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**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**OFFICE OF PUBLIC SCHOOL MONITORING**

## INTEGRATED MONITORING REVIEW REPORT INTRODUCTION

During the 2024-2025 school year, Springfield Public Schools participated in an Integrated Monitoring Review (IMR) conducted by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s (DESE or Department) Office of Public School Monitoring (PSM). The purpose of the Integrated Monitoring Review is to monitor compliance with regulatory requirements focusing on special education and civil rights.

**Components of the Integrated Monitoring Review**



Integrated Monitoring is one of eight components of the state’s general supervision system. One aspect of Integrated Monitoring is the Integrated Monitoring Review. Each school district, charter school, vocational school, and virtual school undergoes an Integrated Monitoring Review every three years. The Department’s Office of Public School Monitoring (PSM) is responsible for conducting these reviews and works closely with offices throughout the Department including, but not limited to, the Office of Special Education Planning and Policy (SEPP), Problem Resolution System Office (PRS), and the Office of Approved Special Education Schools (OASES) to promote cohesion and collaboration across the Department’s general supervision system. As set forth in the diagram above, Integrated Monitoring Review is one of the multilayered, cohesive, and formal processes employed by the Department to examine and evaluate all LEAs’ implementation of IDEA with a particular emphasis on educational results, functional outcomes, and compliance.

The monitoring cycle is posted at [Integrated Monitoring Review Three Year Cycle](https://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/integrated/3year-cycle.docx).

Regularly monitored standards are divided into two groups, known as Group A Universal Standards and Group B Universal Standards. Districts and schools are monitored on an alternate set of Universal Standards every three years.

Group A Universal Standards address:

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

Group B Universal Standards address:

* Licensure and professional development
* Parent/student/community engagement
* Facilities and classroom observations
* Oversight
* Time and learning
* Equal access

The Department has also reserved a specific set of criteria, collectively known as Focused Standards, which are reviewed if the Department deems appropriate due to concerns with those particular standards. In those circumstances, the identified Focused Standards are assessed in addition to the Universal Standards.

Universal Standards and Focused Standards are aligned with the following regulations:

**Special Education (SE)**

* Selected requirements from the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 U.S.C. § 1400 *et seq* and accompanying regulations at 34 CFR Part 300.
* Massachusetts General Law Chapter 71B, and the Massachusetts Special Education regulations (603 CMR 28.00).

**Civil Rights Methods of Administration and Other General Education Requirements (CR)**

* Specific federal civil rights requirements, including requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA); 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 select state requirements under M.G.L. c. 76, § 5 and M.G.L. c. 269 §§ 17 through 19.
* Specific requirements from the Massachusetts Physical Restraint regulations (603 CMR 46.00).
* Specific requirements from the Massachusetts Student Learning Time regulations (603 CMR 27.00).
* Specific requirements from the Massachusetts Student Records regulations (603 CMR 23.00).
* Various requirements under other federal and state laws and regulations.

**Integrated Monitoring Review Process:**

**Discovery:** During the Discovery stage, the PSM chairperson analyzes data and information to prepare for the onsite visit. The chairperson also reviews documents submitted by the district/school.

**Engagement:** The Engagement stage of the Integrated Monitoring Review includes all activities conducted onsite and/or virtually through the issuance of the Integrated Monitoring Review Report. Such activities may include record review, interviews, and observations.

**Close-out:** Once the Report is issued, the Close-out stage begins for the schools and districts with any identified findings of noncompliance. The Close-out stage includes the development of the Correction Action Plan and completion of subsequent progress reports to ensure all instances of noncompliance are resolved within one year of the issuance of the Integrated Monitoring Review Report.

**PSM Team:**

Depending upon the size of a school district and the number of special education programs to be reviewed, a team of one to four Department staff members conducts onsite activities over one to five days in a school district or charter school.

**Report for Integrated Monitoring Reviews:**

The Integrated Monitoring Review Report will be issued within approximately 30 days of the conclusion of the onsite visit.

