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#### MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION COLLABORATIVE MID-CYCLE REVIEW REPORT

**OVERVIEW OF REVIEW PROCEDURES INTRODUCTION**

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Department) is required under M.G.L. c. 71B, §10 to review special education programs in approved special education schools and collaboratives that serve publicly funded students under the provisions of Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Regulations 603 CMR 18.00, 28.00, and 46.00. Each year, the Department's Office of Approved Special Education Schools (OASES) conducts onsite visits to selected approved special education school and collaborative programs to verify the implementation of standard Mid-cycle Review criteria, as well as any criteria from the most recent Program Review that required follow-up due to procedural and programmatic requirements. In the Spring of the previous school year, the schools participating in the review cycle were notified of the dates of the onsite visits and were required to conduct a Data Collection before the onsite portion of the review using the Department's Communication Hub and Monitoring Portal (CHAMP).

The statewide Collaborative Mid-cycle Review cycle together with the Department’s six-year Program Review monitoring schedule is posted on the Department’s website at [https://www.doe.mass.edu/oases/crs/6yrcycle.html.](https://www.doe.mass.edu/oases/crs/6yrcycle.html)

#### COLLABORATIVE MID-CYCLE REVIEW ELEMENTS

**Criteria:** The Mid-Cycle Review criteria encompass key elements drawn from 603 CMR 18.00, 28.09, 46.00 and the approved public day school program’s application for approval. They also include those required by the federal Office for Special Education Programs (OSEP) and revised requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. Section 1400 et seq. (IDEA-2004) as described in the Department's Special Education Advisories.

Through the Desk Review the OASES chairperson examines the Data Collection submission and determines which criteria will be followed up on through onsite verification activities. The Data Collection and Desk Review are both described below.

**Data Collection Phase:** This is a requirement for all collaborative programs being monitored. It is completed for the onsite review and covers all of the Department selected criteria. The collaborative is responsible for completing the Self- Assessment for each individual program being reviewed, which consists of:

 Collaborative review of policies and procedures,

 Collaborative review of student documentation including a sample of student records.  Collaborative review of facilities, buildings, and grounds.

Upon completion of these portions, the collaborative submits the Data Collection to the Department for review.

**Desk Review Phase:** The OASES chairperson assigned to each collaborative reviews the responses by the collaborative regarding the critical elements for appropriate policies, procedures, and practices, as well as actual documents and data submitted for each criterion. The OASES chairperson also reviews documents, student record data, and explanatory comments. The outcome of this review, along with 3-year trend data from the Problem Resolution System, restraint reports, restraint injuries, serious incidents and notification or prior approval from the Department, through its notification system, is used to determine the scope and nature of onsite activities.

**Onsite Verification Phase:**

This includes activities selected from the following:

 Interviews with administrative, instructional, and other staff consistent with those criteria selected for verification.  Telephone interviews as requested by parents, guardians or members of the general public.

Review of student records: The Department selects a sample of student records from those the collaborative reviewed as part of its data collection to verify the accuracy of the data. The Department also conducts an independent review of a sample of student records that reflect activities conducted since the beginning of the school year. The Department monitoring team will conduct this review using standard Department procedures to determine whether procedural and programmatic requirements have been implemented.

Observation of classrooms and other facilities: The team observes 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.

**Team:** Depending upon the scope of follow-up activities that have been identified based on the Department’s Desk Review of the collaborative’s Data Collection, a two-to-four-member Department team will conduct a one-to-five-day Mid-Cycle Review.

**Final Report:** A Final Report is then issued via CHAMP. The Final Report includes findings organized under 3specified compliance areas: Policies and Procedures, Student Documentation, and Building/Facilities.

**Ratings:** The findings explain the “ratings,” or determinations by the Department about the implementation status of the compliance criteria reviewed within each of these areas. The ratings indicate those criteria that were found by the OASES monitoring team to be “Implemented,” “Implemented Response Required, “Implementation in Progress,” “Partially Implemented,” or “Not Implemented.”

**Department Corrective Action Ordered:**

The Department issues corrective action required to bring into compliance with the required statute or regulation in each area found to be not fully “Implemented”. In some instances, the team may have found certain requirements to be fully “Implemented” but made a specific comment on the school program’s implementation methods that also may require follow-up from the approved special education school program. **Under federal Special Education State Performance Plan requirements pursuant to IDEA-2004, public and approved special education school programs serving disabled students must demonstrate effective resolution of noncompliance identified by the Department as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the issuance of the Department’s Final Program Review Report.**

#### REPORT INTRODUCTION

A -member team conducted a visit to South Shore Educational Collaborative during the week of May 20, 2024 to evaluate the implementation of selected compliance criteria under the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Regulations 603 CMR 18.00 (Program and Safety Standards for Approved Public or Private Day and Residential Special Education School Programs) and 603 CMR 28.09 (Approval of Public or Private Day and Residential Special Education School Programs), 603 CMR 46.00 (Prevention of Physical Restraint and Requirements If Used), M.G.L c. 71B, the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. Section 1400 et seq, as amended in 2004 (IDEA--2004), and civil rights provisions that are pertinent to Approved Special Education School Programs. The team appreciated the opportunity to interview staff, to observe classroom facilities, and to review the program efforts underway.

