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**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**TIERED FOCUSED MONITORING REPORT**

**UP Academy Charter School of Boston**

**SCOPE OF TIERED FOCUSED MONITORING REVIEWS**

As one part of its accountability system, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education oversees local compliance with education requirements through Tiered Focused Monitoring (TFM). 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.

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.

**TIERED FOCUSED MONITORING ELEMENTS**

**Team:** Depending upon the size of a school district or charter school and the number of programs to be reviewed, a team of one to eight Department staff members conducts onsite activities over one 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 Tiered Focused Monitoring Review every three years. The statewide Tiered Focused Monitoring cycle is posted at <<<http://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/tfm/6yrcycle.html>>>.

**Tier Level:** Each district/charter school is assigned to one of four tier levels: Tier 1/Self-Directed Improvement; Tier 2/Directed Improvement; Tier 3/Corrective Action; and Tier 4/Cross-unit Support and Corrective Action. The Tiered Focused Monitoring process and subsequent technical assistance varies by monitoring tier. Each district/school is assigned to a monitoring tier based on the district/school’s designated DESE Accountability Level along with risk factors, such as Problem Resolution System complaint data and Public School Monitoring report data. Districts/schools in Tiers 1 and 2 have been determined to have no or low risk. Districts/schools in Tiers 3 and 4 have demonstrated greater risk. Agency intervention, additional onsite monitoring, and provision of technical assistance varies based on district/school tier level, allowing the Department to direct resources to those districts requiring the most support.

1. Tier 1/Self-Directed Improvement: Data points indicate no concern on compliance and performance outcomes – meets requirements.
2. Tier 2/Directed Improvement: No demonstrated risk in areas with close link to student outcomes – low risk.
3. Tier 3/Corrective Action: Areas of concern include both compliance and student outcomes – moderate risk.
4. Tier 4/Cross-unit Support and Corrective Action: Areas of concern have a profound effect on student outcomes and ongoing compliance – high risk.

**Process:** Each school district and charter school undergoes a Tiered Focused Monitoring Review every three years. Regularly monitored standards are divided into two groups, known as Group A Universal Standards and Group B Universal Standards. Districts and charter schools are monitored on an alternate set of Universal Standards every three years. The Department has also reserved a specific set of criteria, collectively known as Targeted Standards, employed if LEA or school level risk assessment data indicate there is a potential issue; the identified Targeted Standards are assessed in addition to the Universal Standards.

**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.
* Depending on which Universal Standard group the district/school is participating in and if there are additional Targeted Standards, the district may review a sample of special education student records selected across grade levels, disability categories and level of need.
* If the district/school is participating in a Group A Universal Standards Tiered Focused Monitoring Review, it will submit a review of student records related to the Indicator Data Collection for Indicators 11, 12 and 13 as part of the self-assessment. This Indicator data collection is also part of the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.
* Upon completion of the self-assessment, the district/school submits the data to the Department for review.

**On-site Verification Phase (dependent upon Group A or Group B Universal Standards)**:

* 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 met.
* 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.
* Observations of classrooms and other facilities: The onsite team may visit 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.

**Report:** **For Tier 3 & 4 Tiered Focused Monitoring Reviews**

At the end of the onsite visit, the onsite team holds 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 forwards to the superintendent or charter school leader a Draft Report containing comments from the Tiered Focused Monitoring 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). Within 10 business days of receipt of the Draft Report, the district/charter school reviews and comments on the report for factual accuracy before the publication of a Final Report with ratings and findings (see below). The Tiered Focused Monitoring 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/psm/tfm/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.”

*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.

*Indicator Data.* In the Final Report for a district or charter school undergoing a review for Group A Universal Standards, the onsite team includes the results of the review of Indicator data submissions for Indicators 11, 12 and 13. For any Indicator data noncompliance found, the district or charter school must develop and implement corrective action that includes correcting noncompliance for the individual students affected by it, addressing the root cause and underlying reasons for the identified noncompliance, and reviewing additional records as evidence that the issues have been corrected and that requirements are being met. The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) requires correction of noncompliance within one year of the finding.