**Pre-finding Corrections:**

During the Discovery and Engagement stages of the review, PSM staff may find that the district violated an IDEA requirement prior to the issuance of a finding in the Integrated Monitoring Review Report. In such cases, PSM staff may implement the pre-finding correction protocol. If PSM staff verify that the identified noncompliance is resolved prior to the issuance of the report, no finding is made. However, a list of any pre-finding corrections will be included in the Integrated Monitoring Review Report. More information regarding the pre-finding correction protocol can be found in the PSM procedures at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/integrated/default.html>.

**Ratings:** In the Integrated Monitoring Review 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,” “Not Applicable,” and “Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review.”

The onsite team includes a comment in the Integrated Monitoring Review Report for each criterion that it rates “Commendable,” “Partially Implemented,” “Not Implemented,” or “Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review,” explaining the basis for the rating.

**Corrective Action:** Where criteria are found “Partially Implemented” or “Not Implemented,” a corrective action plan (CAP) is developed to bring those areas into compliance with the relevant statutes and regulations. Department staff work with districts and charter schools on the development of an appropriate CAP.

PSM staff also provide ongoing technical assistance as the school or district is implementing the approved CAP. **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 Monitoring Report.**

Where criteria are rated “Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review,” the district will work with staff from the specific Department office that identified the noncompliance to develop a corrective action plan.

For more information regarding the Integrated Monitoring Review Process, including district and parent resources, please visit < <https://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/integrated/default.html>>.

## INTEGRATED MONITORING REVIEW DETAILS

 **for** **Springfield Public Schools**

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education conducted an Integrated Monitoring Review in Springfield Public Schools during the weeks of April 7 & 14, 2025, 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 district.

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:

**District Civil Rights Self-Assessment Phase:**

* Review of civil rights documentation for required elements including document uploads.
* Upon completion, the civil rights self-assessment was submitted to the Department for review.

**Discovery Phase:**

* District review of student records related to the Indicator Data Collection for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.
* Upon completion, the results of the Indicator Data Collection for Indicators 11, 12, and 13 were submitted to the Department for review.
* Review of key data points focused on educational results and functional outcomes. For more details regarding the data review, please see the PSM procedures at <https://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/procedures.docx>.

**Engagement Phase:**

* Interviews of administrative, instructional, and support staff consistent with those criteria selected for onsite verification.
* Interviews of special education parent advisory council (SEPAC) representatives and other telephone interviews, as requested by other parents or members of the general public.
* Review of additional documents for special education and civil rights.
* Surveys of parents of students in special education: Parents of students in special education were sent a survey that solicited information regarding their experiences with the district’s implementation of special education programs, related services, and procedural requirements.
* Review of student records for special education: The Department selected a sample of student records from the district’s special education student roster. The onsite team conducted this review, using standard Department procedures, to determine whether procedural and programmatic requirements have been met.
* Observations of time-out rooms.

|  |
| --- |
| The Integrated Monitoring 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," “Implementation in Progress”, and “Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review.” (Refer to the “Definition of Compliance Ratings” section of the report.) Reports do not include criteria receiving a rating of “Implemented” or “Not Applicable.” This will allow the district 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. |
|  |
| **Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review** | A finding of noncompliance was made by another office in the Department and the school/district is currently undergoing corrective action activities. |
|  |
| **Not Applicable**  | The requirement does not apply to the school district or charter school. |

**Springfield Public Schools**

## SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Universal Standards Special Education** | **Universal Standards Civil Rights and Other General Education Requirements** | **Focused Standards** |
| **IMPLEMENTED** | SE 1, SE 2, SE 3, SE 3A, SE 5, SE 6, SE 7, SE 8, SE 9A, SE 10, SE 11, SE 12, SE 13, SE 17, SE 18A, SE 19, SE 25, SE 26, SE 34, SE 35, SE 37, SE 38, SE 39, SE 43, SE 44, SE 45, SE 46, SE 47, SE 48, SE 49 | CR 14 |  |
| **PARTIALLY****IMPLEMENTED** | SE 9, SE 18B, SE 22, SE 40, SE 41, SE 42 |  | SE 51, SE 55 |
| **NOT** **IMPLEMENTED** | None |  |  |
| **PRIOR** **NONCOMPLIANCE -****Corrective Action Under****Review** | SE 14, SE 20, SE 29 | CR 13, CR 18 |  |
| **NOT** **APPLICABLE** | None |  |  |

The full list of criteria and information regarding the requirements can be found in Appendix B of the Tiered Focused Monitoring Toolkit available at < <https://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/resources/tfm-toolkit.docx>>.

