|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ESE LogoStarLogo08_A |  | **Excel Academy Charter School**  **COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW**  **REPORT OF FINDINGS**  **Dates of Onsite Visit:** **May 15-17, 2017**  **Date of Draft Report:** **October 16, 2017**  **Date of Final Report: November 29, 2017**  **Action Plan Due: January 4, 2018**  **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Onsite Team Members:**  **Erin VandeVeer, Office of Public School Monitoring (PSM) Chair**  **Jane Ewing, PSM**  **Audrey Mangone, Office of English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement (OELAAA) Chair** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT**

**Excel Academy Charter School**

**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 (CCTE)

* 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 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 three-member Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education team conducted a Coordinated Program Review at Excel Academy Charter School during the week of May 15, 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 charter school’s programs, together with information gathered by means of the following Department program review methods:

* Interviews of five administrative staff.
* Interviews of 23 teaching and support services staff across all levels.
* Interview of one parent advisory council (PAC) representative.
* Interviews as requested by persons from the general public.
* Student record review: A sample of 33 special education student records and nine English learner education student records.
* Surveys of parents of students with disabilities: Fifty-two parents of students with disabilities were sent surveys that solicited information about their experiences with the charter school’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: Twenty-one parents of ELE students were sent surveys that solicited information about their experiences with the charter school’s implementation of English learner education programs, services, and procedural requirements. Three 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 ten 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. |

