School Committee Meeting

September 25, 2017

Open Session

7:00 P.M.

Superintendent’s Conference Room
Town of Reading  
Meeting Posting with Agenda

**Board - Committee - Commission - Council:**

School Committee

**Date:** 2017-09-25  
**Time:** 7:00 PM

**Building:** School - Memorial High  
**Location:** Superintendent Conference Room

**Address:** 82 Oakland Road  
**Agenda:**

**Purpose:** Open Session

**Meeting Called By:** Linda Engelson on behalf of the Chair

Notices and agendas are to be posted 48 hours in advance of the meetings excluding Saturdays, Sundays and Legal Holidays. Please keep in mind the Town Clerk's hours of operation and make necessary arrangements to be sure your posting is made in an adequate amount of time. A listing of topics that the chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting must be on the agenda.

**All Meeting Postings must be submitted in typed format; handwritten notices will not be accepted.**

**Topics of Discussion:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Call to Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7:05 p.m.</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7:10 – 7:15 p.m.</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Consent Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accept a Donation from the RMHS PTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Accept a Donation to the Wood End School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Approval of RMHS Model United Nations Field Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Approval of Parker French Field Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Approval of Minutes (September 11, 2017)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7:15 – 7:45 p.m.</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Liaison/Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Assistant Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Director of Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Director of Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>Old Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7:45 – 8:30 p.m.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>New Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Data Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Special Education Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Agenda has been prepared in advance and represents a listing of topics that the chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting. However the agenda does not necessarily include all matters which may be taken up at this meeting.
This Agenda has been prepared in advance and represents a listing of topics that the chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting. However the agenda does not necessarily include all matters which may be taken up at this meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Information/Correspondence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Email from Rebecca Liberman – Access to middle school algebra and Math curriculum maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RPS 1st Annual Parent University Flyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. FY18 Capital Plan Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. Routine Matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bills &amp; Payroll Warrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Calendar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Future Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9:15 p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L. Executive Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
TO: Reading School Committee  
FROM: John F. Doherty, Ed.D.  
     Superintendent of Schools  
DATE: September 21, 2017  
TOPIC: Accept a Donation from RMHS PTO

At our meeting on Monday evening, I will ask the School Committee to accept a donation from the RMHS PTO in the amount of $266.66. This donation is being used to cover the balance of the cost of laptop computers.

If you have any questions, please contact me.
TO: Dr. John F. Doherty, Superintendent of Schools

FROM: Adam D. Bakr, Principal

DATE: September 25, 2017

SUBJECT: Donation for Reading Memorial High School

Please accept the donation in the amount of 266.66 from RMHS PTO to cover the balance of the cost for the laptops for the Health and Wellness Department. Most of the cost was funded by a grant from the Reading Education Foundation.

Enclosed is a copy of the check.

Thank You.
TO: Reading School Committee

FROM: John F. Doherty, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools

DATE: September 21, 2017

TOPIC: Accept a Donation from the Wood End PTO

At our meeting on Monday evening, I will ask the School Committee to accept a donation from the Wood End PTO in the amount of $900.18. This donation is being used to purchase library books for the Media Center.

If you have any questions, please contact me.
MEMO

To: Gail Dowd, Director of Finance

From: Joanne King, Principal

Date: September 19, 2017

RE: Wood End Elementary School PTO

The Wood End Elementary School received a check in the amount of $900.18 from the Wood End Elementary School PTO. We ask that the School Committee accept this donation which we will use to purchase library books for our media center.

Thank you.
Wood End Elementary School PTO  
85 Sunset Rock Ln.  
Reading, MA 01867  

September 12, 2017  

Re: Follett Book Order  

Dear Mrs. King:  

Please accept this donation of $900.18 from the Wood End PTO to cover the costs of the Follett book order for the library. This collection will be a great addition for our children.  

Sincerely,  

Nicole Barletta  
PTO Treasurer
TO: Reading School Committee

FROM: John F. Doherty, Ed. D.
Superintendent of Schools

DATE: September 21, 2017

TOPIC: Approval of RMHS Model United Nations Field Trips

At our meeting on Monday evening I will ask the School Committee to approve the RMHS Model UN field trips to Harvard University in January, Boston University in February, and New York City in March 2018. I have met with teacher Amy Fedele to discuss these trips. These trips are an opportunity for delegates to come together into an environment that fosters creative thinking and open-mindedness in debate.

If you have any questions, please contact me.
To: Dr. John Doherty

From: Adam D. Bakr, Principal

Re: Model UN Trips

Date: September 19, 2017

May this letter serve as support for Amy Fedele, advisor for Model UN, to escort RMHS Students to participate in three Model UN Conferences. The first one is at the John B. Hynes Auditorium in Boston on January 25-28th, 2018. The second one is on February 9th-11th, 2018 at Boston University, Boston. The third conference is in New York City on March 2-5th, 2018. Students and chaperones will be traveling by bus to New York. There will be approximately 15 students attending, along with 1 other chaperone.

The conferences are opportunities for students to research World Issues and become aware of the World we live in today.

I respectfully request that you approve Ms. Fedele’s three educational trips.
Reading Public Schools
Field Trip Plan

1. Trip Coordinator: Amy Fedele
   School: RMHS
   Grade(s) Attending: 9-12

2. Destination: Boston University Model UN - Park Plaza Boston, MA

3. Type of Trip: Day____ Extended____ Overnight X Out of State____ International____

4. Purpose of Trip: Model United Nations Simulation

5. Date(s) of Trip: Feb. 9, 10, 11 2018
   Time of Departure: 7:00 am
   Time of Return: 2/11 8 am

6. Cost of Trip: $375.00
   Will there be fundraising? NO
   If yes, please attach plan.

7. No. of Students Attending: 8
   No. of Teachers: 1
   No. of other adults: 1

8. Have all adults had the necessary CORI and/or SAFIS Criminal Background Checks: YES

9. Transportation Required (Circle): Bus Train Boat Plane Private Car Other

10. Name of Company Providing Transportation: N/A

11. If this is an overnight trip, is the bus driver getting sufficient rest in accordance with federal regulations and common sense? N/A

12. Departure Information (location and carrier): N/A

13. Return Trip Information (location and carrier): N/A

14. Food and Lodging (if applicable) will be provided by: students

15. Address and Phone No. of Lodging (if applicable): Boston Park Plaza

16. Has the school determined that the facility has adequate insurance consistent with the level of risk involved (e.g. sedentary trip as opposed to outdoor, physically active trip)?
   If yes, attach a copy of the policy.

17. If swimming is involved, the school has determined that a lifeguard will be on duty at all times when students are in the water. Yes_______ No_______ N/A_______

18. Please describe below the educational alternative for those students who will not be attending the trip.

   Student extra-curricular activity - not required.
19. Please describe the process that will be used to determine student eligibility for the trip.

20. Please attach the following to this document:
   a. A detailed itinerary of the trip
   b. Signed state ethics financial disclosure forms from all teachers whose field trip cost will be covered. This is for any field trip where the cost per person is over $50. To access the form, go to http://www.mass.gov/ethics/disclosure-forms/municipal-employee-disclosure-forms/ and complete Form 11d, Disclosure of Travel Expenses for Non-Elected/Appointed Employee required by 930 CMR 5.08(2)(d)1.
   c. A copy of any contract associated with the field trip.
   d. A list of all adults who will be chaperoning the field trip.

The Following Section is for Out of Country Field Trips Only

A. Are there any current travel warnings or advisories issued by the State Department? Please go to www.cdc.gov or www.travel.state.gov. Yes_______ No_______

If yes, please explain________________________________________________________

B. Have you purchased medical insurance for each day of an out of country field trip? Yes____ No____ (attach a copy of the policy)

C. Is medical preclearance required? Yes_______ No_______

D. Does each student and staff member have the appropriate documentation necessary for travel to the country/countries being visited and for return to the United States? Yes____ No_______

E. Copies of all students’ passports shall be maintained by the Trip Coordinator.

F. At least one staff member accompanying the students must have a phone number with international service.

   Name of Staff Member______________________________________________________

   Telephone Number________________________________________________________

To be completed by Reading Public School Administration

I certify that all requirements of the Reading Public Schools Field Trip Policy have been fulfilled.

21. APPROVED __________________________ DATE 9/30/17

   Principal (For All Field Trips)

22. APPROVED __________________________ DATE 9/30/17

   Superintendent of Schools (For All Extended, Overnight, Out of State, and International Field Trips)

   School Committee Approval Date (For Overnight, Out of State, and International Field Trips) ____________
Reading Public Schools
Field Trip Plan

1. Trip Coordinator: Amy Fedele
   School: ___________________________ Grade(s) Attending: ___________________________


3. Type of Trip: Day ______ Extended ______ Overnight ______ Out of State ______ International ______

4. Purpose of Trip: Model United Nations Simulation

5. Date(s) of Trip: 1/25 - 1/28 Time of Departure: 7:00 AM Time of Return: 9:00 PM

6. Cost of Trip: $500.00 Will there be fundraising? NO If yes, please attach plan.

7. No. of Students Attending: 15 No. of Teachers: 1 No. of other adults: 1

8. Have all adults had the necessary CORI and/or SAFIS Criminal Background Checks? YES

9. Transportation Required (Circle): Bus ______ Train ______ Boat ______ Plane ______ Private Car ______ Other ______

10. Name of Company Providing Transportation: Private Car (Amst.)

11. If this is an overnight trip, is the bus driver getting sufficient rest in accordance with federal regulations and common sense? N/A

12. Departure Information (location and carrier): Private

13. Return Trip Information (location and carrier): Private

14. Food and Lodging (if applicable) will be provided by: Student/Parent

15. Address and Phone No. of Lodging (if applicable):

16. Has the school determined that the facility has adequate insurance consistent with the level of risk involved (e.g. sedentary trip as opposed to outdoor, physically active trip)? If yes, attach a copy of the policy.