## SUMMARY OF PRE-FINDING CORRECTIONS

The pre-finding correction protocol was implemented prior to the issuance of the Integrated Monitoring Report and all instances of noncompliance were resolved by the district. Evidence of correction was reviewed and verified by the Department for the following criteria:

**SE 39:** Procedures used to provide services to eligible students enrolled in private schools at private expense

**SE 44:** Procedure for recording suspensions

**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

**SE 47:** Procedural requirements applied to students not yet determined to be eligible for special education

## SUMMARY OF INDICATOR DATA REVIEW

As part of the self-assessment process for districts or charter schools undergoing a review for Group A Universal Standards, the PSM team reviewed the results of Indicator data submissions for Indicators 11, 12, and 13. The Indicator review is completed prior to the onsite visit and helps inform the scope of the onsite review. 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.

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** |  |  |

The district submitted evidence of corrective action to address the non-compliance identified for Indicators 11 and 12. The submissions were reviewed and approved by the Department. The Department also conducted a review of a second set of student records for both Indicators 11 and 12 to ensure ongoing compliance. All records were found compliant; no further action is required.

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

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

 |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| SE 9 | Timeline for determination of eligibilityWithin 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 and staff interviews indicated that within 45 school working days after receipt of the parent's written consent to an initial evaluation or re-evaluation, Springfield Public Schools does not always determine whether the student is eligible for special education and provide the parent with a proposed IEP and proposed placement.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 14** | Review and revision of IEPs1. At least annually, on or before the anniversary date of the IEP, a Team meeting is held to consider the student's progress and to review, revise, or develop a new IEP or refer the student for a re-evaluation, as appropriate.
2. The IEP Team reviews and revises the IEP to address any lack of expected progress towards the annual goals and in the general curriculum.
3. Amendments to the IEP. In between annual IEP meetings the district and parent may agree to make changes to a student's IEP, documented in writing, without convening a meeting of the Team. Upon request, a parent is provided with a revised copy of the IEP with the amendments incorporated.
 |
|  | State Requirements | Federal Requirements |
|  | 603 CMR 28.04(3) | 34 CFR 300.324(a)(4), (6) and (b) |
|  | **Rating:** | **Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review**  | **District Response Required:** | **No** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| ***Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review****: The Department's Problem Resolution System (PRS) issued a Letter of Finding in February 2025 indicating, in part, that the Springfield Empowerment Zone does not always hold a Team meeting before the anniversary date of the IEP to consider the student's progress and to review, revise, or develop a new IEP.* *As the district is currently engaged with the Department to address the noncompliance, all corrective action required will be reviewed and verified by PRS.* |

| **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 Springfield Public Schools does not always provide the parent with a proposed IEP and proposed placement immediately following the development of the IEP.* |

| **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 300.114-12034 CFR 300.42 |
|  | **Rating:** | **Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review** | **District Response Required:** | **No** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| ***Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review:*** *Currently, the district is engaged in work with a technical assistance provider to address full inclusion rates. The district will continue this work with the technical assistance provider as a result of their 2024-2025 Local Education Agency Special Education Determination rating of Needs Intervention issued in May 2025 by the Department's Office of Special Education Planning and Policy.* |

| **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:** |
| *Document review and staff interviews indicated that when there is a lack of personnel, Springfield Public Schools and the Springfield Empowerment Zone do not always provide the services on the accepted IEP without delay. In such cases, parents are not immediately informed, in writing, of the delayed services, reasons for delay, actions that the district is taking to address the lack of personnel and offered alternative methods to meet the goals on the accepted IEP.* |