**Excel Academy Charter School**

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

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

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 3** | Special requirements for determination of specific learning disability  When a student suspected of having a specific learning disability is evaluated, the Team creates a written determination as to whether or not he or she has a specific learning disability, which is signed by all members of the Team, or if there is disagreement as to the determination, one or more Team members document their disagreement. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  |  | | 34 CFR 300.8(c)(10); 300.311 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that when a student is suspected of having a specific learning disability, IEP Teams consistently create a written determination as to whether or not he or she has a specific learning disability. However, not all Team members sign the written determination or, if there is disagreement as to the determination, Team members do not document their disagreement.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 8** | IEP Team composition and attendance  The following persons are members of the IEP Team and may serve in multiple roles:   1. The child´s parents. 2. A representative of the school district who acts as Chairperson and who is (1) qualified to supervise or provide special education; (2) is knowledgeable about the general curriculum; and (3) is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the district. 3. A representative of the school district who has the authority to commit the resources of the district (and who may act as the Chairperson).    1. If the student *may* be involved in a regular education program, a regular education teacher. If the student *is* involved in a regular education program, a regular education teacher of the student.    2. If the student is participating in a special education program, a special education teacher of the student or, if appropriate, a special education provider for the student. 4. The student, if one purpose of the meeting is to discuss transition services or if otherwise appropriate and if he/she chooses. 5. Other individuals at the request of the student's parents. 6. Reserved 7. An individual who is qualified to interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results, who may be any one of the persons identified in parts 2 - 4 above. 8. Other individuals who may be necessary to write an IEP for the child, as determined by the Administrator of Special Education. 9. When one purpose of the Team meeting is to discuss transition services, with the consent of the parent(s) or student who has reached the age of majority, the public agency must invite a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services. 10. Reserved 11. When one purpose of the Team meeting is to discuss placement, a person knowledgeable about placement options is present at the meeting. 12. Members of the Team attend Team meetings unless:     1. the parent and district agree to use alternative means, such as a video conference or a conference call, for any Team meeting OR     2. the district and the parent agree, in writing, that the attendance of the Team member is not necessary because the member´s area of the curriculum or related services is not being modified or discussed OR     3. the district and the parent agree, in writing, to excuse a required Team member´s participation and the excused member provides written input into the development of the IEP to the parent and the IEP Team prior to the meeting. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.02(21). Part 1 of this criterion is related to State Performance Plan Indicator 8. Parts 5, 10, are related to Performance Plan Indicators 13 and 14. (See <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/spp/>.) | | 34 CFR 300.116(a), 300.321, 300.328.  See also, in the IDEA 97 regulations, 34 CFR Part 300, Appendix A, to State Question #22 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that when a required IEP Team member is unable to attend the Team meeting, specifically general education teachers for students involved in the general education program and related service providers when the IEP meeting involves a modification or discussion of related services, the Team member is not consistently excused in writing by the parent. In addition, record review indicated that the required Team member does not provide written input for the development of the IEP to the parent and the IEP Team prior to the meeting.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| SE 9 | Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent  Within forty‑five (45) school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or a re‑evaluation, the school district determines whether the student is eligible for special education and provides to the parent either a proposed IEP and (except in cases covered by 603 CMR 28.06(2)(e)) proposed placement or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.05(1); 28.06(2)(e) | |  | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that within forty-five (45) school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation, the charter school does not consistently determine whether the student is eligible for special education and provide to the parent either a proposed IEP and proposed placement or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 13** | Progress Reports and content   1. Parents receive reports on the student's progress toward reaching the goals set in the IEP at least as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students. 2. Progress report information sent to parents includes written information on the student’s progress toward the annual goals in the IEP. 3. Where a student’s eligibility terminates because the student has graduated from secondary school or exceeded the age of eligibility, the school district provides the student with a summary of his or her academic achievement and functional performance, including recommendations on how to assist the student in meeting his or her postsecondary goals. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.07(3) | | 34 CFR 300.305(e)(3); 300.320(a)(3) | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that although progress reports are provided to parents at least as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students, the reports do not always include written information on the student's progress towards the annual goals in the IEP.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 14** | Review and revision of IEPs   1. At least annually, on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, a Team meeting is held to consider the student’s progress and to review, revise, or develop a new IEP or refer the student for a re-evaluation, as appropriate. 2. The IEP Team reviews and revises the IEP to address any lack of expected progress towards the annual goals and in the general curriculum. 3. Amendments to the IEP. In between annual IEP meetings the district and parent may agree to make changes to a student’s IEP, documented in writing, without convening a meeting of the Team. Upon request, a parent is provided with a revised copy of the IEP with the amendments incorporated. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.04(3) | | 34 CFR 300.324(a)(4), (6) and (b) | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that at least annually, on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, a Team meeting is not consistently held to consider the student's progress and to review, revise, or develop a new IEP or refer the student for a re-evaluation, as appropriate. Student records indicated that the charter school asks parents to waive the annual IEP timeline.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 18A** | IEP development and content   1. Upon determining that the student is eligible for special education, the Team, including the parent(s), develops an IEP at the Team meeting. 2. The IEP is completed addressing all elements of the most current IEP format provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. 3. The school district ensures that the IEP will not be changed outside of the Team meeting. 4. Whenever the IEP Team evaluation indicates that a student's disability affects social skills development, or when the student's disability makes him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment, or teasing, the IEP must address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing. 5. For students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum, the IEP Team must consider and specifically address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.05(3); G.L.c. 71 B, section 3, as amended by Chapter 92 of the Acts of 2010 | | IDEA-97: 34 CFR Part 300, Appendix A, Question #22 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that IEP Teams do not consistently address all elements of the most current IEP format provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. Specifically, IEPs demonstrated the following issues: 1) sections documenting measurable annual goals are blank; 2) IEP services in the service delivery grid are not linked to specific IEP goals;*  *3) IEP objectives and goals are frequently identical; and 4) IEP objectives require less student proficiency over time.*  *A review of student records also indicated that IEP Teams do not specifically address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing for students whose disability affects social skills development, and when the student's disability makes him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment or teasing.* |

