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**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT**

**UP Academy Charter School of Dorchester**

**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 (OLAAA), including a request for information regarding ELE programs and staff qualifications.

Some reviews also cover selected requirements in:

Career/Vocational Technical Education (CVTE)

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

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

**COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW ELEMENTS**

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

**Timing:** Each school district and charter school in the Commonwealth is scheduled to receive a Coordinated Program Review every six years and a mid-cycle special education follow-up visit three years after the Coordinated Program Review; about seventy 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 fifty-two current special education criteria and thirty-five 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 career/vocational technical education:  The Department selects a representative sample of student records for the onsite team to review, using standard Department procedures, to determine whether procedural and programmatic requirements have been implemented.
* Surveys of parents of English learners whose files are selected for the record review are sent a survey of their experiences with the district's implementation of the English learner education program and related procedural requirements.
* Observation of classrooms and other facilities: The onsite team visits a sample of classrooms and other school facilities used in the delivery of programs and services to determine general levels of compliance with program requirements.

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

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

**Content of Final Report:**

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

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

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

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

# **INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL REPORT**

#

A four-member Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education team conducted a Coordinated Program Review at UP Academy Charter School of Dorchester during the week of March 20, 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 six administrative staff.
* Interviews of 26 teaching and support services staff across all levels.
* Interview of one parent of an English language learner.
* Interviews as requested by persons from the general public.
* Student record reviews: Samples of 44 special education student records and 21 English learner education student records.
* Surveys of parents of students with disabilities: Fifty 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. Two of these parent surveys were returned to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for review.
* Surveys of parents of ELE students: Eleven 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. Two 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 13 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. |