17. If swimming is involved, the school has determined that a lifeguard will be on duty at all times when students are in the water. Yes _______ No _______ N/A _______

18. Please describe below the educational alternative for those students who will not be attending the trip.

Sheraton Boston (Hotel Overnight accom.)
John B Hynes Convention Center (Opening Ceremonies)
Marriott Copley Plaza (Committees)
19. Please describe the process that will be used to determine student eligibility for the trip.

Members of RMHS Model UN

20. Please attach the following to this document:
   a. A detailed itinerary of the trip
   b. Signed state ethics financial disclosure forms from all teachers whose field trip cost will be covered. This is for any field trip where the cost per person is over $50. To access the form, go to http://www.mass.gov/ethics/disclosure-forms/municipal-employee-disclosure-forms/ and complete Form 11d, Disclosure of Travel Expenses for Non-Elected/Appointed Employee required by 930 CMR 5.08(2)(d)1.
   c. A copy of any contract associated with the field trip.
   d. A list of all adults who will be chaperoning the field trip.

Amy T. Fedele

The Following Section is for Out of Country Field Trips Only

A. Are there any current travel warnings or advisories issued by the State Department? Please go to www.cdc.gov or www.travel.state.gov. Yes___________ No___________
   If yes, please explain________________________________________

B. Have you purchased medical insurance for each day of an out of country field trip? Yes___ No___ (attach a copy of the policy)

C. Is medical preclearance required? Yes___________ No___________

D. Does each student and staff member have the appropriate documentation necessary for travel to the country/countries being visited and for return to the United States? Yes____ No____

E. Copies of all students’ passports shall be maintained by the Trip Coordinator.

F. At least one staff member accompanying the students must have a phone number with international service.

Name of Staff Member__________________________________________

Telephone Number______________________________________________

To be completed by Reading Public School Administration

I certify that all requirements of the Reading Public Schools Field Trip Policy have been fulfilled.

21. APPROVED __________________________ DATE 9/29/17
   Principal (For All Field Trips)

22. APPROVED __________________________ DATE 9/29/2017
   Superintendent of Schools (For All Extended, Overnight, Out of State, and International Field Trips)

School Committee Approval Date (For Overnight, Out of State, and International Field Trips) ________________
HMUN 2018 Tentative Conference Schedule

Please note that this is a tentative schedule designed to give delegates and faculty advisors an idea of what to expect at HMUN. All times and dates listed here are subject to change. A more detailed final schedule will be published in the Delegate Handbook, which will be distributed at the start of conference.

Thursday, January 25, 2018

9:00am - 3:00pm  Registration
2:15pm - 3:00pm  International Schools Meeting and Reception (faculty advisors only)
2:00pm - 3:30pm  HMUN Delegate Training Sessions
3:30pm - 4:15pm  Mandatory Faculty Advisor and Head Delegate Welcome
5:00pm - 6:30pm  Opening Ceremonies and Keynote Address
Starting at 7:30pm  COMMITTEE SESSIONS AT THE SHERATON BOSTON AND THE MARRIOTT Copley Place
Committees will end at staggered times from 11:00pm to 11:30pm.
8:15pm - 9:00pm  Faculty Advisor Meet-and-Greet with the Secretariat
12:30am  Curfew (all delegates must be within their assigned hotel rooms)

Friday, January 26, 2018

9:00am - 1:00pm  Optional tours of Harvard University (public transportation to Harvard Square)
10:00am - 11:45am  College & Summer Opportunities Fair
11:45am - 12:20pm  College Admissions Panel
Starting at 2:30pm  COMMITTEE SESSIONS AT THE SHERATON BOSTON AND THE MARRIOTT Copley Place
Committees will end at staggered times from 5:30pm to 6:00pm.
3:30pm - 4:30pm  Faculty Advisor Speaker Series
Starting at 7:30pm  COMMITTEE SESSIONS AT THE SHERATON BOSTON AND THE MARRIOTT Copley Place
Committees will end at staggered times from 11:00pm to 11:30pm.
9:30pm - 10:30pm  Faculty Advisor Conference Feedback Session
12:30am  Curfew

Saturday, January 27, 2018

Starting at 9:00am  COMMITTEE SESSIONS AT THE SHERATON BOSTON AND THE MARRIOTT Copley Place
Committees will end at staggered times from 12:00pm to 12:30pm.
9:15am - 11:15am  Faculty Advisor Discussion Panel (breakfast will be served)
Starting at 2:00pm  COMMITTEE SESSIONS AT THE SHERATON BOSTON AND THE MARRIOTT Copley Place
Committees will end at staggered times from 5:30pm to 6:00pm.
2:30pm - 3:30pm  Faculty Advisor Speaker Series
4:00pm - 5:00pm  Faculty Advisor Conference Feedback Session
7:45pm - 9:15pm  Cultural Extravaganza
9:15pm - 12:00am  Movie Night
9:45pm - 12:30am  Delegate Dance
1:00am  Curfew

Sunday, January 28, 2018

9:00am - 11:30am  COMMITTEE SESSIONS AT THE SHERATON BOSTON AND THE MARRIOTT Copley Place
12:15pm - 1:30pm  Closing Ceremonies

Harvard Model United Nations 2018
Reading Public Schools
Field Trip Plan

1. Trip Coordinator: Amy Fedele
   School: RMHS
   Grade(s) Attending: 9-12

2. Destination: NYC National High School Model UN Conference

3. Type of Trip: Day____ Extended____ Overnight____ Out of State____ International____

4. Purpose of Trip: NY Statem UN Conference 2018 - NYC

5. Date(s) of Trip: 3/2-3/5 2019
   Time of Departure: 7:00 AM
   Time of Return: 2:00 PM

6. Cost of Trip: 400.00
   Will there be fundraising? No____ If yes, please attach plan.

7. No. of Students Attending: 15
   No. of Teachers: 1
   No. of other adults: 1

8. Have all adults had the necessary CORI and/or SAFIS Criminal Background Checks? Yes____

9. Transportation Required (Circle): Bus____ Train____ Boat____ Plane____ Private Car____
   Other: Peter Pan Busline____

10. Name of Company Providing Transportation: Peter Pan Busline____

11. If this is an overnight trip, is the bus driver getting sufficient rest in accordance with federal regulations and common sense? N/A____

12. Departure Information (location and carrier): Peter Pan Busline____

13. Return Trip Information (location and carrier): Peter Pan Busline____

14. Food and Lodging (if applicable) will be provided by: Students____

15. Address and Phone No. of Lodging (if applicable):____

16. Has the school determined that the facility has adequate insurance consistent with the level of risk involved (e.g. sedentary trip as opposed to outdoor, physically active trip)? If yes, attach a copy of the policy.____

17. If swimming is involved, the school has determined that a lifeguard will be on duty at all times when students are in the water. Yes____ No____ N/A____

18. Please describe below the educational alternative for those students who will not be attending the trip.
19. Please describe the process that will be used to determine student eligibility for the trip.

20. Please attach the following to this document:
   a. A detailed itinerary of the trip
   b. Signed state ethics financial disclosure forms from all teachers whose field trip cost will be covered. This is for any field trip where the cost per person is over $50. To access the form, go to http://www.mass.gov/ethics/disclosure-forms/municipal-employee-disclosure-forms/ and complete Form 11d, Disclosure of Travel Expenses for Non-Elected/Appointed Employee required by 930 CMR 5.08(2)(d):1.
   c. A copy of any contract associated with the field trip.
   d. A list of all adults who will be chaperoning the field trip.

The Following Section is for Out of Country Field Trips Only
A. Are there any current travel warnings or advisories issued by the State Department? Please go to www.cdc.gov or www.travel.state.gov. Yes_______ No___________

   If yes, please explain___________________________________________________________________________

   ___________________________________________________________________________________________

B. Have you purchased medical insurance for each day of an out of country field trip? Yes____ No____ (attach a copy of the policy)

C. Is medical preclearance required? Yes_______ No___________

D. Does each student and staff member have the appropriate documentation necessary for travel to the country/countries being visited and for return to the United States? Yes_______ No___________

E. Copies of all students’ passports shall be maintained by the Trip Coordinator.

F. At least one staff member accompanying the students must have a phone number with international service.

   Name of Staff Member__________________________________________________________

   Telephone Number_____________________________________________________________

To be completed by Reading Public School Administration

I certify that all requirements of the Reading Public Schools Field Trip Policy have been fulfilled.

21. APPROVED ___________________ DATE 9/22/17
    Principal (For All Field Trips)

22. APPROVED ___________________ DATE 9/21/12
    Superintendent of Schools (For All Extended, Overnight, Out of State, and International Field Trips)

School Committee Approval Date (For Overnight, Out of State, and International Field Trips) ____________
NHSMUN 2018 TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

Both NHSMUN 2018 sessions will feature the same activities and programming. The conference begins in the early afternoon of Day 1, and concludes in the early afternoon of Day 4. Below is a tentative schedule. Specific times, as well as more detailed activities, will be posted in the fall.