| **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 receive detailed 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 charter school and a statement of the major goal areas associated with these services. Records demonstrated that the school consistently sends two copies of the proposed IEP and placement following the IEP Team meeting. However, the Notice of Proposed School District Action (N1) is sometimes dated prior to the IEP meeting, which contradicts the IEP's issuance date.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 20** | Least restrictive program selected   1. The program selected is the least restrictive environment for students, with consideration given to any potential harmful effect on the student or on the quality of services that he or she needs. 2. If the student is removed from the general education classroom at any time, the Team states why the removal is considered critical to the student’s program and the basis for its conclusion that education of the student in a less restrictive environment, with the use of supplementary aids and services, could not be achieved satisfactorily. 3. The district does not remove an eligible student from the general education classroom solely because of needed modification in the curriculum. 4. If a student’s IEP necessitates special education services in a day or residential facility or an out-of-district educational collaborative program, the IEP Team considers whether the student requires special education services and support to promote the student’s transition to placement in a less restrictive program. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71B, § 3  603 CMR 28.06(2) | | 34 CFR 300.114-120 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that IEP Teams do not consistently state why removal from the general education classroom is considered critical to the student's program and the basis for its conclusion that education in the least restrictive environment, with the use of supplementary aids and services, could not be achieved satisfactorily.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 25** | Parental consent  In accordance with state and federal law, the school district obtains informed parental consent as follows:   1. The school district obtains written parental consent before conducting an initial evaluation and before making an initial placement of a student in a special education program. Written parental consent is obtained before conducting a reevaluation and before placing a student in a special education placement subsequent to the initial placement in special education. 2. The school district obtains consent before initiating extended evaluation services. 3. The school district obtains consent to the services proposed on a student´s IEP before providing such services. 4. A parent is informed that consent may be revoked at any time. Except for initial evaluation and initial placement, consent may not be required as condition of any benefit to the child. 5. When the participation or consent of the parent is required and the parent fails or refuses to participate, the attempts to secure the consent of the parent are implemented through multiple attempts using a variety of methods which are documented by the district. Such efforts may include letters, written notices sent by certified mail, electronic mail (e-mail), telephone calls, or, if appropriate, TTY communications to the home, and home visits at such time as the parent is likely to be home.  Efforts may include seeking assistance from a community service agency to secure parental participation. 6. If, subsequent to initial evaluation and initial placement and after following the procedures required by the regulations, the school district is unable to obtain parental consent to a re-evaluation or to placement in a special education program subsequent to the initial placement, the school district considers with the parent whether such action will result in the denial of a free appropriate public education to the student.  If, after consideration, the school district determines that the parent´s failure or refusal to consent will result in a denial of a free appropriate public education to the student, it seeks resolution of the dispute through the BSEA. 7. If the parent has given consent for special education services and then, at any time following, revokes his/her consent to the student´s special education services in writing, the district is obligated to discontinue all special education services and may not use mediation or request a due process hearing to obtain agreement or a ruling requiring the continuation of services, consistent with federal regulation. If a parent revokes consent in writing, the district must act promptly to provide written notice to the parent/guardian of the district´s proposal to discontinue services based on the revocation of consent, as well as information on how the parent can obtain a copy of his/her right to procedural safeguards. The district must provide the notice a reasonable time before the district intends to discontinue the services. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.07(1)  This criterion is related to State Performance Plan Indicator 8. (See <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sped/spp/>.) | | 34 CFR 300.300 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that the charter school does not consistently obtain written parental consent before conducting an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 29** | Communications are in English and primary language of home   1. Communications with parents are in simple and commonly understood words and are in both English and the primary language of the home if such primary language is other than English. Any interpreter used in fulfilling these requirements is fluent in the primary language of the home and familiar with special education procedures, programs, and services. If the parents or the student are unable to read in any language or are blind or deaf, communications required by these regulations are made orally in English with the use of a foreign language interpreter, in Braille, in sign language, via TTY, or in writing, whichever is appropriate, and all such communications are documented. 2. If the district provides notices orally or in some other mode of communication that is not written language, the district keeps written documentation (a) that it has provided such notice in an alternate manner, (b) of the content of the notice and (c) of the steps taken to ensure that the parent understands the content of the notice. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.07(8) | | 34 CFR 300.322(e); 300.503(c) | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that when a family's primary language of the home is other than English as documented on the Home Language Survey, the charter school does not consistently ensure that all special education documents are translated. Specifically, IEPs are not consistently fully translated.* |