**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 Tiered Focused Monitoring Report.**

**SUMMARY OF INDICATOR DATA REVIEW**

As part of Tiered Focused Monitoring for Group A Universal Standards, districts and charter schools submit data for Indicators 11, 12 and 13; the results of the Department’s analysis regarding these Indicators are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Compliant** | **Non-Compliant** | **Not Applicable** |
| **Indicator 11 – Initial**  **Evaluation Timelines** | X |  |  |
| **Indicator 12 – Early**  **Childhood Transition** |  |  | X |
| **Indicator 13 –**  **Secondary Transition** |  | X |  |

# **INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL REPORT**

# 

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education conducted a Tiered Focused Monitoring Review of UP Academy Charter School of Boston during the week of November 11, 2019 to evaluate the implementation of Group A Universal Standards in the program areas of special education, civil rights and other related general education requirements. The team appreciated the opportunity to interview staff and parents, to observe classroom facilities and to review the programs underway in the charter school.

The Department is submitting the following Tiered Focused Monitoring Report containing findings made pursuant to this onsite visit. In preparing this report, the team reviewed extensive written documentation regarding the operation of the school’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

Surveys:

* Parents of students with disabilities

Review of special education student records

The report includes findings in the program areas reviewed based on the assigned Universal Standard group for this review:

**Group A Universal Standards:**

* Student identification
* IEP development
* Programming and support services
* Equal opportunity

|  |
| --- |
| The Tiered Focused Monitoring 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," and “Implementation in Progress.” (Refer to the “Definition of Compliance Ratings” section of the report.) The Tiered Focused Monitoring Reports do not include criteria receiving a rating of “Implemented” or “Not Applicable.” This will allow the district/school and the Department to focus their efforts on those areas requiring corrective action. 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; 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 Boston**

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Universal Standards**  **Special Education** | **Universal Standards**  **Civil Rights and Other General Education Requirements** | **Targeted Standards** |
| **IMPLEMENTED** | SE 1, SE 3A, SE 6, SE 8,  SE 9A, SE 10, SE 11, SE 12, SE 13, SE 14, SE 18A, SE 19, SE 20, SE 22, SE 26, SE 29, SE 34, SE 40, SE 41, SE 43, SE 48, SE 49 | CR 13, CR 14, CR 18 | SE 45, SE 47 |
| **PARTIALLY**  **IMPLEMENTED** | SE 2, SE 3,  SE 9, SE 25 |  | SE 44, SE 46 |
| **NOT IMPLEMENTED** |  |  |  |
| **NOT APPLICABLE** | SE 7, SE 17, SE 37, SE 38, SE 39, SE 42 |  |  |

The Tiered Focused Monitoring Toolkit, which includes the regulatory requirements specific to the special education and civil rights criteria referenced in the table above, can be found at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/resources/default.html>.

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

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 2** | Required and optional assessments   1. Required assessments: The following assessments are completed by appropriately credentialed and trained specialists for each referred student:    1. Assessment(s) in all areas related to the suspected disability(ies) including consideration of any needed assistive technology devices and services and/or instruction in Braille.    2. Educational assessment by a representative of the school district, including a history of the student’s educational progress in the general curriculum.    3. Assessment by a teacher(s) with current knowledge of the student’s specific abilities in relation to learning standards of the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and the district's general education curriculum, as well as an assessment of the student's attention skills, participation behaviors, communication skills, memory, and social relations with groups, peers, and adults.    4. For a student being assessed to determine eligibility for services at age three (3), an observation of the student's interactions in the student's natural environment or early intervention program is strongly encouraged together with the use of current assessments from Early Intervention Teams to avoid duplicate testing. 2. Optional assessments: The administrator of special education may recommend or the parent may request one or more of the following:    1. A comprehensive health assessment by a physician that identifies medical problems or constraints that may affect the student's education. The school nurse may add additional relevant health information from the student's school health records.    2. A psychological assessment by a licensed school psychologist, certified psychologist, or certified educational psychologist, including an individual psychological examination.    3. A home assessment that may be conducted by a nurse, psychologist, social worker, guidance or adjustment counselor, or teacher and includes information on pertinent family history and home situation and may include a home visit, with the agreement of the parent. 3. At the re-evaluation of a student, if no additional assessments are needed to determine whether the student continues to be eligible for special education, the school district recommends to the student's parents the following:    1. that no further assessments are needed and the reasons for this; and    2. the right of such parents to request an assessment. | | | |
|  | **State Requirements** | | **Federal Requirements** | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.04 (1) and (2) | | 34 CFR 300.304; 300.305;  300.324(a)(2)(v) | |
|  | **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 charter school does not consistently complete all required assessments, specifically a history of the student's educational progress in the general curriculum and a teacher's assessment of the student's attention skills, participation behaviors, communication skills, memory and social relations with groups, peers and adults.* |