CONFERENCE DAY 1 (Friday, March 2 or Wednesday, March 7)

All Day: Conference Registration
Afternoon: Mission Briefings; Delegate Training Sessions
Early Evening: Opening Ceremonies
Evening: Committee Session 1

CONFERENCE DAY 2 (Saturday, March 3 or Thursday, March 8)

Morning: Speaker Series; Mission Briefings
Afternoon: Committee Session 2
Evening: Committee Session 3

CONFERENCE DAY 3 (Sunday, March 4 or Friday, March 9)

Morning: Committee Session 4
Afternoon: Committee Session 5
Evening: Delegate Dance

CONFERENCE DAY 4 (Monday, March 5 or Saturday, March 10)

Morning: Plenary Session and Closing Ceremonies

Note: NHSMUN 2018 will offer an expanded set of optional training and preparation sessions, as well as practice simulations, the day prior to Day 1 of the conference (March 1 and March 6). The sessions are available for beginner, intermediate, and advanced students and are open to all interested schools. We will also run training sessions during the afternoon of Day 1 of the conference (March 2 and March 7).

If you are interested in a customized training session for your students the day prior to the start of the conference, please contact us no later than January 1, 2018 to arrange the scheduling and content to be covered. We enjoy the ability to interact with students in advance of the conference, as we have found that it makes them more comfortable in committee sessions and enriches their conference experience.

WHICH SESSION WILL I ATTEND?
Inevitably, schools will have different preferences regarding which session to attend. At NHSMUN 2017, we had a remarkably even distribution in the interest of Session I versus Session II. Some schools tend to prefer a specific session because of scheduling or because they can miss fewer days of class; others prefer a session because airfare is cheaper over the given set of dates. Other schools prefer whichever session allows them to receive their top choice of country to represent. Regardless of your situation, we will do our best to accommodate your requests. You may change your session preference until October 15. Both of our conference sessions feature the same programming and activities; likewise, students from both sessions will spend time in the General Assembly Hall of the United Nations Headquarters. Committees and topics will be the same at both sessions. Students and teachers can look forward to the same, top-quality level of debate across our two sessions, coupled with a number of annual enhancements to boost the overall delegate experience.
TO: Reading School Committee

FROM: John F. Doherty, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools

DATE: September 21, 2017

TOPIC: Approval of Parker Grade 8 Field Trip to Quebec

At our meeting on Monday evening I will ask the School Committee to approve the annual Parker 8th Grade field trip to Quebec in April. I have met with Principal Shankland and teacher Steve Olivo to discuss this trip. This trip will include an opportunity for students to experience a diversity of curricular and cultural activities that complement the middle school curriculum.

I have attached a memorandum from Principal Shankland for your information.

If you have any questions, please contact me.
Memo

To: John Doherty, Superintendent of Schools
From: Richele Shankland, Principal
CC: Brendan Norton, Assistant Principal
    Lisa Jobst, French Teacher
    Steve Olivo/English Teacher/Trip Coordinator
Date: September 12, 2017
Re: French Trip

This memo is to request permission for our 8th grade French students to take a trip to Quebec City in the province of Quebec, Canada. As you know, our French students took this trip last year and it was very successful, with students having many opportunities to practice the French language, and experience the French culture. The trip this year will be led and chaperoned by English Teacher, Steve Olivo. The trip will be three days and two nights, Wednesday, April 25 through Friday, April 27, 2018. I have included the itinerary with this memo for you to review.

I would like to formally request School Committee approval to allow this educational trip which the teachers and I feel would be very beneficial to our students’ study of the French language and culture. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me or Steve Olivo, regarding this initiative.

Thank you.

Richele Shankland

The Reading Public Schools does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, age or disability.
Reading Public Schools
Field Trip Plan

1. Trip Coordinator: Steve Olivo
   School: Parker
   Grade(s) Attending: 8

2. Destination: Fairmont Chateau Frontenac & Various locations in Quebec City (see itinerary)

3. Type of Trip: Day_____ Extended_____ Overnight__X__ Out of State__X__ International__X__

4. Purpose of Trip: an experience in the food and lifestyle of old Quebec city

5. Date(s) of Trip: 4/25-4/27
   Time of Departure: 7:15am (4/25)
   Time of Return: 9:45 (4/27)

6. Cost of Trip: $639
   Will there be fundraising? No
   If yes, please attach plan.

7. No. of Students Attending: approx. 40
   No. of Teachers: 4-5
   No. of other adults:

8. Have all adults had the necessary CORI and/or SAFIS Criminal Background Checks? Yes

9. Transportation Required (Circle): Bus
   Train
   Boat
   Plane
   Private Car
   Other

10. Name of Company Providing Transportation: Brush Hill Transportation (arranged by ACIS)

11. If this is an overnight trip, is the bus driver getting sufficient rest in accordance with federal regulations and common sense?
    Yes

12. Departure Information (location and carrier): depart Parker MS @7:15 am via bus company listed above

13. Return Trip Information (location and carrier): depart Quebec City @ 1:45pm to arrive at Parker @ 9:45 via the bus company listed above.

14. Food and Lodging (if applicable) will be provided by Lodging: Chateau Frontenac, Food: various locations (see itinerary)

15. Address and Phone No. of Lodging (if applicable): Address: 1 rue des Carrières, QC, Canada G1R 4P5
    Phone: 1 418 692 3861

16. Has the school determined that the facility has adequate insurance consistent with the level of risk involved (e.g. sedentary trip as opposed to outdoor, physically active trip)? N/A
    If yes, attach a copy of the policy.

17. If swimming is involved, the school has determined that a lifeguard will be on duty at all times when students are in the water. Yes__________ No______________ N/A_X

18. Please describe below the educational alternative for those students who will not be attending the trip.
   Students who choose not to attend the trip will be put in one of the two groups staying behind each day and will follow their schedule for the day.
19. Please describe the process that will be used to determine student eligibility for the trip. 
The trip is open to all 8th grade French students.

20. Please attach the following to this document:
   a. A detailed itinerary of the trip
   b. Signed state ethics financial disclosure forms from all teachers whose field trip cost will be covered. 
      This is for any field trip where the cost per person is over $50. To access the form, go to 
      http://www.mass.gov/ethics/disclosure-forms/municipal-employee-disclosure-forms/ and complete 
      Form 11d, Disclosure of Travel Expenses for Non-Elected/Appointed Employee required by 930 CMR 
      5.08(2)(d)1.
   c. A copy of any contract associated with the field trip.
   d. A list of all adults who will be chaperoning the field trip.

The Following Section is for Out of Country Field Trips Only
A. Are there any current travel warnings or advisories issued by the State Department? Please go to 
   www.cdc.gov or www.travel.state.gov . Yes__________ No______ X____

   If yes, please explain______________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________

B. Have you purchased medical insurance for each day of an out of country field trip? Yes____ No____ X____
   (attach a copy of the policy)

C. Is medical preclearance required? Yes____ N/A____ No____ N/A____

D. Does each student and staff member have the appropriate documentation necessary for travel to the 
   country/countries being visited and for return to the United States? Yes____ X____ No____

E. Copies of all students’ passports shall be maintained by the Trip Coordinator.
F. At least one staff member accompanying the students must have a phone number with international service.

   Name of Staff Member __________ Steve Olivo
   Telephone Number _______ 425-591-5057

To be completed by Reading Public School Administration

I certify that all requirements of the Reading Public Schools Field Trip Policy have been fulfilled.

21. APPROVED ___________ DATE 9/12/17
   Principal (For All Field Trips)

22. APPROVED ___________ DATE 9/21/2017
   Superintendent of Schools (For All Extended, Overnight, Out of State, and International Field Trips)
Québec City for French Students
Walter Parker Middle School

Apr 25 - Apr 27, 2018
Group Leader:
Steve Olivo
Group ID:
242690
Depart From:
Reading, MA

what's included
Round-Trip Transportation
3- and 4-star quality hotels with quad occupancy
Overnight Security
Basic Travel Protection
Professional Group Photograph
St. Lawrence River Ferry
Québec City Funiculaire

Daily Breakfast and Dinner (unless otherwise noted)
Daytime Tour Manager (On-Call in Evening)
Martello Tower
Québec City Culture Quest
Basilique Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré
Montmorency Falls
Cabane à Sucre Evening
Musée du Fort

our promise
In educational travel, every moment matters. Pushing the experience from "good enough" to exceptional is what we do every day. Our mission is to empower educators to introduce their students to the world beyond the classroom and inspire the next generation of global citizens. Travel changes lives.

"Our tour guide was phenomenal; he went above and beyond my expectations. His knowledge of the area and the history behind it was most impressive."