| **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:** | **Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review**  | **District Response Required:** | **No** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| ***Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review****: The Department's Problem Resolution System (PRS) issued a Letter of Finding in December 2024 indicating, in part, that Springfield Public Schools does not always provide parents with IEP documents in their primary language.* *As the district is currently engaged with the Department to address the noncompliance, all corrective action required will be reviewed and verified by PRS.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 40** | Instructional grouping requirements for students aged five and older1. The size and composition of instructional groupings for eligible students receiving services outside the general education classroom are compatible with the methods and goals stated in each student's IEP.
2. Instructional grouping size requirements are maximum sizes and the school district exercises judgment in determining appropriate group size and supports for smaller instructional groups serving students with complex special needs.
3. When eligible students are assigned to instructional groupings outside of the general education classroom for 60% or less of the students' school schedule, group size does not exceed
	1. 8 students with a licensed special educator,
	2. 12 students if the licensed special educator is assisted by 1 aide, and
	3. 16 students if the licensed special educator is assisted by 2 aides
4. For eligible students served in settings that are substantially separate, serving solely students with disabilities for more than 60% of the students' school schedule, the district provides instructional groupings that do not exceed
	1. 8 students to 1 licensed special educator, or
	2. 12 students to 1 licensed special educator and 1 aide.
5. After the school year has begun, if instructional groups have reached maximum size as delineated in paragraphs 3 and 4 of this criterion, the administrator of special education and the licensed special educator(s) providing services in an instructional group may decide to increase the size of an instructional grouping by no more than 2 additional students if the additional students have compatible instructional needs and then can receive services in their neighborhood school.
6. In such cases, the administrator provides written notification to the Department and the parents of all group members of the decision to increase the instructional group size and the reasons for such decision. Such increased instructional group sizes are in effect only for the year in which they are initiated.
7. The district takes all steps necessary to reduce the instructional groups to the sizes outlined in paragraph 3 or 4 of this criterion for subsequent years. Such steps are documented by the district.
 |
|  | State Requirements | Federal Requirements |
|  | 603 CMR 28.06(6) |  |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *Document review and staff interviews indicated that 16 instructional groupings in Springfield Public Schools and three instructional groupings in the Springfield Empowerment Zone exceed the maximum instructional grouping student to staff ratios for eligible students receiving services outside the general education classroom.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 41** | Age span requirementsThe ages of the youngest and oldest student in any instructional grouping do not differ by more than 48 months. A written request for approval of a wider age range is submitted to the commissioner of elementary and secondary education in cases where the district believes it is justified. Such requests are implemented only after approval of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. |
|  | State Requirements | Federal Requirements |
|  | 603 CMR 28.06(6)(f) |  |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *Document review indicated that in one instructional grouping at the Springfield Empowerment Zone the ages of the youngest and oldest student differ by more than 48 months.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 42** | Programs for young children three and four years of ageGeneral requirements:1. The school district ensures programs are available for eligible students three and four years of age. Such programs shall be developmentally appropriate and specially designed for students ages three and four years.
2. Where appropriate, the school district elects, consistent with federal requirements, to use the format and services of the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP), if appropriate, for an additional year as a means of transitioning eligible students to public school services.
3. Where appropriate the Team allows a student to remain in a program designed for three and four year old students for the duration of the school year in which the student turns five years old (including the summer following the date of the student's fifth birthday).

Types of Settings:1. Inclusionary programs for young students are located in a setting that includes students with and without disabilities and meet the following standards:
	1. Services in such programs are provided in the home, the public school, Head Start, or a licensed childcare setting.
	2. For public school programs that integrate students with and without disabilities, the class size does not exceed 20 with 1 teacher and 1 aide and no more than 5 students with disabilities. If the number of students with disabilities is 6 or 7 then the class size does not exceed 15 students with 1 teacher and 1 aide.
2. Substantially separate programs for young students are located in a public school classroom or facility that serves primarily or solely students with disabilities. Substantially separate programs adhere to the following standards:
	1. Substantially separate programs are programs in which more than 50% of the students have disabilities.
	2. Substantially separate programs operated by the district limit class sizes to 9 students with 1 teacher and 1 aide.
 |
|  | State Requirements | Federal Requirements |
|  | 603 CMR 28.06(7) | 34 CFR 300.101(b);300.124(b); 300.323(b) |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *Document review and staff interviews indicated that one instructional grouping for students three and four years of age in Springfield Public Schools does not meet the requirements for appropriate class sizes and ratios.* *Specifically, the grouping below does not meet the following inclusionary program requirement:** *When the number of students with disabilities is 6 or 7, the class size does not exceed 15 students with 1 teacher and 1 aide.*