| **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 interviews indicated that Excel Academy Charter School has not established a parent advisory council (PAC) for special education. Although document review and parent and staff interviews demonstrated that the charter school has conducted outreach to all parents of students with disabilities and other interested parties within the school, there are no elected officers or bylaws. Document review indicated that the charter school has held a workshop on the rights of students and their parents and guardians under state and federal special education laws at one of the school’s four campuses.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 40** | Instructional grouping requirements for students aged five and older   1. The size and composition of instructional groupings for eligible students receiving services outside the general education classroom are compatible with the methods and goals stated in each student's IEP. 2. Instructional grouping size requirements are maximum sizes and the school district exercises judgment in determining appropriate group size and supports for smaller instructional groups serving students with complex special needs. 3. When eligible students are assigned to instructional groupings outside of the general education classroom for 60% or less of the students’ school schedule, group size does not exceed    1. 8 students with a certified special educator,    2. 12 students if the certified special educator is assisted by 1 aide, and    3. 16 students if the certified special educator is assisted by 2 aides 4. For eligible students served in settings that are substantially separate, serving solely students with disabilities for more than 60% of the students’ school schedule, the district provides instructional groupings that do not exceed    1. 8 students to 1 certified special educator or    2. 12 students to 1 certified special educator and 1 aide. 5. After the school year has begun, if instructional groups have reached maximum size as delineated in paragraphs 3 and 4 of this criterion, the Administrator of Special Education and the certified special educator(s) providing services in an instructional group may decide to increase the size of an instructional grouping by no more than two additional students if the additional students have compatible instructional needs and then can receive services in their neighborhood school. 6. In such cases, the Administrator provides written notification to the Department and the parents of all group members of the decision to increase the instructional group size and the reasons for such decision. Such increased instructional group sizes are in effect only for the year in which they are initiated. 7. The district takes all steps necessary to reduce the instructional groups to the sizes outlined in paragraph 3 or 4 of this criterion for subsequent years. Such steps are documented by the district. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.06(6) | |  | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that two periods of Academic Support at the East Boston campus exceed the required student to staff ratios for students assigned to instructional groupings outside of the general education classroom for 60% or less of their schedule.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 48** | Equal opportunity to participate in educational, nonacademic, extracurricular and ancillary programs, as well as participation in regular education  All students receiving special education, regardless of placement, shall have an equal opportunity to participate in and, if appropriate, receive credit for the vocational, supportive, or remedial services that may be available as part of the general education program as well as the non-academic and extracurricular programs of the school.  Programs, services and activities include, but are not limited to:   1. art and music 2. vocational education, industrial arts, and consumer and homemaking education 3. work study and employment opportunities 4. counseling services available at all levels in the district 5. health services 6. transportation 7. recess and physical education, including adapted physical education 8. athletics and recreational activities 9. school‑sponsored groups or clubs 10. meals | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.06(5) | | 34 CFR 300.101 - 300.113 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records, documents and a staff interview indicated that the charter school does not consistently ensure all students with disabilities have equal opportunity to participate in the non-academic portions of the school; specifically, special education services are, at times, scheduled during students' lunch periods.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 51** | Appropriate special education teacher licensure  Except at Commonwealth charter schools, individuals who design and/or provide direct special education services described in IEPs are appropriately licensed.  **Commonwealth Charter Schools – Special Education Teacher Qualifications**  To come into compliance with IDEA, Commonwealth charter schools must use “qualified” teachers to provide specialized instruction or have a “qualified” teacher consult with or provide direct supervision for someone who is not qualified but is delivering specialized instruction.  This is an IDEA requirement.  “Qualified” teachers must hold a valid license in special education or have successfully completed an undergraduate or graduate degree in an approved special education program.  Please see additional guidance at:  [http://www.doe.mass.edu/charter/tech\_advisory/07\_1.html#](http://www.doe.mass.edu/charter/tech_advisory/07_1.html)  (update 2/2011)  <http://www.doe.mass.edu/charter/sped/staffqualifications.html> (update 3/23/2012). | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71, s. 38G; s. 89(qq);  603 CMR 1.07; 7.00; 28.02(3) | | 34 CFR 300.18; 300.156 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of licenses, student records and documents demonstrated that not all staff who design and/or provide direct special education services described in IEPs during the regular and extended school year are appropriately licensed or qualified. Specifically, students with disabilities receive specialized instruction from general educators who have neither undergraduate or graduate degrees from an approved special education program, licenses in special education, or are supervised by a qualified individual.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 52** | Appropriate certifications/licenses or other credentials -- related service providers  Any person, including non‑educational personnel, who provides related services described under federal special education law, who supervises paraprofessionals in the provision of related services, or who provides support services directly to the general or special classroom teacher is appropriately certified, licensed, board‑registered or otherwise approved to provide such services by the relevant professional standards board or agency for the profession. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.02(3),(18) | | 34 CFR 300.34; 300.156(b) | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records and documents indicated that the charter school does not consistently ensure that individuals providing related services, specifically specialized reading and counseling services, are appropriately certified, licensed, board registered or otherwise approved to provide such services by the relevant professional standards board or agency for the profession.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 54** | **Professional development**   1. The district considers the needs of all staff in developing training opportunities for professional and paraprofessional staff and provides a variety of offerings. 2. The district ensures that all staff, including both special education and general education staff, are trained on:    1. state and federal special education requirements and related local special education policies and procedures;    2. analyzing and accommodating diverse learning styles of all students in order to achieve an objective of inclusion in the general education classroom of students with diverse learning styles;    3. methods of collaboration among teachers, paraprofessionals and teacher assistants to accommodate diverse learning styles of all students in the general education classroom; 3. The district provides in-service training for all locally hired and contracted transportation providers, before they begin transporting any special education student receiving special transportation, on his or her needs and appropriate methods of meeting those needs; for any such student it also provides written information on the nature of any needs or problems that may cause difficulties, along with information on appropriate emergency measures. Transportation providers include drivers of general and special education vehicles and any attendants or aides identified by a Team for either type of vehicle. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71, §§ 38G , 38Q and 38Q ½  603 CMR 28.03(1)(a); 28.06(8)(b) and (c) | |  | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that the charter school does not provide locally hired and contracted transportation providers and their aides in-service training on special education students' needs and appropriate methods of meeting those needs before they begin transporting students who receive special transportation. However, the charter school does provide written information on the nature of needs or problems of students requiring special transportation prior to his or her transport, along with information on appropriate emergency measures.* |