Matthew L. Participant
trip itinerary - 3 days

Apr 25, 2018: Quebec
Depart your school by bus and get ready to say Bonjour to Québec City! Arrive in la Belle Province, where you will meet your tour manager in the South Shore community of Lévis. Begin your visit with a short ferry ride across the mile-wide St. Lawrence River. Upon arrival, your guide will lead you on a walking orientation tour through the lower city, ending with a ride on the funiculaire to the boardwalk across the street from Place d’Armes. Enjoy a Port de Québec walking tour ending at the Château Frontenac. Walk a few steps to Notre Dame de Québec Cathedral and then to Le petit Séminaire de Québec for a short visit to its beautiful courtyard. Continue on to the Quartier Latin for dinner. After dinner, walk to the PLAINS OF ABRAHAM for a visit to a unique, stone fortification that was erected in the mid-nineteenth century to protect Québec City from an invasion from all places, America. Arrive at MARTELLO TOWER TWO for an interesting, interactive lesson about military strategy of the era, and about the singularly harsh lives led by the soldiers stationed in the Martello Towers. (D)

Apr 26, 2018: Quebec
Enjoy an indulgent breakfast in a charming, centuries-old building in the Quartier Petit Champlain, then walk to the Terrasse Dufferin for a group photo overlooking the Château Frontenac. After the photo, walk with your tour manager to Place Royale where you will begin a cultural and historic Chasse au Trésor that will test you on what you have learned thus far about the rich history of New France. The Culture Quest will end on the rue du Trésor from which you will walk into the Quartier Latin where you’ll be free for lunch on your own on rue St-Jean. After lunch depart for the magnificent Basilique Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré. This gothic cathedral is renowned for its enormous proportions and superb stained glass windows. More than a million visitors tour the basilica every year. After the Basilique depart for the Parc de la Chute Montmorency, where the first battle between Generals Wolfe and Montcalm took place during the epochal summer of 1759. Upon arrival at Montmorency Falls, you will walk across a footbridge that crosses directly over the top of the 275-foot high falls, then down a 250-foot staircase that’s so close to the face of the falls, you’ll feel the mist. Depart for a ride through the rolling hills and quaint villages of rural Québec to an authentic French-Canadian cabane à sucre (or sugar shack). After an all-you-can-eat dinner of typical Québécois fare, you’ll learn some traditional dances and folk songs, and your evening will end with a sugar-on-snow party, with real maple syrup and real snow (stored in the winter and served every day of the year). (B, D) (B,D)

Apr 27, 2018: Departure
Begin your day with breakfast. Then walk next door to the Musée du Fort where you will learn about the many battles between the French, British and American armies; the presentation will end with a highly educational depiction of the decisive Battle of the Plains of Abraham, and a quiz to see how much history you absorbed. After, Arrive at the Centre D’Interpretation Place-Royale for a self-guided visit. Before you leave, you will learn about the people, houses and challenges of setting up on the shores of the St. Lawrence River in the early 1600’s. Walk to the Quartier Petit Champlain the oldest part of Québec City. There you’ll be free for lunch and some last-minute souvenir shopping and picture taking on your own amidst the ancient graystone buildings and cobbled streets dating back to the 1600s. Depart for home. (B)

This is a preliminary itinerary for your group.
# Tour Cost

**Participant Fees**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Fee</td>
<td>$639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Participant Fees$ ^2 $639

^2 Valid through 11/01/17 with $200 deposit.

**Additional Fees (as applicable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fee Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Surcharge</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Room Supplement</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Room Supplement</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Protection Plan</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes from ACIS

Program fee varies based on final paying participant numbers.

- With 40+ paid participants the Program Fee is $605
- With 35-39 paid participants the Program Fee is $639
- With 30-34 paid participants the Program Fee is $679

- All registered participants can enjoy the convenience, security and savings of having payments automatically withdrawn from a checking account by enrolling in an Automatic Payments plan. To learn more, visit [www.acis.com/autopay](http://www.acis.com/autopay)
- Adult travelers age 24 and older should add in the Adult Surcharge and Double or Single Room Supplement to calculate their Total Participant Fees.
- Pricing based on quad rooming for participants
- Tipping for Tour Manager and Bus Driver is not included
- This educational travel program is not school or district sponsored unless expressly stated by the Group Leader.

---

The Most Recommended Educational Travel Company!

Don't just take our word for it! Read reviews online at [acis.com/V04](http://acis.com/V04)
Travel Changes Lives

Can travel make a difference in students’ futures? It certainly can and does every single day. In fact, we surveyed 330 former ACIS travelers to see how their tours abroad as young adults influenced their choices in education and paved a way for future careers. Many of them credit travel as a defining moment in their adolescence, and below is a recap of our findings.

**education**

81% of those that traveled in middle school or high school continued their studies at the college level compared to the national average of 68% of travelers who went on to college said their travel experience influenced their field of study.

57% of respondents were motivated to study abroad during college.

**language skills**

67% of students continued to study foreign language in college.

73% of ACIS travelers say they speak one foreign language fairly well compared with 18% of the American population.

**personal development**

94% felt more independent after their trip.

78% saw an increase in their problem-solving skills.

92% noted improvement in their interpersonal skills.

65% have traveled overseas again since their ACIS trip.

Get Started Today

**ONLINE:**

Find Your Trip at: www.acis.com

Enter your Group Leader's ID & Last Name (on page 1) about halfway down the page. Click Register Now on your Trip Site when you're ready to sign up.

**MAIL:**

If you prefer, send your completed registration form to:

ACIS
343 Congress Street Suite 3100
Boston, MA 02210

**QUESTIONS?**

Give client services a ring at:
877-795-0813 or
email: accounts@acis.com
Town of Reading
Meeting Minutes

Board - Committee - Commission - Council:
School Committee

Date:  2017-09-11  Time:  7:00 PM
Building:  School - Memorial High  Location:  Superintendent Conference Room
Address:  82 Oakland Road  Session:  Open Session
Purpose:  Open Session  Version:  Draft

Attendees:  **Members - Present:**
Gary Nihan, Chuck Robinson, Nick Boivin, Linda Snow Dockser, Jeanne Borawski, and Elaine Webb

**Members - Not Present:**

**Others Present:**
Superintendent John Doherty, Director of Finance Gail Dowd, Assistant Superintendent Craig Martin, Student Representatives Mario Cutone & Catie Comounduros, Chronicle Reporter Al Sylvia, Coolidge Assistant Principal Bree Karow

**Minutes Respectfully Submitted By:**  Linda Engelson on behalf of the Chair

**Topics of Discussion:**

I. Call to Order

Chair Robinson called the School Committee to order at 7:00 p.m. and reviewed the agenda.

II. Recommended Procedure

A. **Public Comment**

Rebecca Liberman asked about a math curriculum update. Dr. Doherty said no date has been set at this point.

B. **Consent Agenda**

Mrs. Webb asked if anyone would like to remove any item from the consent agenda. The donation of the clock was removed to be accepted separately.

**Donation of Clock**

Mr. Joe Cain provided the background of the clock that was being donated to the district. In 1935 The Reading School Committee bought a state of the art clock and bell system for Reading High School, then located on Sanborn Street. It was manufactured by the International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) and
consisted of a programmable oak master clock in the Principal’s Office with synchronized wall clocks in every classroom. Following the high school’s move to Oakland Road in 1954, the building was used as a Community Center or shuttered until it was sold to developers in 1988. Prior to the sale, members of the School Department and the Reading Historical Commission toured the building to determine if there were any items that might be worth retaining. This clock was one of the artifacts that were removed prior to turning over the building.

In 1990, a battery powered quartz movement replaced the antique clock mechanism and Stephen Trites of Furniture Restoration of Reading donated the refinishing of the clock case. The clock hung in the RMHS Media Center until the most recent renovation; since then, the clock has not really had much of a home. We’re pleased to finally have it in a place where it can be enjoyed as a beautiful piece of craftsmanship, a technological curiosity of its time and an interesting piece of Reading history.

Mrs. Webb moved, seconded by Dr. Nihan, to accept the donation of a clock to be hung in the Central Office. The motion carried 6-0.

Consent Agenda

- Accept a Donation to RMHS Volleyball
- Approval of Coolidge Field Trip - Quebec
- Approval of Minutes (August 28, 2017)

Mrs. Webb moved, seconded by Mr. Boivin, to approve the consent agenda as amended. The motion carried 6-0.

C. Reports

Student Representative

Ms. Comounduras reported that the football team won their first game.

Mr. Cutone reported that Back to School Night is Wednesday.

Liaison’s Report

Dr. Nihan reported that RCASA is celebrating Recovery month.

Mrs. Webb followed up sharing the line-up of events that will occur during Recovery month.

Dr. Snow Dockser shared that the SEPAC is meeting on Thursday night at 7:00 p.m. in the Superintendent’s Conference Room.

The HRAC did not have a quorum at the last meeting and the Board of Selectmen delayed the decision on the sun-setting of the group until December 1st. Dr. Snow Dockser also announced that she has resigned from HRAC. There will be a kickoff event on October 3rd at 7:00 p.m. More information will be forthcoming.
Mrs. Borawski shared information from a community member regarding a Reading Public Schools employee that went above and beyond the call of duty.

Assistant Superintendent

Mr. Martin reported on the recent professional development that has occurred relating to the district goals. All of the kindergarten teachers attended a writer’s workshop. He did state that the timing of the training was not the best but we had an opportunity to secure a quality trainer for the sessions. The feedback from the teachers was positive.