***Group A:*** *1 teacher, 1 aide, 6 students with disabilities, 12 students without disabilities.* |

| **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. |
|  | 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 300.156IDEA § 34 CFR 300.156(a) |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that 91 individuals at Springfield Public Schools and 18 individuals at the Springfield Empowerment Zone who design and provide direct special education services described in IEPs are not appropriately licensed.* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** | SPECIAL EDUCATION**VII. SCHOOL FACILITIES** |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **SE 55** | Special education facilities and classroomsThe school district provides facilities and classrooms for eligible students that1. maximize the inclusion of such students into the life of the school;
2. provide accessibility in order to implement fully each student's IEP;
3. are at least equal in all physical respects to the average standards of general education facilities and classrooms;
4. are given the same priority as general education programs in the allocation of instructional and other space in public schools in order to minimize the separation or stigmatization of eligible students; and
5. are not identified by signs or other means that stigmatize such students.
 |
|  | State Requirements | Federal Requirements |
|  | 603 CMR 28.03(1)(b) | Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 |
|  | **Rating:** |  **Partially Implemented**  | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *Observations of all time-out rooms in Springfield Public Schools and the Springfield Empowerment Zone indicated that one time-out room at Springfield Public Day Elementary is not safe or appropriate for the purposes of calming.* |

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

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

 |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** |       |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| CR 13 | Availability of information and academic counseling on general curricular and occupational/vocational opportunitiesStudents in grades 7-12 all receive the same information and academic counseling on the full range of general curricular opportunities and any occupational/vocational opportunities available to them.Race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, or sexual orientation are not presented as limiting factors in career determination.The district ensures that English learners are taught to the same academic standards and curriculum as all students and provides the same opportunities to master such standards as other students, including the opportunity to enter academically advanced classes, receive credit for work done, and have access to the full range of programs.The district uses grade appropriate content objectives for English learners that are based on the district curricula in English language arts, history and social science, mathematics, and science and technology/engineering, taught by qualified staff members. |
|  | Title VI: 42 U.S.C. 2000d; 34 CFR 100.3(a), (b); Title IX: 20 U.S.C. 1681; 34 CFR 106.31, 106.36; Section 504: 29 U.S.C. 794; 34 CFR 104.4, 104.37(b); Title II: 42 U.S.C. 12132; 28 CFR 35.130; NCLB: Title III, Part A, Sec. 3121(c)(1)(C); Title X, Part C, Sec. 721; Mass. Const. amend. art. 114; M.G.L. c. 71A, s. 7; c. 76, s. 5; 603 CMR 26.03 |
|  | **Rating:** | **Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review**  | **District Response Required:** | **No** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| ***Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review:*** *During the 2024-2025 monitoring review conducted by the Office of Language Acquisition (OLA), it was determined that Springfield Public Schools and the Springfield Empowerment Zone do not always ensure English learners are taught to the same academic standards and curriculum as all students. OLA issued an ELE 5 Program Placement and Structure finding in May 2025 that included the following:** *English learners are sometimes pulled out of content classes for English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction, causing them to miss critical instruction in core subjects and limiting their access to grade-level content; and*
* *Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE) do not always have access to the full range of programs offered by the district.*

