s. 5; 603 CMR 26.02(2) | | | |
|  | **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 consistently translate important information and documents, such as handbooks and codes of conduct, into its major languages of Spanish and Portuguese. The district website has an online translation option, but the translator is not functional for linked documents such as the Bullying Prevention and Intervention Plan and code of conduct.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **CR 7C** | Early release of high school seniors  When the school district schedules the early release at the end of the year of the senior class of a high school, it does so in a way that conforms with Board of Education requirements under 603 CMR 27.05, ensuring that neither the conclusion of the seniors’ school year nor graduation is more than 12 school days before the regular scheduled closing date of that school. | | | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 69, § 1G; 603 CMR 27.05 | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of the school calendar and staff interviews indicated that after final exams are completed, any additional days of attendance are optional for seniors; therefore, the conclusion of the seniors' school year is more than 12 school days before the regular scheduled closing date of the high school.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | CIVIL RIGHTS METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION (CR)AND OTHER RELATED GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS **V. STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **CR 10A** | Student handbooks and codes of conduct   1. 1. The district has a code of conduct for students and one for teachers.    2. The principal of every school containing grades 9-12 prepares, in consultation with the school council, a student handbook containing the student code of conduct and distributes it to each student annually, as well as to parents and school personnel; the school council reviews and revises the student code of conduct every year.    3. The principal of every school containing other grades distributes the district’s student code of conduct to students, parents, and personnel annually.    4. At the request of a parent or student whose primary language is not English, a student handbook or student code of conduct is translated into that language. 2. Student codes of conduct contain:    1. procedures assuring due process in disciplinary proceedings and    2. the district’s responsibility to provide every student with an opportunity to make academic progress during the period of suspension whether in-school, out-of-school, or expulsion.    3. appropriate procedures for the discipline of students with disabilities and students with Section 504 Accommodation Plans.    4. if a charter school or a virtual school, the designation by the board of trustees as to who shall serve as the principal and who shall serve as superintendent for the purpose of 603 CMR 53.00. 3. Student handbooks and codes of conduct reference M.G.L. c. 76, s. 5 and contain:    1. a nondiscrimination policy that is consistent with M.G.L. c. 76, s. 5, and affirms the school’s non-tolerance for harassment based on race, color, national origin, sex, gender identity, religion, or sexual orientation, or discrimination on those same bases;    2. the school’s procedure for accepting, investigating and resolving complaints alleging discrimination or harassment; and    3. the disciplinary measures that the school may impose if it determines that harassment or discrimination has occurred. | | | |
|  | Section 504; M.G.L. c. 71, § 37H; M.G.L. c. 71, § 37H ¾; 603 CMR 53.00; 603 CMR 26.08 as amended by Chapter 199 of the Acts of 2011 | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that the non-discrimination policy in the student handbooks does not address gender identity as a protected category.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| CR 10C | Student Discipline  Each school committee and board of trustees shall ensure that policies and procedures are in place in public preschool, elementary, and secondary schools and programs under its jurisdiction that meet, at a minimum, the requirements of M.G.L.c. 71, section 37H ¾, M.G.L.c. 76, section 21, and 603 CMR 53.00. These policies and procedures must address or establish, but are not limited to:   1. The notice of suspension and hearing; 2. Procedures for emergency removal; 3. Procedures for principal hearings for both short and long-term suspension; 4. Procedures for in-school suspension; 5. Procedures for superintendent hearing; 6. Procedures for education services and academic progress (School-wide Education Service Plan); 7. A system for periodic review of discipline data by special populations; 8. Alternatives to suspension. | | | |
|  | M.G.L.c. 71, section 37H ¾, M.G.L.c. 76, section 21, and 603 CMR 53.00, M.G.L.c. 71 section 38R and Chapter 77 of the Acts of 2013. | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that the district's discipline policy does not include the provision that a student suspended for ten (10) consecutive days or less has the right to make up tests and other assignments and do such other work as necessary to make academic progress during that period. In addition, the district does not provide educational services to students suspended or expelled for more than ten (10) consecutive days to allow them to continue to make academic progress toward state and local requirements.* |

