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**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**TIERED FOCUSED MONITORING REPORT**

**Nashoba Valley Technical High School**

**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 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.

**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.**

# **INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL REPORT**

#

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education conducted a Tiered Focused Monitoring Review in Nashoba Valley Technical High School during the week of January 13, 2020 to evaluate the implementation of Group B 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.

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 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

Surveys:

* Parents of students with disabilities

Observations:

* Classrooms and other facilities

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

**Group B Universal Standards:**

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

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |

**Nashoba Valley Technical High School**

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Universal Standards Special Education** | **Universal Standards Civil Rights and Other General Education Requirements** |
| **IMPLEMENTED** | SE 15, SE 32, SE 35, SE 36, SE 50, SE 51, SE 52, SE 52A, SE 54, SE 55, SE 56 | CR 3, CR 7, CR 7A, CR 7B, CR 7C, CR 10A, CR 10B, CR 10C, CR 12A, CR 16, CR 20, CR 21, CR 22, CR 23, CR 24, CR 25 |
| **PARTIALLY****IMPLEMENTED** |  | CR 17A |
| **NOT IMPLEMENTED** |  |  |

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents indicated that although the district has developed written restraint prevention and behavior support policy and procedures, the written procedures do not include: methods for preventing student violence and self-injurious behavior; explanation of the program's alternatives to physical restraint and method of physical restraint in emergency situations; and a procedure for the use of time-out.* |

|  |
| --- |
| 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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