Director of Finance

Mrs. Dowd reviewed two memos in the packet addressing concerns of the committee at the last meeting. The first memo, which was included in the June 19th packet outlined adjustments made to the FY18 budget due to the difference in funding between the School Committee approved and final Town Meeting budget. She also said that she will provide detailed information during the quarterly updates. The second memo outlined how the $150,000 for the science curriculum implementation was used and reminded the committee that the funds were approved during the April Town Meeting and are out of the FY17 budget.

Superintendent’s Report

Superintendent Doherty took a moment to introduce Brienne Karow, Coolidge Assistant Principal. Ms. Karow provided a brief background.

The Fall Street faire was a great success and Dr. Doherty thanked all the volunteers and business/vendors that played a part in the success. There were a great number school groups and organizations that participated this year.

The elementary schools held their back to school nights last week, Wednesday will be the high school and RISE @ RMHS and the middle schools will be on September 27th.

D. Old Business

Second Reading and Acceptance of Policy IMDA – Accommodations for Religious and Ethnic Observances

Mrs. Webb moved, seconded by Mrs. Borawski, to accept the second reading of revised policy IMDA – Accommodations for Religious and Ethnic Observances.

Mrs. Webb began the second reading.

Mr. Boivin moved, seconded by Dr. Nihan, to dispense of the further reading of Policy IMDA. The motion carried 6-0.

Dr. Doherty reviewed the revised policy. He thanked those that participated on the committee.
Mr. Boivin thanked the Superintendent for capturing the committee suggestions in this policy. He had a concern with the continuity between the policy and the implementation regulations. He would like to add a statement to the regulation under section III clarifying how the parent would handle calling in their child’s absence.

**Mr. Boivin moved, seconded by Dr. Nihan, that the following be added to Section III of the Accommodation Regulation – “notification to the school will be in accordance with the normal process in reporting a student absence”. The motion carried 6-0.**

**The original motion carried 6-0.**

E. **New Business**

FY19 Budget – Guiding Principles

Chair Robinson shared that in previous years the guiding principles were proposed and discussed at the meeting. This year, the guiding principles have been submitted to the Superintendent and feels that there is no need for further discussion. The Superintendent and Director of Finance have them to use as they begin the budget process.

Mr. Boivin would like to see a document that outlines how the guiding principles will be used to develop the budget.

III. **Routine Matters**

a. **Bills and Payroll (A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warrant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1809</td>
<td>8.31.17</td>
<td>$146,350.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1810</td>
<td>9.7.17</td>
<td>$184,755.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **Calendar**

IV. **Information/Correspondence**

V. **Future Business**

VI. **Adjournment**

Adjourn

Chair Robinson declared that executive session was necessary to protect the board’s bargaining position.

**Mrs. Webb moved, seconded by Mrs. Borawski, to enter executive session to discuss strategies with respect to collective bargaining and not to return to**
open session. The roll call vote carried 6 – 0. Dr. Nihan, Dr. Snow Dockser, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Boivin, Mrs. Borawski, and Mrs. Webb.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

NOTE: The minutes reflect the order as stated in the posted meeting agenda not the order they occurred during the meeting.
Reading Public Schools

Instilling a joy of learning and inspiring the innovative leaders of tomorrow

TO: Reading School Committee

FROM: John F. Doherty, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools

DATE: September 21, 2017

TOPIC: Data Presentation

At our meeting on Monday evening, Data Coach Courtney Fogarty, Mr. Martin and Mrs. Wilson will be presenting information on the process in which data is being used to inform instruction in our district.

If you have any questions, please contact me.
Building **capacity** to ensure continuous student progress . . .

**Measures of Progress**

**Data Driven Informed Education**

*Not everything that can be counted counts. Not everything that counts can be counted.*

William Bruce Cameron

School Committee Presentation / Reading Public Schools
September, 2017

---

**Data-Driven vs. Data-Informed**

“Data is an invaluable and persuasive source of business insight . . . But when it comes to making that insight work . . . don’t let data completely overrule your human instincts and experience. . . .

Being data-informed is about striking a balance in which your expertise and understanding of information plays as great a role in your decisions as the information itself. It’s like flying an airplane. No matter how sophisticated the systems onboard are, a highly trained pilot is ultimately responsible for making decisions at critical junctures.

Far from taking decision-making away from people, data can actually make them better at it, by giving them more inputs to work with. It’s like GPS in your car. When the system presents you with all the available options, you have more information with which to assess what you want to do next.”

Be Data-Informed not Data-Driven, For Now (Forbes, Jan. 13, 2015)

“Standards & Accountability are exceedingly weak strategies for driving reform.”

- “. . . the evolution of standards and accountability as applied to the teaching profession with greater intensity over the years has fundamentally weakened the effectiveness of the profession.”
- “. . . Policymakers are trying to do at the back end with accountability what they should have done at the front end with capacity building.”

What are the best “drivers” for change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrong</th>
<th>Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic Solutions</td>
<td>Collaborative Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented Strategies</td>
<td>Systemness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- “. . . capacity building is to accountability what finance is to accounting. Finance is about how people organize and invest their assets; if you have only accounting, you are merely keeping careful records while you go out of business! In the same way, there is more to accountability than measuring results; you need also to develop people’s capacity to achieve the results.

- “By drivers, I mean the policies and associated strategies—usually set by federal entities, states, or districts—that are intended, well, to ‘drive’ a school or larger system to new levels of success.”
- “Wrong drivers do not always look obviously wrong, and they are not wrong topics to consider, but . . . [they] do not actually produce the desired results.”

Michael Fullan, The Principal, 2014
Successes and failures are shared safely and without judgment.

- Time for collaboration is used productively and with purpose.
- Participants share the leadership and own the process and outcomes.
- Collaboration focuses on the core issues of student learning.
- Student outcomes are clearly defined, and progress monitored.
- Professional development is sought when needed

All share in the accountability for student learning.

- Adult learning is a shared responsibility.
- Learning that occurs through collaboration is captured and shared with others.

Collaboration is grounded in evidence of student learning.

- Multiple sources of evidence are available.
- Student work is examined and discussed regularly with others.

Measures of Progress

Objectives

1. Why is this work important?
2. How is it different from an accountability system?
3. Why is monitoring student growth essential?
4. How are we doing this work in our district?
5. How does the process benefit both students and staff?
Achievement vs. Progress
The importance of monitoring individual student growth

“Achievement and progress are often used interchangeably, but their meanings are actually very different. **Achievement** is a point-in-time measure that evaluates how well students perform against a standard. In contrast, **progress** is measured by how much "growth" students make over time, typically from one year to the next. Both of these measures are important, but they provide different information.

For years, student achievement has been measured by how well students perform on state tests, either by the mastery of standards or from set grade-level expectations. Similarly, the performance of school districts and school buildings has been evaluated based on the percentage of students who pass these tests. While providing some useful evaluative and student academic information, passage rates are incomplete . . . .”

Guiding Questions

1. **What do we want each student to learn?**
2. **How will we know when each student has learned it?**
3. **How will we respond when a student experiences difficulty in learning?**
4. **How will we deepen the learning for students who have already mastered essential knowledge and skill?**
Doing The Work
The Steps of Collaborative Inquiry

Resources

- Data Analysis for Continuous School Improvement
- Solving Professionalism and Professional Equity
- Data Wise
- The Data Coach's Guide to Improving Learning for All Students

Systems  Data  Practices  Building Capacity
Levels of Analysis

Aggregate Level
Disaggregate Level
Strand
Item
Student Work/Staff Voice

What happens at each level?

Look at Overall Outcomes

Draw critical comparisons between areas/groups

Collaboratively explore implications of those critical comparisons – “what area contributed to the outcome most?”

Determine which parts of the area contributed most and action plan. “What's in our control? Where can we make the biggest impact?”

Focus on student work and staff voice. What does actual student progress/success/struggle look like? What does that mean for our action plan? How do we know if we are getting the outcome we want?
Who’s ‘at the table’ at each level?

Administrators and District Staff

Collaborative Inquiry: Building Leadership Teams of Teacher Leaders, Administrators, Specialists

Grade Level Teams

Levels of Analysis: District Capacity Assessment (DCA)

Aggregate Level

Disaggregate Level

Strand

Item

Student Work
District Capacity Assessment: Aggregate “How Are We Doing?”

Levels of Analysis:
District Capacity Assessment (DCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/17/2015</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15/2016</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1/2017</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DCA: Disaggregated
“Where are the successes/areas for improvement?”
DCA: Strand
“What skill(s) contributed to the problem/success?”

Improvements: 3/26
No Change*: 9/26
Decreases: 7/26

*7 more items also had ‘no change’ from the highest possible score of 2, meaning there were 16/26 “No Change” total; however, these do not need immediate action due to their high score.

Show here is a Page Extract from the Item Subscale Report

Levels of Analysis:
District Capacity Assessment (DCA)
“Which skills are connected?”

“Which ones have the most weight?”

“Which can we address?”

Levels of Analysis:
District Capacity Assessment (DCA)
DCA: Staff Voice & Work
“What does this initiative mean in day-to-day life? What do teachers/administrators want to work on?”
TO: Reading School Committee
FROM: John F. Doherty, Ed.D.
    Superintendent of Schools
DATE: September 21, 2017
TOPIC: Special Education Presentation

At our meeting on Monday evening, Mrs. Wilson will update the School Committee on special education, the mid-cycle review as part of the Coordinated Program Review and a ruling from the Office of Civil Rights.