| **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:** |
| *Facilities observations at the Orient Heights campus indicated that the related service space is not adequate for the number of students receiving services; the space is a fraction of the size of other office spaces and may include as many as three students during a given session. This space is also identified by a related services sign, which is stigmatizing to the students. Observations at the Orient Heights campus also demonstrated that an office used as a small group instructional space for math is not physically adequate for the number of students receiving services, which can be as many as six students. The overcrowding of this small instructional space creates excessive auditory distractions.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **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 REQUIREMENTSII. STUDENT IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| CR 3 | Access to a full range of education programs  All students, regardless of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, disability, or homelessness, have equal access to the general education program and the full range of any occupational/vocational education programs offered by the district. | | | |
|  | Title VI: 42 U.S.C. 2000d; 34 CFR 100.3(a),(b); EEOA: 20 U.S.C. 1703(f); Title IX: 20 U.S.C. 1681; 34 CFR 106.31, 106.34, 106.35; Section 504: 29 U.S.C. 794; 34 CFR 104.4; Title II: 42 U.S.C. 12132; 28 CFR 35.130; IDEA 2004: 20 U.S.C. 1400; 34 CFR 300.110; NCLB: Title III, Part A, Sec. 3121(c)(1)(C); Title X, Part C, Secs. 721, 722(g)(4); Mass. Const. amend. art. 114; M.G.L. c. 71A, s. 7; c. 76, s. 5; 603 CMR 26.03 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 although the charter school describes how it ensures equal access to a full range of education programs for all students, regardless of race, color, sex, religion, national origin, gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability, this description does not consistently address the protected category of homelessness.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **CR 7B** | Structured learning time   1. The school district ensures that its structured learning time is time during which students are engaged in regularly scheduled instruction, learning, or assessments within the curriculum of core subjects and other subjects as defined in 603 CMR 27.02 (including physical education, required by M.G.L. c. 71, s. 3). The district’s structured learning time may include directed study (activities directly related to a program of studies, with a teacher available to assist students), independent study (a rigorous, individually designed program under the direction of a teacher, assigned a grade and credit), technology-assisted learning, presentations by persons other than teachers, school-to-work programs, and statewide student performance assessments. 2. The district ensures that its structured learning time does not include time at breakfast or lunch, passing between classes, in homeroom, at recess, in non-directed study periods (study halls), participating in optional school programs, or receiving school services such as health screening, speech, or physical and occupational therapy, except where those services are prescribed by a student’s IEP or Section 504 Accommodation Plan. 3. The hours spent in any type of structured learning time are verified by the school district. Where the school district counts independent study or a school-to-work program as structured learning time, it has guidelines that explain clearly how hours spent by students are verified. | | | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 69, § 1G; 603 CMR 27.02, 27.04 | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the charter school network does not ensure that structured learning time is time during which students are engaged in regularly scheduled instruction, learning, or assessments within the curriculum of core subjects and other subjects as defined in 603 CMR 27.02. According to student schedules and staff interviews, all students are scheduled for a 65 minute block of time at the end of the school day; however, this period is not consistently used as instructional time. Depending on the student’s instructional needs, this period can be non-directed learning periods for homework completion (study hall) that does not consistently include activities directly related to a program of studies.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| CR 16 | Notice to students 16 or over leaving school without a high school diploma, certificate of attainment, or certificate of completion   1. No student who has not graduated from high school shall be considered to have permanently left public school unless an administrator of the school where the student last attended has sent notice within 5 days from the student’s tenth consecutive absence to the student and the parent/guardian of the student in English and the primary language of the parent or guardian (to the extent practicable). The notice shall offer at least two dates and times for an exit interview between the superintendent (or designee) and the student and the parent/guardian to occur prior to the student permanently leaving school. The notice shall include contact information for scheduling the exit interview and indicate that the parties shall agree to a date and time for the exit interview and that the interview shall occur within 10 days of the notice. The time and the date for the exit interview may be extended at the request of the parent/guardian but for no longer than 14 days. The superintendent or designee may proceed with an exit interview without a parent/guardian if the superintendent or designee makes a good faith effort to include the parent/guardian. 2. The exit interview shall be for the purpose of discussing the reasons for the student permanently leaving school and to consider alternative education programs and services available to the student. The superintendent (or designee) shall convene a team of school personnel, such as the principal, guidance counselor, teachers, attendance officer and other relevant school staff, to participate in the exit interview with the student and the parent/guardian. During the exit interview, the student shall be given information about the detrimental effects of early withdrawal from school, the benefits of earning a high school diploma and a list of alternative education program and services available to the student. 3. Any district serving students in high school grades sends annual written notice to former students who have not yet earned their competency determination and who have not transferred to another school    1. to inform them of the availability of publicly funded post-high school academic support programs and    2. to encourage them to participate in those programs.   At a minimum, the district sends annual written notice by first class mail to the last known address of each such student who attended a high school in the district within the past two years.   1. The Superintendent shall annually report to the Department the number of students sixteen years of age or older who have permanently left school, the reasons for such leaving and any alternative educational or other placement the student has taken. | | | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 76, §§ 5, 18; St. 1965, c. 741 | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the charter school has developed a written notice to send to students and their parent/guardian within five (5) days of the student's tenth consecutive unexcused absence to discuss reasons the student is leaving school. This notice offers two dates and times for an exit interview between the superintendent (or designee) and the student and parent/guardian. However, the notice does not provide contact information for scheduling the exit interview or an option to extend the date of the meeting at the parent’s request for no longer than 14 days.*  *Document review and staff interviews also confirmed that the charter school has developed a process to provide annual written notice to former students who have left school, and are not enrolled elsewhere and have not earned their diploma, to inform them of the availability of publicly funded post-high school academic support programs and to encourage them to participate in those programs. However, the annual notice lists two web links to resources offered by the Department without detail and suggests contacting the charter school’s guidance counselors without providing specific contact information.* |