**UP Academy Charter School of Dorchester**

**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 8, SE 9, SE 9A, SE 10, SE 12, SE 13, SE 14, SE 15, SE 16, SE 18A, SE 18B, SE 19, SE 21, SE 24, SE 25A, SE 25B, SE 26, SE 27, SE 33, SE 34, SE 35, SE 36, SE 40, SE 41, SE 42, SE 43, SE 44, SE 45, SE 46, SE 47, SE 48, SE 49, SE 50, SE 52, SE 52A, SE 53, SE 54, SE 55, SE 59 | CR 6, CR 7A, CR 7B, CR 8, CR 10C,CR 11A, CR 13, CR 14, CR 15, CR 17A, 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 7, ELE 8, ELE 9, ELE 10, ELE 11, ELE 12, ELE 13, ELE 15, ELE 16 |
| **PARTIALLY****IMPLEMENTED** | SE 3, SE 11, SE 20, SE 22, SE 25, SE 29, SE 51, SE 56 | CR 3, CR 7, CR 10A, CR 10B, CR 12A | ELE 6, ELE 14, ELE 18 |
| **NOT IMPLEMENTED** | SE 32 | CR 25 | ELE 17 |
| **NOT APPLICABLE** | SE 7, SE 17, SE 37, SE 38, SE 39A, SE 39B | CR 7C, CR 9, CR 10, CR 16 |  |
| **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 disabilityWhen 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 suspected of having a specific learning disability is evaluated, the IEP Team creates 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 11** | School district response to parental request for independent educational evaluationIf a parent disagrees with an initial evaluation or re-evaluation completed by the school district, and the parent requests an independent educational evaluation, the district implements the following requirements:1. All independent educational evaluations funded by the district are conducted by qualified persons who are registered, certified, licensed or otherwise approved and who abide by the rates set by the state agency responsible for setting such rates. Unique circumstances of the student are to be justified when an individual assessment rate is higher than that normally allowed.
2. The school district has procedures to offer parents the option of participating in an income eligibility program for free or reduced cost independent educational evaluations that are equivalent to the types of assessments done by the school district.
3. The district extends the right to a publicly funded independent educational evaluation (only if cost shared or funded for state wards or for students receiving free or reduced cost lunch) for sixteen (16) months from the date of the evaluation with which the parent disagrees.
4. If the parent is requesting an independent education evaluation in an area not assessed by the school district, the student does not meet income eligibility standards or the family chooses not to provide financial documentation to the school district establishing family income level, the school district shall respond in accordance with the requirements of federal law. Within five school days, the district shall either agree to pay for the independent education evaluation or, proceed to the Bureau of Special Education Appeals (BSEA) to show that its evaluation was comprehensive and appropriate. If the Bureau of Special Education Appeals finds that the school district’s evaluation was comprehensive and appropriate, then the school district shall not be obligated to pay for the independent educational evaluation requested by the parent.
5. Whenever possible, the independent educational evaluation is completed and a written report sent no later than thirty (30) days after the date the parent requests the independent educational evaluation. If publicly funded, the report is sent to the parents and to the school district. The independent evaluator’s report summarizes, in writing, procedures, assessments, results, and diagnostic impressions as well as educationally relevant recommendations for meeting identified needs of the student. The independent evaluator recommends appropriate types of placements but does not recommend specific classrooms or schools.
6. Within ten (10) school days from the time the school district receives the report of the independent educational evaluation, the Team reconvenes and considers the independent educational evaluation (which may be publicly or privately funded) and whether a new or amended IEP is appropriate.
 |
|  | State Requirements | Federal Requirements |
|  | 603 CMR 28.04(5) | 34 CFR 300.502 |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that the charter school has procedures to offer an independent educational evaluation (IEE) to parents or guardians who disagree with an initial evaluation or re-evaluation completed by the school. However, these procedure do not specify that IEEs funded by the school must abide by the rates set by the responsible state agency and, whenever possible, be completed within thirty (30) days of parental request.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 20** | Least restrictive program selected1. 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, § 3603 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 22** | IEP implementation and availability1. Where the IEP of the student in need of special education has been accepted in whole or in part by that student's parent, the school district provides the mutually agreed upon services without delay.
2. At the beginning of each school year, the district has an IEP in effect for each eligible student within its jurisdiction.
3. Each teacher and provider described in the IEP is informed of his or her specific responsibilities related to the implementation of the student’s IEP and the specific accommodations, modifications, and supports that must be provided for the student under it.
4. The school district does not delay implementation of the IEP due to lack of classroom space or personnel, provides as many of the services on the accepted IEP as possible and immediately informs parents in writing of any delayed services, reasons for delay, actions that the school district is taking to address the lack of space or personnel and offers alternative methods to meet the goals on the accepted IEP. Upon agreement of the parents, the school district implements alternative methods immediately until the lack of space or personnel issues are resolved.
 |
|  | State Requirements | Federal Requirements |
|  | 603 CMR 28.05(7)(b); 28.06(2)(d)(2) | 34 CFR 300.323 |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that when there is a delay in the implementation of an IEP due to lack of personnel, the charter school immediately informs parents in writing of the delayed services, reasons for delay, and actions that the school is taking to address the lack of personnel. However, the charter school does not offer alternative methods to implement the IEP immediately until the personnel issues are resolved. Specifically, administrative interviews and document review indicated that between December 2016 and March 2017, students did not receive counseling services while the charter school sought to fill the school psychologist position.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 25** | Parental consentIn 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 and staff interviews indicated that when participation or consent of a parent is required and the parent fails or refuses to participate, the charter school does not consistently attempt to secure consent through multiple attempts using a variety of documented methods. Subsequent to IEP Team meetings, the charter school will consistently send the proposed IEP and placement page to the parent multiple times; however, attempts to secure the parent's consent by a variety of methods, such as written notices sent by certified mail, electronic mail (e-mail), telephone calls, or home visits, are not employed.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 29** | Communications are in English and primary language of home1. 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 and the parent has requested translation as documented on the Home Language Survey, the charter school does not consistently ensure that all special education documents, specifically progress reports, are 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:** |  **Not Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and interviews with administrative staff indicated that the charter school has not established a school-wide parent advisory council (PAC) on special education or sought a waiver from the Department to meet this requirement in an alternative manner.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 51** | Appropriate special education teacher licensureExcept 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 documents indicated that one individual who designs and/or provides direct special education services described in IEPs is not appropriately licensed.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** | SPECIAL EDUCATION**VIII. PROGRAM PLAN AND EVALUATION** |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 56** | Special education programs and services are evaluatedSpecial 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:** |
| *A review of documents and interviews with administrative staff indicated that the charter school does not regularly evaluate 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 II. STUDENT IDENTIFICATION AND PLACEMENT |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| CR 3 | Access to a full range of education programsAll 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 has a policy that ensures equal access to a full range of education programs for all students, regardless of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, or disability, this policy does not address the protected category of homelessness.* |

| **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 English1. 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 charter school has translated several documents into Spanish, including the handbook, enrollment application, school calendar, and report cards. However, staff interviews indicated that many documents are translated using an online translator without a subsequent review to ensure accuracy.* |