If you have any questions, please contact me.
July 6, 2017

John Doherty, Superintendent
Reading Public Schools
82 Oakland Road
Reading, MA 01867

Re: Mid-cycle Report

Dear Superintendent Doherty:

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education conducted a Mid-cycle Review in your district in April 2017. In this Mid-cycle Review the Department monitored selected special education criteria to determine your district’s compliance with special education laws and regulations. The review consisted of a district self-assessment and information gathered from one or more of the following activities: staff interviews, review of student records, examination of documentation, and/or observation of instructional spaces.

The Department found one or more of the criteria monitored in your district to be “Partially Implemented” or “Not Implemented.” In all instances where noncompliance has been found, the Department has prescribed corrective action for the district. This corrective action must be implemented as soon as possible, but in no case later than a year from the date of this report. You will find these requirements for corrective action included in the report, which is now available online at the Web-Based Monitoring System (WBMS) site, along with requirements for submitting progress reports.

Please upload into the WBMS by July 20, 2017, your written assurance that all of the required corrective action will be implemented by your district within the timelines specified in the report.

Your staff’s cooperation throughout this Mid-cycle Review is appreciated. If you have questions about this letter or need assistance with the Web-Based Monitoring System (WBMS), please do not hesitate to contact Erin VandeVeer at 781-338-3735.

Sincerely,

Erin VandeVeer, Mid-cycle Review Chairperson
Office of Public School Monitoring

Yam Rastogi-Kelly, Director
Office of Public School Monitoring

c: Jane Ewing, Supervisor, Office of Public School Monitoring
Jeanne Borawski, School Committee Chairperson, Reading Public Schools
Carolyn Wilson, Director of Student Services, Reading Public Schools
COORDINATED PROGRAM REVIEW
MID-CYCLE REPORT
District: Reading Public Schools
MCR Onsite Dates: 04/25/2017 - 04/26/2017
Program Area: Special Education
### SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Basis for Findings:</strong></th>
<th>A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that within forty-five (45) school working days after receipt of the parent’s written consent to an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation, the district does not consistently provide to the parent a proposed IEP and proposed placement when the student was found eligible for special education services. Specifically, interviews with administrative staff indicated that the proposed IEP is sometimes delayed awaiting principal signature.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Department Order of Corrective Action:** | Provide training to Team chairpersons, principals and other relevant staff to ensure that within forty-five (45) school working days after receipt of the parent’s written consent to an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation, the district determines whether the student is eligible for special education and provides to the parent either a proposed IEP and proposed placement or a written explanation of the finding of no eligibility. 

Develop an internal oversight and tracking system for ensuring that the district provides to the parents of eligible students a proposed IEP and proposed placement within 45 school working days after receipt of consent to an initial evaluation or a re-evaluation. The oversight system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure ongoing compliance.

Develop a report of the results of an internal review of student records, in which initial evaluations or re-evaluations were conducted subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, to ensure that provision of the proposed IEP and placement occurs within 45 school working days of receipt of written parental consent. |
|---|---|

*Please note when conducting internal monitoring the district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the Department upon request: a) list of the student names and grade levels for the records reviewed; b) date of the review; and c) name of person(s) who conducted the review, their role(s), and signature(s).*
SE Criterion # 9 - Timeline for determination of eligibility and provision of documentation to parent

**Required Elements of Progress Reports:**
Submit the evidence of training, including name of presenter, agenda, and attendance sheet with staff name, role and signature by **November 10, 2017**.

Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system by **November 10, 2017**.

Submit the results of the review of student records and include the following:
1. the number of records reviewed;
2. the number of records in compliance;
3. for any records not in compliance, determine the root cause; and
4. the specific corrective actions taken to remedy the non-compliance.

Please submit the above information by **February 9, 2018**.

**Progress Report Due Date(s):**

| 11/10/2017 | 02/09/2018 |

---

**SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content**

**Rating:**
Partially Implemented

**Basis for Findings:**
A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that progress reports are provided at least as often as parents are informed of the progress of non-disabled students and consistently address student progress towards IEP goals.

A review of student records and staff interviews demonstrated that when a student's eligibility terminates because the student has graduated from secondary school or exceeded the age of eligibility, the district does not consistently provide the student with a summary of his or her academic achievement and functional performance, including recommendations on how to assist the student in meeting his or her postsecondary goals.

**Department Order of Corrective Action:**
Develop procedures to ensure that when a student's eligibility terminates because the student has graduated from secondary school or exceeded the age of eligibility, the district provides the student with a summary of his or her academic achievement and functional performance, including recommendations on how to assist the student in meeting his or her postsecondary goals. Provide training to Team chairpersons on these procedures.

Develop an internal oversight and tracking system for ensuring that summaries of achievement and functional performance are provided to students who have graduated or exceeded the age of eligibility. The oversight system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure ongoing compliance.

Develop a report of the results of an internal review of student records, in which students have graduated or aged out subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, to ensure that summaries of academic achievement and functional performance are developed and provided to students.
**SE Criterion # 13 - Progress Reports and content**

*Please note when conducting internal monitoring the district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the Department upon request: a) list of the student names and grade levels for the records reviewed; b) date of the review; and c) name of person(s) who conducted the review, their role(s), and signature(s).*

**Required Elements of Progress Reports:**
Submit the evidence of training, including name of presenter, agenda, and attendance sheet with staff name, role and signature by **November 10, 2017**.

Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system by **November 10, 2017**.

Submit the results of the internal review of student records and include the following:
1. the number of records reviewed;
2. the number of records in compliance;
3. for any records not in compliance, determine the root cause; and
4. the specific corrective actions taken to remedy the non-compliance.

Please submit the above information by **May 11, 2018**.

**Progress Report Due Date(s):**

| 11/10/2017 | 05/11/2018 |

---

**SE Criterion # 14 - Review and revision of IEPs**

**Rating:**
Implemented

**Basis for Findings:**
A review of student records indicated that 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. Staff interviews indicated that IEP Teams consistently review and revise IEPs to address any lack of expected student progress towards the annual goals and in the general curriculum.

Record review and staff interviews also indicated that if the district and parent agree to make changes to a student's IEP between annual meetings, the Team is reconvened to amend the IEP. Parents are advised that they may request a complete copy of the amended IEP.
### SE Criterion # 18A - IEP development and content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Basis for Findings:**
A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that upon determining that the student is eligible for special education, IEP Teams develop the IEP, addressing all elements of the current IEP format provided by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

A review of student records, documents and staff interviews also indicated that IEP Teams specifically address the skills and proficiencies needed to avoid and respond to bullying, harassment, or teasing for students whose disability affects social skills development, when the student's disability makes him or her vulnerable to bullying, harassment or teasing, and for students identified with a disability on the autism spectrum. Record review indicated that IEP Teams document their considerations of the skills and proficiencies needed by students in the district's Notices of Proposed School District Action (N1s), as well as in the Present Levels of Educational Performance (PLEP) B and the Additional Information sections of the IEP.

### SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating:</th>
<th>Partially Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Basis for Findings:**
A review of student records indicated that IEP Teams develop the IEP prior to determining the appropriate placement to deliver the student's identified services and accommodations. Record review demonstrated that Teams consistently ensure that students are educated in the school she or he would attend if the student did not require special education, unless otherwise required by the IEP. Record review also demonstrated that placements are based on the IEP, including the types of related services, types of settings, types of service providers, and location where services are to be provided.

A review of student records and staff interviews also indicated that parents receive detailed summary notes at the conclusion of the IEP Team meeting, which include a completed IEP service delivery grid describing the types and amounts of special education and related services proposed by the district and a statement of the major goal areas associated with these services. Records demonstrated that although the district provides two copies of the proposed IEP and placement, they are not consistently sent to parents within two calendar weeks of the Team meeting.
**SE Criterion # 18B - Determination of placement; provision of IEP to parent**

**Department Order of Corrective Action:**
Develop procedures for ensuring the provision of the proposed IEP and placement to parents within two calendar weeks when a summary is provided at the conclusion of the IEP Team meeting or within 3-5 days if a summary is not provided at the conclusion of the meeting. Please see Memorandum on the Implementation of 603 CMR 28.05(7): Parent response to proposed IEP and proposed placement at [http://www.doe.mass.edu/news/news.aspx?id=3182](http://www.doe.mass.edu/news/news.aspx?id=3182) for guidance on implementing these requirements. Provide training to Team chairpersons, principals and other relevant staff on these procedures.

Develop an internal oversight and tracking system for ensuring that two copies of the proposed IEP and placement are provided to parents immediately following development at the IEP Team meeting. The oversight and tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure ongoing compliance.

Develop a report of the results of an internal review of student records, in which IEPs were developed subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, to ensure that IEPs are issued to parents immediately following development at the Team meeting.

*Please note when conducting internal monitoring the district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the Department upon request: a) list of the student names and grade levels for the records reviewed; b) date of the review; and c) name of person(s) who conducted the review, their role(s), and signature(s).*

**Required Elements of Progress Reports:**
Submit the evidence of training, including name of presenter, agenda, and attendance sheet with staff name, role and signature by **November 10, 2017**.

Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system by **November 10, 2017**.

Submit the results of the internal review of student records and include the following:
1. the number of records reviewed;
2. the number of records in compliance;
3. for any records not in compliance, determine the root cause; and
4. the specific corrective actions taken to remedy the non-compliance.

