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**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT**

**Northborough-Southborough Regional School District**

**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 2017 - 2018 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 2017 - 2018 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 2017 - 2018 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 English 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 68 school districts and charter schools are scheduled for Coordinated Program Reviews in 2017 - 2018, of which all districts participated in the Web-based Monitoring System (WBMS). The Department’s

2017 - 2018 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 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**

#

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education conducted a Coordinated Program Review in the Northborough-Southborough Regional School District during the week of

April 30, 2018 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:

* Administrative staff
* Teaching and support services staff
* Special education parent advisory council representative
* Parent of an English learner
* Persons from the general public

Student record reviews:

* Special education student records
* English learner student records

Surveys:

* Parents of students with disabilities
* Parents of English learners

Observations of classrooms and other facilities

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. |

Northborough-Southborough Regional School District

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

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

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

 |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| SE 18B | Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent1. 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 the district provides the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement along with the required notice. However, these documents are not always provided to parents immediately following the development of the IEP.* |

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

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

 |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| CR 17A | Use of physical restraint on any student enrolled in a publicly-funded education program1. Public education programs must develop and implement written restraint prevention and behavior support policy and procedures consistent with new regulations 603CMR 46.00 regarding appropriate responses to student behavior that may require immediate intervention.
	1. restraint prevention and behavior support policy and procedures shall be annually reviewed and provided to program staff and made available to parents of enrolled students.
	2. restraint prevention and behavior support policy and procedures shall include, but not be limited to: methods for preventing student violence, self-injurious behavior and suicide; methods for engaging parents and youth in discussions about restraint prevention and use; a description and explanation of the program’s alternatives to physical restraint and method of physical restraint in emergency situations; a statement prohibiting: medication restraint, mechanical restraint, prone restraint unless permitted pursuant to 603 CMR 46.03(1)(b), seclusion, and the use of restraint inconsistent with 603 CMR 46.03; a description of the program’s training requirements, reporting requirements, and follow-up procedures; a procedure for receiving and investigating complaints; a procedure for conducting periodic review of data and documentation on the program’s use of restraint; a procedure for implementing the reporting requirements; a procedure for making both oral and written notification to the parent; and a procedure for the use of time-out.
2. Each principal or director shall determine a time and method to provide all program staff with training regarding the program’s restraint prevention and behavior support policy and requirements when restraint is used. Such training shall occur within the first month of each school year and, for employees hired after the school year begins, within a month of their employment.
3. At the beginning of each school year, the principal of each public education program or his/her designee shall identify program staff who are authorized to serve as a school-wide resource to assist in ensuring proper administration of physical restraint. Such staff shall have in-depth training on the use of physical restraint.
4. The program administers physical restraint on students only in emergency situations of last resort when needed to protect a student and/or member of the school community from assault or imminent, serious, physical harm and with extreme caution in order to prevent or minimize any harm to the student as a result of the use of physical restraint.
 |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71, § 37G; 603 CMR 46.00 effective January 1, 2016 |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that although the school has developed written restraint prevention and behavior support policies and procedures, these do not include: methods for preventing student violence, self-injurious behavior and suicide; methods for engaging parents and youth in discussions about restraint prevention and use; and a procedure for receiving and investigating complaints.* |

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

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **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; ESEA; 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 the documentation indicated that the district reclassified a student as a Former English Learner (FEL) before the student met the minimum exit criteria determined by the Department. The district's current reclassification practices are not in compliance with 603 CMR 14.02 that requires districts to establish exit criteria in accordance with the Department 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 ELs holds an appropriate license or current waiver issued by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.Core academic teachers who provide sheltered English instruction to English learners in school districts, including charter schools and education collaboratives, must earn an SEI Teacher Endorsement as set forth in 603 CMR 7.00 and 603 CMR 14.00. Principals, assistant principals, and supervisors/directors who supervise or evaluate such teachers must earn an SEI Teacher Endorsement or SEI Administrator Endorsement as set forth in 603 CMR 7.00 and 603 CMR 14.00.Any core academic teacher who is assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to an EL shall either hold an SEI Teacher Endorsement, or is required to earn such an endorsement within one year from the date of the assignment. Any school district that assigns an EL to a core academic teacher who has a year to obtain an SEI endorsement, shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that such EL is assigned to core academic teachers with an SEI endorsement in subsequent school years.No principal, assistant principal, or supervisor/director shall supervise or evaluate a core academic teacher who provides sheltered English instruction to an EL 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 must have 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(ii); 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:** |
| *Staff interviews and the relevant SEI endorsement data indicated that most core academic teachers assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to English learners hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement, but some do not.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 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 2018 |
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