The Department is submitting the following Approved Special Education School Program Review Report containing findings made pursuant to this onsite visit. In preparing this report the team reviewed extensive documentation regarding the operation of the school programs, together with information gathered by means of the following Department program review methods:

 Interviews of 7 leadership staff;

 Interviews of 0 related services staff;  Interviews of 0 teaching staff; and

 Interviews of 0 direct care staff.

 Student record review: A sample of 17 Massachusetts student records was selected by the Department. Student records were first examined by the school program’s staff and then verified by the OASES monitoring team using standard Department student record review procedures to make determinations regarding the implementation of procedural and programmatic requirements. An additional number of randomly selected student records were also reviewed by the OASES monitoring team to ensure determinations regarding the implementation of procedural and programmatic requirements remain in effect.

 Observation of classrooms and other facilities: A sample of instructional classrooms and other facilities used in the delivery of programs and services was observed to determine general levels of compliance with program requirements.

##### Summary of Compliance Criteria Included In This Report Requiring Corrective Action Plan Development In Response to the Following Mid Cycle Review Report Findings

**Implemented**

 The requirement is totally or substantially met

##### Implemented Response Required

 The requirement is met, but the Agency is required to provide additional information.

##### Implementation in Progress

 This rating is used for criteria containing new or updated legal requirements and means that the agency 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.

|  |
| --- |
| **Policies & Procedures** |
| **Criteria** | **Implemented** | **Implemented Response Required** | **Implementation In Progress** | **Partially Implemented** | **Not Implemented** |
| \* **APD 9.1 (a)****Student Separation Resulting from Behavior Support** |  |  |  | Quest School |  |

**Staff Documentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Implemented** | **Implemented Response Required** | **Implementation In Progress** | **Partially Implemented** | **Not Implemented** |
| **CSE 51 Appropriate Special Education Teacher Licensure** | All |  |  |  |  |
| **CSE 52 Appropriate certifications/licenses or other****credentials-- related service providers** | All |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Documentation** |
| **Criteria** | **Implemented** | **Implemented Response Required** | **Implementation In Progress** | **Partially Implemented** | **Not Implemented** |
| **CSE 13 Progress Reports and Content** | All |  |  |  |  |
| **CSE 22 IEP****implementation and availability** | All |  |  |  |  |
| **CSE 29****Communications are in English and Primary language of home** | All |  |  |  |  |
| **CSE 40****Instructional grouping requirements for students aged five and older** | All |  |  |  |  |
| **CSE 41 Age Span requirements** | All |  |  |  |  |

\*Criterion was not previously included in the standard review cycle, but was reviewed during the Onsite visit.

#### Policies & Procedures

##### APD 9.1 (a) Student Separation Resulting from Behavior Support

**Requirements**

If the program’s behavior support policy and procedures result in a student being separated in a room apart from the group or program activities, it shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

* 1. Guidelines for staff in the utilization of such an area;
	2. Persons responsible for implementing such procedures;
	3. The duration of the procedures including procedures for approval by the chief administrative person or his/her designee for any period longer than 30 minutes;
	4. Requirement that students shall be observed at all times and in all parts of the room, and that the staff shall be accessible at all times; and
	5. A means of documenting the use of time-out for an individual student, including, at a minimum, length of time, reasons for this intervention, who approved the procedure, and who monitored the student during the time out.
		1. Time out rooms shall not be locked.
		2. Any room or space used for the practice of separation must be physically safe and appropriate to the population served by the facility.

**Legal Standards**

[18.05(5)(i), 18.05(6,7](https://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr18.html?section=05)) 46.02(5)(b)

**Confirmed Findings**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applies To** | **Rating** | **Response Required** | **Finding Description** |
| Quest School | Partially Implemented | Yes | Observations and staff interviews indicated that students are not continuously observed while in spaces designated for student separation. |

##### Corrective Action Plan

**Department Order of Corrective Action - Due Date: Progress Report 1 -** 08/16/2024

**Required Elements: Progress Report 1 -** Submit the procedure for student separation, including a description of the spaces used for student separation, and how the collaborative ensure these spaces are monitored.

**Due Date: Progress Report 2 -** 09/20/2024

**Required Elements: Progress Report 2 -** Provide evidence of staff training on the procedure for student separation. Evidence of training must include:

1) the name and job title of the person conducting the training; 2) the date the training was held; 3) list of all staff trained with their position tittle; 4) training materials; 5) for any staff who did not receive the training the reason why, and when their training is scheduled.