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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, Bourne 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 a 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.

**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/procedures.docx>.

**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** **Bourne Public Schools**

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education conducted an Integrated Monitoring Review in Bourne Public Schools during the week of January 27, 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 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.
* Interview of a special education parent advisory council (SEPAC) representative.
* 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 special education student roster. The onsite team conducted this review, using standard Department procedures, to determine whether procedural and programmatic requirements have been met.

|  |
| --- |
| 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. |

**Bourne Public Schools**

# **SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

# **SUMMARY OF PRE-FINDING CORRECTIONS**

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

**SE 37: Procedures for approved and unapproved out-of-district placements**

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 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** |  |  |

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

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | **SPECIAL EDUCATION**  **I. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 1** | Assessments are appropriately selected and interpreted for students referred for evaluation   1. Tests and other evaluation materials are:    1. validated;    2. administered and interpreted by trained individuals;    3. tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and related developmental needs;    4. selected and administered to reflect aptitude and achievement levels and related developmental needs;    5. as free as possible from cultural and linguistic bias;    6. provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the student knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally;    7. not the sole criterion for determining an appropriate educational program;    8. not only those designed to provide a single general intelligence quotient;    9. are selected and administered to ensure that when a test is administered to a student with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills, the test results accurately reflect the student's aptitude or achievement level or the other factors the test purports to measure;    10. technically sound instruments that may assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental factors. 2. In interpreting evaluation data and making decisions, the district:    1. uses information from a variety of sources to gather relevant functional and developmental information, including information provided by the parent;    2. ensures that information obtained from these sources is considered;    3. ensures that the placement decision conforms with placement in the least restrictive environment;    4. includes information related to enabling the student to be involved in and progress in the general curriculum. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.04  603 CMR 28.05 | |  | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that although the district conducts evaluations using tests and other evaluation materials tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and related developmental needs of students, the district does not always include recommendations related to the student's areas of need in the evaluation reports.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 8** | IEP Team composition and attendance  The following persons are members of the IEP Team and may serve in multiple roles:   1. The student's parents. 2. A representative of the school district who acts as Chairperson and who is (1) qualified to supervise or provide special education; (2) is knowledgeable about the general curriculum; and (3) is knowledgeable about the availability of resources of the district. 3. A representative of the school district who has the authority to commit the resources of the district (and who may act as the Chairperson).    1. If the student *may* be involved in a regular education program, a regular education teacher. If the student *is* involved in a regular education program, a regular education teacher of the student.    2. If the student is participating in a special education program, a special education teacher of the student or, if appropriate, a special education provider for the student. 4. The student, if one purpose of the meeting is to discuss transition services or if otherwise appropriate and if he/she chooses. 5. Other individuals at the request of the student's parents. 6. An individual who is qualified to interpret the instructional implications of evaluation results, who may be any one of the persons identified in parts 2 - 4 above. 7. Other individuals who may be necessary to write an IEP for the child, as determined by the Administrator of Special Education. 8. When one purpose of the Team meeting is to discuss transition services, with the consent of the parent(s) or student who has reached the age of majority, the public agency must invite a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services. 9. When one purpose of the Team meeting is to discuss placement, a person knowledgeable about placement options is present at the meeting. 10. Members of the Team attend Team meetings unless:     1. the parent and district agree to use alternative means, such as a video conference or a conference call, for any Team meeting OR     2. the district and the parent agree, in writing, that the attendance of the Team member is not necessary because the member's area of the curriculum or related services is not being modified or discussed OR     3. the district and the parent agree, in writing, to excuse a required Team member's participation and the excused member provides written input into the development of the IEP to the parent and the IEP Team prior to the meeting. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.02(21). Part 1 of this criterion is related to State Performance Plan Indicator 8. Parts 5, 10, are related to Performance Plan Indicators 13 and 14. (See Massachusetts State Performance Plan (MA SPP) and Annual Performance Reports (MA APR) - Special Education.) | | 34 CFR 300.116(a), 300.321, 300.328.  See also, in the IDEA 97 regulations, 34 CFR Part 300, Appendix A, to State Question #22 | |
|  | **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 a Team member does not attend the Team meeting, the district does not always follow the required procedures, including the following:*   * + *Documenting, in writing, that the district and the parent agree the attendance of the Team member is not necessary because the member's area of the curriculum or related services is not being modified or discussed; or*   + *Documenting, in writing, the district and the parent agree to excuse a required Team member's participation and the excused member provides written input into the development of the IEP to the parent and the IEP Team prior to the meeting.*   *Additionally, when one purpose of the Team meeting is to discuss transition services, the district does not always invite a representative of a participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services.*  *Furthermore, when an eligible student is involved in a general education program, a general education teacher is not always invited to the Team meeting.* |