| **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 the district has not developed and implemented written restraint prevention and behavior support policy and procedures consistent with regulations under 603 CMR 46.00 regarding appropriate responses to student behavior that may require immediate intervention. The district has thereby not provided staff with training on the new regulations, provided staff with a copy of the policy and procedures, or made the policy and procedures available to parents. A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the district has identified program staff to serve as school-wide resources for the administration of restraint and provided school-wide resource staff with in-depth training on the use of physical restraint.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | CIVIL RIGHTS METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION (CR)AND OTHER RELATED GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS **VII. SCHOOL FACILITIES** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| CR 22 | Accessibility of district programs and services for students with disabilities  In at least one facility within the district, the district makes available and entirely accessible to students with disabilities all educational and vocational programs and services offered at each level (preschool, elementary and secondary). | | | |
|  | Section 504: 29 U.S.C. 794; 34 CFR 104.21,104.22; Title II: 42 U.S.C. 12132; 28 CFR 35.149, 35.150; Mass. Const. amend. art. 114; 603 CMR 28.03(1)(b)(1) | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *Observations indicated that the playground at the Doyle Early Childhood Center has no ramp access and, therefore, is not accessible to students whose disabilities affect mobility.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | CIVIL RIGHTS METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION (CR) **AND OTHER RELATED GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS**  **VIII. PROGRAM PLAN AND EVALUATION** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **CR 24** | Curriculum review  The district ensures that individual teachers in the district review all educational materials for simplistic and demeaning generalizations, lacking intellectual merit, on the basis of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin and sexual orientation. Appropriate activities, discussions and/or supplementary materials are used to provide balance and context for any such stereotypes depicted in such materials. | | | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 76, § 5; 603 CMR 26.05(2) as amended by Chapter 199 of the Acts of 2011 | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that although the district incorporates cultural competency in its educator evaluation rubric and its curriculum adoption procedures, the district does not ensure that individual teachers review all educational materials for simplistic and demeaning generalizations, lacking intellectual merit, on the basis of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin and sexual orientation.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| CR 25 | Institutional self-evaluation  The district evaluates all aspects of its K-12 program annually to ensure that all students, regardless of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, limited English proficiency, sexual orientation, disability, or housing status, have equal access to all programs, including athletics and other extracurricular activities. It makes such changes as are indicated by the evaluation. | | | |
|  | Title VI: 42 U.S.C. 2000d; 34 CFR 100.3(b)(2); EEOA: 20 U.S.C. 1703(f); Section 504: 29 U.S.C. 794; 34 CFR 104.4(b)(4); Title II: 42 U.S.C. 12132; 28 CFR 35.130(b)(3); NCLB: Title III, Part A, Sec. 3121(c)(1)(C); Title X, Part C, Sec. 722(g)(1)(J)(i), 722(g)(7); Mass. Const. amend. art. 114; M.G.L. c. 71A, § 7; c. 76, § 5; 603 CMR 26.07(1),(4) as amended by Chapter 199 of the Acts of 2011 | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that although the district analyzes course data to assess enrollment patterns for traditionally underserved students, it has not conducted a self-evaluation of all aspects of its K-12 program to ensure that all students, regardless of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, limited English proficiency, sexual orientation, disability, or housing status, have equal access to all programs, including athletics and other extracurricular activities.* |

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

| **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 document review using the Department's “ESE Form 4: Program Evaluation Rubric” indicated that the district's English Learner Education (ELE) program evaluation tool does not qualify as acceptable. The Department concludes that the district does not have a comprehensive system in place to evaluate the effectiveness of its ELE program in developing students’ English language and to make appropriate program adjustments or changes, as needed. Please see http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/ProgramEvaluation.pdf.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | ENGLISH LEARNER EDUCATION **IX. RECORD KEEPING** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 18 | **Records of ELL Students**  ELL student records include:   1. home language survey; 2. results of identification and proficiency tests and evaluations; 3. ACCESS for ELLs report; 4. MCAS/PARCC report; 5. information about students' previous school experiences if available; 6. copies of parent notification letters; 7. progress reports, in the native language, if necessary; 8. report cards, in the native language, if necessary; 9. evidence of follow-up monitoring, if applicable; 10. documentation of a parent’s consent to “opt-out” of ESL instruction, if applicable; 11. waiver documentation, if applicable; 12. individualized learning plan (optional).   **Authority: Title VI; EEOA; G.L. c. 69, § 1I; c. 71A, §§ 5, 7; 603 CMR 14.02, 14.04** | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that records do not consistently include English Learner students' current report cards and progress reports or evidence of follow-up monitoring for students who are opted out or have exited the ELE education program.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 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/>. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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