| **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 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.*  *Student record review also indicated that the charter school does not consistently complete all four components used to determine a specific learning disability, specifically the observation (SLD 4).* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| SE 9 | Timeline for determination of eligibility  Within 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. | | | |
|  | 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 school working days after receipt of the parent's consent to an initial evaluation or 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 25** | Parental consent   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 student. 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 Bureau of Special Education Appeals (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. | | 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 parental consent to the services proposed on a student's IEP is required, and the parent fails or refuses to participate, the charter school does not routinely secure consent from the parent through multiple attempts using a variety of methods or consistently document its efforts. Record review demonstrated that in some cases, IEPs were unsigned for as long as six months after the IEP development meeting.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 44** | Procedure for recording suspensions  The district has a procedure to record the number and duration of suspensions from any part of the student's program, including suspensions from special transportation prescribed by the IEP. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  |  | | 34 CFR 300.530  IDEA 2004 Final Regulations, Analysis of Comments and Changes, Federal Register 71 (14 August 2006): 46715 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records, documents and staff interviews indicated that although the charter school has a system to record the number and duration of suspensions from any part of the student's program, student suspensions are not accurately reported and recorded, including in-school and out-of-school suspensions and emergency removals.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 46** | Procedures for suspension of students with disabilities when suspensions exceed 10 consecutive school days or a pattern has developed for suspensions exceeding 10 cumulative days; responsibilities of the Team; responsibilities of the district   1. A suspension of longer than 10 consecutive days or a series of suspensions that are shorter than 10 consecutive days but constitute a pattern are considered to represent a change in placement. 2. When a suspension constitutes a change in placement of a student with disabilities, district personnel, the parent, and other relevant members of the Team, as determined by the parent and the district, convene within 10 days of the decision to suspend to review all relevant information in the student's file, including the IEP, any teacher observations, and any relevant information from the parents, to determine whether the behavior was caused by or had a direct and substantial relationship to the disability or was the direct result of the district's failure to implement the IEP-“a manifestation determination.” 3. If district personnel, the parent, and other relevant members of the Team determine that the behavior is NOT a manifestation of the disability, then the suspension or expulsion may go forward consistent with policies applied to any student without disabilities, except that the district must still offer:    1. services to enable the student, although in another setting, to continue to participate in the general education curriculum and to progress toward IEP goals; and    2. as appropriate, a functional behavioral assessment and behavioral intervention services and modifications, to address the behavior so that it does not recur. 4. Interim alternative educational setting. Regardless of the manifestation determination, the district may place the student in an interim alternative educational setting (as determined by the Team) for up to 45 school days    1. on its own authority if the behavior involves weapons or illegal drugs or another controlled substance or the infliction of serious bodily injury on another person while at school or a school function or, considered case by case, unique circumstances; or    2. on the authority of a hearing officer if the officer orders the alternative placement after the district provides evidence that the student is “substantially likely” to injure him/herself or others.   Characteristics. In either case, the interim alternative education setting enables the student to continue in the general curriculum and to continue receiving services identified on the IEP, and provides services to address the problem behavior.   1. If district personnel, the parent, and other relevant members of the Team determine that the behavior IS a manifestation of the disability, then the Team completes a functional behavioral assessment and behavioral intervention plan if it has not already done so. If a behavioral intervention plan is already in place, the Team reviews it and modifies it, as necessary, to address the behavior. Except when he or she has been placed in an interim alternative educational setting in accordance with part 4, the student returns to the original placement unless the parents and district agree otherwise or the hearing officer orders a new placement. 2. Not later than the date of the decision to take disciplinary action, the school district notifies the parents of that decision and provides them with the written notice of procedural safeguards. If the parent chooses to appeal or the school district requests a hearing because it believes that maintaining the student's current placement is substantially likely to result in injury to the student or others, the student remains in the disciplinary placement, if any, until the decision of the hearing officer or the end of the time period for the disciplinary action, whichever comes first, unless the parent and the school district agree otherwise. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  |  | | 34 CFR 300.530-537 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records, documents and staff interviews indicated that the IEP Team does not consistently document the manifestation determination process, including the results of the manifestation determination meeting.* |

|  |
| --- |
| This Tiered Focused Monitoring Final Report is also available at:  <http://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/tfm/default.html>.  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 2020 | |
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