| **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 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, the district does not always determine whether the student is eligible for special education and provide the parent with a proposed IEP.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 12** | Frequency of re-evaluation   1. When the student's needs warrant it or a parent or teacher requests it, the school district, with parental consent, conducts a full re-evaluation consistent with the requirements of federal law, provided that:    1. a re-evaluation is conducted every 3 years unless the parent and district agree that it is unnecessary and    2. a re-evaluation is conducted no more frequently than once a year unless the parent and district agree otherwise. 2. The district implements re-evaluation procedures in all cases where it is suspected that a student is no longer eligible for special education, except that no re-evaluation is required before the termination of eligibility because a student has graduated with a general high school diploma or exceeded the age of eligibility. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.04(3) | | 34 CFR 300.303; 300.305(e) | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records indicated that the district does not always conduct re-evaluations every three years.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| SE 18B | Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent   1. At the Team meeting, after the IEP has been fully developed, the Team determines the appropriate placement to deliver the services on the student's IEP. 2. Unless the student's IEP requires some other arrangement, the student is educated in the school that he or she would attend if the student did not require special education. 3. The decision regarding placement is based on the IEP, including the types of related services that are to be provided to the student, the type of settings in which those services are to be provided, the types of service providers, and the location at which the services are to be provided. 4. Reserved. 5. Immediately following the development of the IEP, the district provides the parent with two (2) copies of the proposed IEP and proposed placement along with the required notice, except that the proposal of placement may be delayed according to the provisions of 603 CMR 28.06(2)(e) in a limited number of cases. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | 603 CMR 28.05(6) and (7); 28.06(2) | | 34 CFR 300.116; 300.325 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the district does not always issue a proposed IEP and proposed placement to the parent immediately following the development of the IEP.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 39** | Procedures used to provide services to eligible students enrolled in private schools at private expense  For all students with disabilities attending private school(s) located in the district's geographic boundary whose parents reside in Massachusetts or out of state, the school district:   1. Conducts child find activities comparable to those for public school students, for all students enrolled at private expense in private schools located in the geographic boundary of the district. 2. Provides or arranges for the provision of an evaluation for any private school student who is referred for evaluation. The evaluation may take place in the public school, the private school, or an appropriate contracted facility. 3. Provides for ongoing timely and meaningful consultation with private school representatives and representatives of parents of parentally-placed private school children with disabilities prior about:    1. the child find process for students suspected of having a disability, and how parents, teachers, and private school officials will be informed about the child find process;    2. what the determination of proportionate share funds is and the calculation of which that determination is based, including the underlying data;    3. how the consultation process will occur during the school year between the district, private school representatives, and parents;    4. how, where, and by whom special education and related services will be provided to eligible private school students with disabilities using proportionate share funds, including types of services, how funds will be apportioned if federal funds are insufficient to serve all eligible students, and how and when decisions about proportionate share services will be made; and    5. how the district will notify private school officials, in writing, if the district does not agree with the view of the private school offices about the provision of services or specific types of services. 4. Obtains signed, written affirmation from participating private school officials that consultation has occurred, and if there is no written affirmation, the district sends ESE documentation about the consultation process. 5. Calculates the proportionate share of federal special education entitlement funds (Fund Code 240 [IDEA Section 611Funds] and Fund Code 262 [IDEA Section 619 Funds]) required to be spent, based on the child count taken between October 1 and December 1 of the *prior* fiscal year that includes the number of all eligible private school students attending school in the district's geographic catchment area including residents, non-residents, and home school students, using the ESE form. (N.B.: A student remains eligible for 3 years following identification. Child count includes all students found eligible attending school in the district, regardless of whether they receive(d) special education services.) 6. Determines equitable services and how they will be provided to one or more students with disabilities attending private schools in the district through    1. a discussion of student needs and possible types of special education and related services that can be provided either directly or through alternative service delivery mechanisms;    2. consideration that federal grant funds can be used to provide services on the grounds of private schools, although services provided with state and local funds must be provided at a "public school facility or other public or neutral site";    3. if the amount of proportionate share grant funds are insufficient to serve every eligible student, a discussion of how the district will apportion the services among eligible students, or may choose to supplement the proportionate share of the grant funds with additional grant funds or with state or local funds; and    4. if the school district disagrees with the views of the private school officials on the provision or type of services, the district must provide private school officials with a written explanation of the reasons the district chose not to provide services directly or through a contract. The school district has the final decision-making authority. 7. Creates a services plan for each eligible private school student who will receive special education or related services from the district using proportionate share funds.    1. Initiates and conducts meetings to develop, review, and revise services plans for eligible students.    2. Ensures a representative of each student's private school attends each meeting or is able to participate through individual or conference calls. 8. If using federal funds only, provides special education services and/or related services to private school children at the private school, and if using state funds, provides services to private school students on the grounds of the public school or another public or neutral site. 9. Collects the following data and information, and reports to ESE as necessary in the Fund Code 240 application:    1. the number of private school and home school children evaluated in a school year;    2. the number of private school and home school children determined to be eligible in a school year (may include evaluations conducted, or, for non-residents, evaluations provided by the district of residence and accepted as evidence of eligibility); and    3. the number of private school and home school children served in a school year regardless of where they attend school. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  | M.G.L. c. 71B, section 2  603 CMR 28.03(1)(e) | | 34 CFR 300.130-144; 300.300(d)(4) | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that although the district developed procedures to provide services to eligible students enrolled in private schools at private expense, the procedures do not include the following requirements:*   * *Providing ongoing timely and meaningful consultation with private school representatives and representatives of parents of parentally-placed private school children with disabilities;* * *Obtaining signed written affirmations from participating private school officials following consultations;* * *Calculating the proportionate share of federal special education entitlement funds required to be spent;* * *Providing private school officials with a written explanation of the reasons the district may choose not to provide services directly or through a contract; and* * *Creating a services plan for each eligible private school student who will receive special education or related services from the district using proportionate share funds.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** |  | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| **SE 47** | Procedural requirements applied to students not yet determined to be eligible for special education   1. If, prior to the disciplinary action, a district had knowledge that the student may be a student with a disability, then the district makes all protections available to the student until and unless the student is subsequently determined not to be eligible. The district may be considered to have prior knowledge if:    1. The parent had expressed concern in writing; or    2. The parent had requested an evaluation; or    3. District staff had expressed directly to the special education director or other supervisory personnel specific concerns about a pattern of behavior demonstrated by the student.   The district may not be considered to have had prior knowledge if the parent has not consented to evaluation of the student or has refused special education services, or if an evaluation of the student has resulted in a determination of ineligibility.   1. If the district had no reason to consider the student disabled, and the parent requests an evaluation subsequent to the disciplinary action, the district must have procedures consistent with federal requirements to conduct an expedited evaluation to determine eligibility. 2. If the student is found eligible, then he/she receives all procedural protections subsequent to the finding of eligibility. | | | |
|  | State Requirements | | Federal Requirements | |
|  |  | | 34 CFR 300.534 | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **No** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *No Finding.* |