| **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 indicated that the charter school 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 school 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. Staff interviews indicated that the school 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** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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 administrative interviews indicated that the charter school network does not evaluate all aspects of its 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.* |

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

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | ENGLISH LEARNER EDUCATION **VI. FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATION** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 14 | **Licensure Requirements**  Licensure requirements for districts where ELs are enrolled:  Every district, including every Commonwealth charter school, has at least one teacher who has an English as a Second Language or Transitional Bilingual Education, or ELL license under G.L. c.71**,** § 38G and 603 CMR 7.04(3). (This requirement does not apply separately to Horace Mann charter schools.)  Except at Commonwealth charter schools, *every* teacher or other educational staff member who teaches ELLs holds an appropriate license or current waiver issued by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.  Core academic teachers\* of ELs, including charter schools and education collaboratives, must hold an SEI Teacher Endorsement as set forth in 603 CMR 7.00 and this section. A core academic teacher who does not have the Endorsement may be assigned an EL but the teacher must obtain the SEI Endorsement within a year of the assignment, as set forth at 603 CMR 7.15(9)(b)1.  \* Under Department regulations adopted in June 2012, starting on July 1, 2016, core academic teachers (including pre-school teachers) in public schools who are assigned to teach ELs must have an SEI Endorsement or must earn the Endorsement within one year of the assignment. 603 CMR §§7.15(9)(b)1 and 14.07(3); The following teachers are “core academic teachers” for purposes of providing SEI instruction: teachers of students with moderate disabilities; teachers of students with severe disabilities; subject-area teachers in English, reading or language arts; mathematics, science; civics and government, economics, history, and geography; and early childhood and elementary teachers who teach such content. Core academic teachers of ELs at Commonwealth charter schools are not required to hold an educator license but they are subject to the same SEI Endorsement requirements as core academic teachers of ELs in other public schools.  Any school district that assigns an EL to a core academic teacher who has a year to obtain an SEI endorsement, must take all reasonable steps to ensure that such EL is assigned to core academic teachers with an SEI endorsement in subsequent school years.  Starting on July 1, 2016, no principal, assistant principal, or supervisor/director shall supervise or evaluate a core academic teacher who provides sheltered English instruction to an English learner unless such principal, assistant principal, or supervisor/director holds an SEI Teacher Endorsement or SEI Administrator Endorsement, or will earn either endorsement within one year of the commencement of such supervision or evaluation.  Except at Commonwealth charter schools, any director of ELE program(s) who is employed in that role for one-half time or more has a Supervisor/Director license and an English as a Second Language (ESL), Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) or an ELL license.  If a district with 200 or more ELs—including all charter schools with 200 or more ELs—has a director of EL programs, that director has an English as a Second Language, Transitional Bilingual Education, or an EL license even if he or she is employed in that position for less than one-half time. (This requirement does not apply separately to Horace Mann charter schools.)  **Authority: Title VI; EEOA; G.L. c. 71, § 38G, §89(qq); St. 2002, c. 218, §§ 24, 25, 30; 603 CMR 7.04(3), 7.09(3); 603 CMR 7.14 (1) and (2); 603 CMR 7.15(9)(b); 603 CMR 14.07.** | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and Educator Licensure and Renewal (ELAR) data indicated that not all charter school ESL teachers who provide students with ESL instruction hold an ESL license or a current waiver issued by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | ENGLISH LEARNER EDUCATION **VII. SCHOOL FACILITIES** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 16 | **Equitable Facilities**  The district ensures that ELs are provided facilities, materials and services comparable to those provided to the overall student population.  **Authority: Title VI; EEOA; G.L. c. 76, § 5; 603 CMR 26.07** | | | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A facilities observation and staff interviews indicated that the charter school's English learners' (ELs) classrooms are not always comparable to classrooms provided to the overall student population. At the Orient Heights campus, a staff member's office used for ESL instruction is not large enough for the instructional groupings, which typically includes nine ELs.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 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 2017 | |
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