Please submit the above information by **February 9, 2018**.

**Progress Report Due Date(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>11/10/2017</th>
<th>02/09/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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SE Criterion # 20 - Least restrictive program selected

Rating:
Implemented

Basis for Findings:
A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that when a student is removed from the general education classroom, IEP Teams consistently state 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.

SE Criterion # 22 - IEP implementation and availability

Rating:
Partially Implemented

Basis for Findings:
A review of documents and staff interviews indicated that the district does not immediately inform parents in writing of delayed services, reasons for the delay, and actions that the district is taking to address the lack of space or personnel. Specifically, document review indicated that once the student has missed five (5) consecutive sessions or 12 sessions within a three-month period due to staff absence or lack of space, school personnel are instructed to notify the director of special education before contacting the parent regarding the missed services. The director then sends a notice and proposed compensatory service plan to the parents within three days.

A review of student records, documents and staff interviews also indicated that once parents are notified of the delay of services, the district offers a sole method, rather than alternative methods that convey the most benefit for the individual student to meet the goals on the accepted IEP.

Department Order of Corrective Action:
Revise the district's procedures to ensure that parents are immediately informed, in writing, of any delayed services, reasons for the delay, actions that the district is taking to address the lack of space or personnel, and offers alternative methods to meet the goals on the accepted IEP. Provide training to Team chairpersons, principals and other relevant staff on these procedures.

Develop an internal oversight and tracking system for ensuring that parents are immediately notified of a delay in IEP services, including reasons for delay, actions that the district is taking, and the alternative methods offered to meet the goals on the accepted IEP. The oversight and tracking system should include periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure ongoing compliance.

Develop a report of the results of an internal review of student records, in which delays of IEP service occurred subsequent to implementation of all corrective actions, to ensure that parents are immediately notified and offered alternative methods to meet the goals on the accepted IEP.

*Please note when conducting internal monitoring the district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the Department upon request: a) list of the student names and grade levels for the records reviewed; b) date of the review; and c) name of person(s) who conducted the review, their role(s), and signature(s).
SE Criterion # 22 - IEP implementation and availability

Required Elements of Progress Reports:
Submit the evidence of training, including name of presenter, agenda, and attendance sheet with staff name, role and signature by November 10, 2017.

Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system by November 10, 2017.

Submit the results of the internal review of student records and include the following:
1. the number of records reviewed;
2. the number of records in compliance;
3. for any records not in compliance, determine the root cause; and
4. the specific corrective actions taken to remedy the non-compliance.
Please submit the above information by February 9, 2018.

Progress Report Due Date(s):

| 11/10/2017 | 02/09/2018 |

SE Criterion # 26 - Parent participation in meetings

Rating: Implemented

Basis for Findings:
The district provided its special education student roster as requested by the Department.

SE Criterion # 37 - Procedures for approved and unapproved out-of-district placements

Rating: Partially Implemented

Basis for Findings:
A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the district does not consistently monitor the provision of services to and the programs of individual students placed in public and private out-of-district programs.

Department Order of Corrective Action:
Develop procedures to ensure that the district monitors the provision of services to and the programs of individual students placed in public and private out-of-district programs, and documentation of monitoring plans and all actual monitoring are placed in the files of every out-of-district student. Please see http://www.doe.mass.edu/specl/advisories/02_5.html for guidance on implementing these requirements. Provide training to relevant staff on these procedures.

For those students whose records were identified by the Department, complete the monitoring of each student’s provision of service and out-of-district programming and ensure the monitoring plans are documented in the students’ records.

Develop an internal oversight and tracking system to ensure that the district monitors all students in out-of-district placements and maintains documentation of monitoring activity within the student record. The tracking system should include oversight and periodic reviews by an administrator to ensure ongoing compliance.

Develop a report of the results of an internal review of student records, in which students are placed in public and private out-of-district placements subsequent to implementation of all
SE Criterion # 37 - Procedures for approved and unapproved out-of-district placements

corrective actions, to ensure that a monitoring plan and evidence of actual monitoring are documented in the student record.

*Please note when conducting internal monitoring the district must maintain the following documentation and make it available to the Department upon request: a) list of the student names and grade levels for the records reviewed; b) date of the review; and c) name of person(s) who conducted the review, their role(s), and signature(s).

**Required Elements of Progress Reports:**
Submit the evidence of training, including name of presenter, agenda, and attendance sheet with staff name, role and signature by November 10, 2017.

For those student records identified by the Department, submit a copy of each student's monitoring activities by November 10, 2017.

Submit a description of the internal oversight and tracking system by November 10, 2017.

Submit the results of the review of student records and include the following:
1. the number of records reviewed;
2. the number of records in compliance;
3. for any records not in compliance, determine the root cause; and
4. the specific corrective actions taken to remedy the non-compliance.

Please submit the above information by February 9, 2018.

**Progress Report Due Date(s):**

| 11/10/2017 | 02/09/2018 |
August 31, 2017

John F. Doherty
Superintendent
Reading Public Schools
82 Oakland Road, Reading, MA, 01867
Fall River, MA 02720

Re: Complaint Nos. 01-16-1234 & 01-16-1235
Reading Public Schools

Dear Superintendent Doherty:

The U.S. Department of Education (Department), Office for Civil Rights (OCR) has completed its investigation of the complaints we received on May 9, 2016 against the Reading Public Schools (the District). Complainant A and Complainant B alleged that the District discriminated against Student A and Student B, respectively, on the basis of disability. Specifically, the Complainants alleged that the District was discriminating against the students in the Bridge Program at the Joshua Eaton Elementary School (the School), including Student A and Student B, because the classroom space used by the Bridge Program students was not comparable to the classroom space used by students without disabilities (Allegation 1). In addition, the Complainants alleged that the District was discriminating against Student A and Student B by failing to implement their Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) with respect to certain provisions related to multi-sensory instruction (Allegation 2).

OCR enforces Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504) and its implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. Part 104, which prohibit discrimination on the basis of disability in programs and activities that receive Federal financial assistance from the Department. OCR also enforces Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Title II) and its implementing regulation at 28 C.F.R. Part 35, which prohibit discrimination against qualified individuals with disabilities by public entities, including public education systems and institutions, regardless of whether they receive Federal financial assistance from the Department. The District is a recipient of Federal financial assistance from the Department and is a public elementary and secondary education system. Therefore, OCR has jurisdictional authority to investigate these complaints under Section 504 and Title II.

---

1 As used herein, the complainant in Complaint No. 01-16-1234 is referred to as “Complainant A” and will be referred to as “Student A.” In addition, the complainant in Complaint No. 01-16-1235 is referred to as “Complainant B” and will be referred to as “Student B.”

The Department of Education’s mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

www.ed.gov
In reaching a determination, OCR reviewed documents and photographs provided by the Complainants and the District; interviewed the Complainants, District staff, and third parties; and conducted a site visit on November 2, 2016.

After carefully considering all of the information obtained during the investigation, OCR found sufficient evidence of a violation of Section 504 and Title II regarding Allegation 1 and certain aspects of Allegation 2, which the District agreed to resolve through the enclosed resolution agreement.

OCR’s findings and conclusions are discussed below.

**Allegation 1: The Classroom Spaces Used by the Bridge Program Students**

The School provides a substantially separate special education program called the Bridge Program. Students in the Bridge Program are qualified students with a disability who are afforded the protections of Section 504 and Title II. They receive multi-sensory instruction in reading, writing, and sometimes math in the Bridge Program for the majority of the school day; although they are provided science and social studies in their general education classes and they attend specials with their general education classes.

OCR learned that the structure of the Bridge Program Classes was substantially similar during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years. A teacher (the 2/3 Teacher) and a paraprofessional (the 2/3 Paraprofessional) taught Bridge Program students in second and third grade (the 2/3 Class); and a teacher (the 4/5 Teacher) and a paraprofessional (the 4/5 Paraprofessional) taught Bridge Program students in fourth and fifth grade (the 4/5 Class).2

During these academic years, both the 2/3 Class and the 4/5 Class shared their classroom spaces with Learning Centers (the 2/3 Learning Center and the 4/5 Learning Center, respectively). The Learning Centers provided pull-out instructional services, whereas the Bridge Program Classes provided a substantially separate special education program.

The District split the classroom space between the Bridge Program Classes and the Learning Centers using temporary, partial coverage partitions between the two programs that did not reach the ceiling and lacked doors. As a result of this partitioning, the 2/3 Class and the 4/5 Class did not have full use of the classrooms, but rather only had about two-thirds of the space, which could only be accessed by entering through the doors located at the Learning Centers’ sides of the classrooms. No general education classroom in the School shared space with another program, and none of the other Bridge Program classes in the District shared space with another program. The Complainants alleged that as a result of sharing space with the Learning Centers, the classroom spaces used by the Bridge Program Classes were smaller than general education classrooms; were noisy; and lacked doors, direct means of ingress and egress to a hallway, and privacy.

---

2 As used herein, the 2/3 Class and the 4/5 Class are referred to collectively as the “Bridge Program Classes.”
Legal Standards

The Section 504 regulation, at 34 C.F.R. § 104.4, and the Title II regulation, at 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(a), provide that no qualified individual with a disability shall be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or otherwise subjected to discrimination under the District’s programs or activities on the basis of disability.