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

| **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 principal   1. 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:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the district has not developed procedures for early literacy screening. Additionally, when screenings determine that a student is significantly below relevant benchmarks for age-typical development in specific literacy skills, they district does not always:*   * *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; and* * *Inform the student's parent or guardian of the screening results and the school's response and offer them the opportunity for a follow-up discussion.*   *Additionally, although the district recently updated the District Curriculum Accommodation Plan, the plan does not include supports for linguistic minority students and direct and systematic instruction in reading.*  *Review of documentation also indicated that the district's home/hospital procedures have not been updated to include the steps that must be taken upon receipt of a physician's written order verifying that a 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.*  ***Prior Noncompliance-Corrective Action Under Review:*** *During the 2024-2025 monitoring review conducted by the Office of Language Acquisition (OLA), it was determined that the district does not consistently offer adequate and appropriate services for linguistic minority students. OLA issued an ELE 5 Program Placement and Structure finding in November 2024 that set forth content teachers do not always use sheltered content instructional strategies aligned with WIDA Standards. Additionally, teachers who work with students who have not met their English language proficiency benchmarks do not plan lessons to support students' learning goals and there is no process to track and assess the progress of English learners (ELs) in the identified areas of need as required by M.G.L 71 A; 11.*  *Furthermore, the district does not have an ESL curriculum.*  *Corrective action for the ELE 5 finding will be reviewed and approved by OLA through the district's Continuous Improvement 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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