| **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 conduct1. 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 although the charter school has developed procedures for the discipline of students with disabilities, the procedures do not address students with Section 504 Accommodation Plans.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| CR 10B | Bullying Intervention and Prevention1. Public schools (including charter schools and collaboratives) must update school handbooks to conform to their updated amended Bullying Prevention and Intervention Plan (Plan). The school handbook (and local updated Plan) must be consistent with the amendments to the Massachusetts anti-bullying law, which became effective July 1, 2013. The amendments extend protections to students who are bullied by a member of the school staff. As defined in G.L. c. 71, 37O, as amended, a member of the school staff includes, but is not limited to, an “educator, administrator, school nurse, cafeteria worker, custodian, bus driver, athletic coach, advisor to an extracurricular activity or paraprofessional.” The school handbook must make clear that a member of the school staff may be named the “aggressor” or “perpetrator” in a bullying report.
2. School and district employee handbooks must also contain relevant sections of the amended Plan relating to the duties of faculty and staff and relevant provisions addressing the bullying of students by a school staff member.
3. Each year all school districts and schools must give parents and guardians annual written notice of the student-related sections of the local Plan.
4. Each year all school districts and schools must provide all staff with annual written notice of the Plan.
5. All schools and school districts must implement, for all school staff, professional development that includes developmentally appropriate strategies to prevent bullying incidents; developmentally appropriate strategies for immediate, effective interventions to stop bullying incidents; information regarding the complex interaction and power differential that can take place between and among a perpetrator, victim and witnesses to the bullying; research findings on bullying, including information about specific categories of students who have been shown to be particularly at risk for bullying in the school environment; information on the incidence and nature of cyber-bullying; and internet safety issues as they relate to cyber-bullying.
 |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71, s. 37H, as amended by Chapter 92 of the Acts of 2010. M.G.L. c. 71, s. 37O(e)(1) & (2). M.G.L. c. 71, s. 370(d), as amended. |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that although the charter school has developed a Bullying Prevention and Intervention Plan, the plan does not ensure annual training of all staff. The plan specifies that staff members hired after the start of the school year are not required to participate in training during the school year if they can demonstrate participation in an acceptable and comparable program within the last two years.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| CR 12A | Annual and continuous notification concerning nondiscrimination and coordinators1. If the district offers vocational education programs, it advises students, parents, employees and the general public before the beginning of each school year that all vocational opportunities will be offered regardless of race, color, national origin, gender identity, sex or disability. The notice includes a brief summary of program offerings and admission criteria and the name(s), office address(es), and phone number(s) of the person(s) designated under CR 11A to coordinate compliance under Title IX and Section 504.
2. In all cases, the district takes continuing steps to notify applicants, students, parents, and employees (including those with impaired vision or hearing), as well as unions or professional organizations holding collective bargaining or professional agreements with the district, that it does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender identity, sex, or disability. This notice, also, includes the name(s), office address(es), and phone number(s) of the person(s) designated under CR 11A to coordinate compliance under Title IX and Section 504.
3. Written materials and other media used to publicize a school include a notice that the school does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, gender identity, disability, religion, or sexual orientation.
 |
|  | Title VI: 42 U.S.C. 2000d; 34 CFR 100.6(d); Title IX: 20 U.S.C. 1681; 34 CFR 106.8(a), 106.9; Section 504: 29 U.S.C. 794; 34 CFR 104.8; M.G.L. c. 76, § 5; 603 CMR 26.02(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: Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that although the charter school provides annual and continuous notification to applicants, students, parents, and employees that it does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, or disability, the policy does not include gender identity as a protected category.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| CR 25 | Institutional self-evaluationThe 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:** |  **Not Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and interviews with administrative staff demonstrated that the charter school does not evaluate all aspects of its K-8 programming 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**II. STUDENT IDENTIFICATION AND PROGRAM PLACEMENT** |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| ELE 6 | **Program Exit and Readiness**1. Each school district shall establish criteria, in accordance with Department of Elementary and Secondary Education guidelines, to identify students who may no longer be English learners.
2. The district does not reclassify an English Learner (EL) as Former English Learner (FEL) until he or she is deemed English proficient and can participate meaningfully in all aspects of the district’s general education program without the use of adapted or simplified English materials.
3. Districts do not limit or cap the amount of time in which an EL can remain in a language support program. An EL only exits from such a program after he or she is determined to be proficient in English.

**Authority: Title VI; EEOA; G.L. c. 71A, § 4; 603 CMR 14.02** |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that some students have been reclassified as Former English Learners (FELs) before they met the minimum exit criteria determined by the Department. The charter school's current reclassification procedures are not in compliance with 603 CMR 14.02 that requires districts/schools to establish exit criteria in accordance with the Department's guidelines.*  |

| **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 individuals who teach English as a Second Language (ESL) hold an appropriate ESL license or current waiver issued by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.* |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that the charter school submitted a blank program evaluation tool. In addition, the school's submitted ESL program summary is not acceptable in lieu of the completed program evaluation rubric (ESE Form 4) used by the Department to assess districts' ELE program evaluations. The Department concludes that the charter school does not have a system to periodically evaluate the effectiveness of its ELE program in developing students' English language skills and increasing their ability to participate meaningfully in the educational program.* |

| **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 EL student records do not consistently include home language surveys, MCAS/PARCC reports, and report cards.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 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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