*Corrective action for the ELE 5 finding will be reviewed and approved by OLA through the district's Continuous Improvement and Monitoring Plan (CIMP).* |

| **CRITERION****NUMBER** | CIVIL RIGHTS METHODS OF ADMINISTRATION (CR)AND OTHER RELATED GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS**VI. FACULTY, STAFF AND ADMINISTRATION** |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** |
| **CR 18** | Responsibilities of the school principal1. Instructional support. The principal in each of the district's schools promotes instructional practices responsive to student needs and ensures that adequate instructional support is available within the general education program for students and teachers. Instructional support includes remedial instruction for students, consultative services for teachers, availability of reading instruction at the elementary level, appropriate services for linguistic minority students, and other services consistent with effective educational practices and the requirements of M.G.L. c. 71B, §2. The principal consults with the administrator of special education regarding accommodations and interventions for students. Such efforts and their results are documented and placed in the student record. Additionally, when an individual student is referred for an evaluation to determine eligibility for special education, the principal ensures that documentation on the use of instructional support services for the student is provided as part of the evaluation information reviewed by the Team when determining eligibility. The school district does not limit a parent's right to refer a student for timely special education evaluation because the district has not fully explored and/or attempted some or all of the available instructional support programs or other interventions available in general education that may be described in the district's curriculum accommodation plan, including any pre-referral program.
2. Curriculum Accommodation Plan. The principal implements a curriculum accommodation plan developed by the district's general education program to ensure that all efforts have been made to meet the needs of diverse learners in the general education program. The plan assists the regular classroom teacher in analyzing and accommodating diverse learning styles of all children in the regular classroom and in providing appropriate services and support within the general education program including, but not limited to, direct and systematic instruction in reading and provision of services to address the needs of children whose behavior may interfere with learning. The plan includes provisions encouraging teacher mentoring and collaboration and parental involvement. (*The plan may be part of a multi-year strategic plan.)*
3. Early Literacy Screening. Effective July 31, 2023, each school district shall at least twice per year assess each student's reading ability and progress in literacy skills, from kindergarten through at least third grade, using a valid, developmentally appropriate screening instrument approved by the Department. Consistent with section 2 of chapter 71B of the general laws and the Department's dyslexia and literacy guidelines, if such screenings determine that a student is significantly below relevant benchmarks for age-typical development in specific literacy skills, the school shall determine which actions within the general education program will meet the student's needs, including differentiated or supplementary evidence-based reading instruction and ongoing monitoring of progress. Within 30 school days of a screening result that is significantly below the relevant benchmarks, the school shall inform the student's parent or guardian of the screening results and the school's response and shall offer them the opportunity for a follow-up discussion.
4. Coordination with special education. The principal, with the assistance of the administrator of special education, coordinates the delivery and supervision of special education services within each school building.
5. Educational services in home or hospital. Upon receipt of a physician's written order verifying that any student enrolled in a public school or placed by the public school in a private setting must remain at home or in a hospital on a day or overnight basis, or any combination of both, for medical reasons and for a period of not less than fourteen school days in any school year, the principal arranges for provision of educational services in the home or hospital. Such services are provided with sufficient frequency to allow the student to continue his or her educational program, as long as such services do not interfere with the medical needs of the student. The principal coordinates such services with the Administrator for Special Education for eligible students. Such educational services are not considered special education unless the student has been determined eligible for such services, and the services include services on the student's IEP.
 |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71, § 38Q 1/2; 603 CMR 28.03(3); 603 CMR 28.03(1)(f) |
|  | **Rating:** | **Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review**  | **District Response Required:** | **No** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| ***Prior Noncompliance - Corrective Action Under Review:*** *During the 2024-2025 monitoring* *review conducted by the Office of Language Acquisition (OLA), it was determined that**Springfield Public Schools and the Springfield Empowerment Zone do not always implement* *appropriate services for linguistic minority students. OLA issued an ELE 5 Program Placement* *and Structure finding in May 2025 that included the following:** *When students are expected to receive English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction through a push-in model, ESL instruction does not consistently occur;*
* *While the district adopted ESL curricular materials, they are not consistently implemented across all schools; and*
* *The district does not ensure that English learners with disabilities placed in out-of-district programs receive ELE services.*

*Corrective action for the ELE 5 finding will be reviewed and approved by OLA through the district's Continuous Improvement and Monitoring Plan (CIMP).* |

|  |
| --- |
| This Integrated Monitoring Review Report is also available at:<https://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/tfm/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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