When investigating an allegation of different treatment, OCR first determines whether there is sufficient evidence to establish an initial, or prima facie, case of discrimination. Specifically, OCR determines whether the District treated the students in the Bridge Program less favorably than similarly situated individuals without disabilities. If so, OCR then determines whether the District had a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for the different treatment. Finally, OCR determines whether the reason given by the District is a pretext, or excuse, for unlawful discrimination.

In addition, the Section 504 regulation, at 34 C.F.R. § 104.34(c), requires that the District ensure that facilities for students with disabilities are comparable to the school district’s other facilities.

Analysis

OCR’s investigation sought to determine whether the beneficial and negative features of the classroom spaces used by the special education Bridge Program Classes on the whole made the spaces inferior or not comparable to those of the general education classrooms in the School, thereby resulting in different treatment of students with disabilities. OCR’s investigation also sought to determine whether the District articulated a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for any such different treatment.

A. Classroom Size

The 2/3 Class and the 4/5 Class had fewer students than the general education classes at the School. The square footage of the space used by the 2/3 Class and by the 4/5 Class was comparable to the square footage of the space used by the general education classes at the School when averaged by the number of students in the classes.¹ However, classroom size alone is not determinative of whether the space used by the Bridge Program Classes was inferior to that of the general education classrooms in the School.

B. Access to the Hallway

Students in the Bridge Program Classes needed to walk through the Learning Centers to access the hallway several times a day, e.g., when the Bridge Program students went to their general education classes, lunch, specials, the bathroom, and the nurse.

For the 2/3 Class, OCR learned based on photographs and interviews with the 2/3 Teacher, the Complainants, and third parties that the single means of access to the hallway was on the 2/3

¹ OCR notes that the only rooms smaller than the 2/3 Class and the 4/5 Class were rooms used for pull-out instruction and support services, including the Learning Centers, the psychology room, and the speech room.
Learning Center side of the classroom. In addition, OCR learned that there was a gap in the middle partial room dividers between the 2/3 Class and the 2/3 Learning Center that was used as a makeshift doorway. As a result, students in the 2/3 Class had to walk past the students in the 2/3 Learning Center to access their side of the classroom and to access the hallway.

For the 4/5 Class, OCR learned based on photographs and interviews with third parties that the single means of access to the hallway was on the 4/5 Learning Center side of the classroom. In addition, OCR learned that there was a gap in the partial room divider between the 4/5 Class and the 4/5 Learning Center in the front of the classroom. As a result, students in the 4/5 Class had to cross the 4/5 Learning Center to access their side of the classroom and to access the hallway. The exception to this was during the 2014-2015 academic year, when the 4/5 Class shared an additional door that led directly into the fourth grade students’ general education classroom.

No general education classrooms in the school were set up in this manner – with students required to walk through other classrooms to enter or exit their own classroom spaces. In addition, the lack of direct access to the hallway was exacerbated in the Bridge Program Classes because the Bridge Program students were frequently entering and exiting their classroom spaces as they transitioned to class time with their general education classes, lunch, the nurse, and the bathroom. As a result, the lack of direct access to the hallway was a negative feature of the Bridge Program classroom space.

C. Classroom Noise

There was no door or full wall separating the Bridge Program Classes from the Learning Centers. Rather, the District used partial wall room dividers that did not reach the ceiling and had no doors. As a result, noise travelled between the two programs, although the level of noise is disputed between the District and the Complainants.

For the 2/3 Class, the 2/3 Teacher explained in an interview with OCR that approximately once a week or less the 2/3 Class would ask the 2/3 Learning Center to quiet down, or vice versa. However, both Student A and Student B mentioned to the Complainants that they could hear teachers and students talking in the 2/3 Learning Center on multiple occasions. Both Complainants alleged that this noise was distracting and this distraction was exacerbated by Student A and Student B’s processing disabilities.

For the 4/5 Class, OCR learned from an interview with a third party that during the 2014-2015 academic year an educational specialist recommended and the District purchased “soundproof” dividers for the 4/5 Class to provide some additional separation between the 4/5 Class and the 4/5 Learning Center. However, since these dividers did not reach the ceiling, they were not effective in soundproofing. As a result, the third-party interviewee explained, the 4/5 Teacher and the teachers in the 4/5 Learning Center worked with each other to manage the noise levels. In addition, the third-party interviewee explained that the noise level was more of an issue during the 2015-2016 academic year because there were more students in both the 4/5 Class and in the 4/5 Learning Center.
OCR recognizes that students may overhear other classes throughout the school day. However, the likelihood that the Bridge Program students would overhear the Learning Center students and teachers was augmented by the classroom structure: the Bridge Program Classes lacked both a door and a full wall or other barrier to effectively separate their space from the space used by the Learning Centers. In addition, while some level of background noise may be easily tolerated by students and adults without certain disabilities, the Bridge Program students' processing disabilities made it more difficult for these students to process their learning materials with the additional classroom noise from the Learning Centers. In sum, the noise inherent when two educational programs involving small children with disabilities share their classroom space was a negative feature of the Bridge Program classroom space.

D. Privacy

As a result of sharing space with the Learning Centers and because there was no door separating the Bridge Program Classes from the Learning Centers, the Complainants were concerned that students in the Learning Center knew which students received services in the Bridge Program, and vice versa, and would therefore know which students had difficulty reading or doing math. Specifically, Complainant A explained that was concerned about bullying because Student A was told by a group of students that was "stupid" when other students saw in the Bridge Program Class. In addition, Complainant B explained that was concerned that students in the Learning Center could see how Student B was performing in the Bridge Program Class and be able to determine special needs.

This issue appears to have been more acute in the 2/3 Class because, as the 2/3 Teacher explained, students would sometimes sit in the open space between the partial wall partitions dividing the 2/3 Class from the 2/3 Learning Center when the 2/3 Class was using the SmartBoard. OCR learned from an interview with a third party that, in contrast, the 4/5 Class had its desks and tables set up on the opposite side of the 4/5 Learning Center.

OCR recognizes that students may be aware of who receives special education services. However, this awareness was heightened by the fact that the Bridge Program classroom spaces lacked their own doors and full walls separating them from the Learning Centers and students in the Bridge Program Classes had to walk through the Learning Centers to enter and exit their classroom space. As a result, the classroom structure was a negative feature of the Bridge Program classroom space which compromised the privacy of the Bridge Program students.

E. Conclusions Regarding the Classroom Space Used by the Bridge Program Students

OCR found that students in the Bridge Program Classes were more likely than not adversely impacted by their shared classroom set-up. In terms of square footage, the Bridge Program portion of the shared classroom space was somewhat comparable to that of other classrooms in the school, after taking into account the class sizes of the Bridge Program Classes. However, the space used by Bridge Program students was inferior to other classrooms in that it lacked direct access to the hallway, lacked a door, was noisy, and lacked privacy. As a result, the District treated the Bridge Program students differently than other students at the School.
The District failed to articulate a legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for this different treatment. The District explained that the classrooms shared by the Bridge Program Classes and the Learning Centers were set up with the hallway door on the side of the Learning Centers because the students in the Learning Centers were coming and going more frequently. In addition, the District explained that classroom space at the School was at a premium, as evidenced by the District’s use of modular classrooms for kindergarten classes. However, OCR found that no other class in the School shared space with another class. Further, none of the other Bridge Program classes in the District shared space with another class. Thus, no other students in the District had to go through other classes to reach their own, or be subjected to the greater potential for noise and its attendant distractions, or diminished privacy, because of their classroom set-up. As a result, OCR has determined that in combining the Bridge Program Classes with the Learning Centers, the District treated the Bridge Program students differently during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years.

During the course of the investigation, the District provided evidence that as of the start of the 2016-2017 academic year, the Bridge Program Classes no longer shared space with the Learning Centers, but had their own classroom spaces. As a result, the different treatment described above was independently resolved as of that point in time. However, the District was still obligated to remedy any harm incurred by the Bridge Program Students during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years as a result of sharing classroom space with the Learning Centers. The Resolution Agreement includes provisions to remedy such harm.

**Allegation 2(a): The Implementation of Student A’s IEPs**

Student A has a specific learning disorder in the areas of reading and math (dyslexia and dyscalculia), ADHD, and generalized anxiety disorder. As a result, Student A is a qualified student with a disability who is afforded the protections provided under Section 504 and Title II.

Student A had several IEPs in effect during the 2015-2016 academic year, and Student A’s IEP was amended before he started as a student the 2/3 Class in fall 2016. As a result, OCR analyzed:

- Student A’s IEP dated April 14, 2015 to April 13, 2016, as amended in June 2015 (June 2015 Amendment), in November 2015 (November 2015 Amendment), and in January 2016 (January 2016 Amendment).\(^4\)

- Student A’s IEP dated March 31, 2016 to March 31, 2017 (Student A’s 2016 IEP), which went into effect after the District received Complainant A’s partial rejection of this IEP on June 14, 2016.

---

\(^4\) Student A’s June 2015 Amendment was signed by Student A’s parents on July 12, 2015 and was effective until December 9, 2015. Student A’s November 2015 Amendment was signed by Student A’s parents on December 6, 2015, was received by the District on December 9, 2015, and was effective until January 26, 2016. Student A’s January 2016 Amendment was signed by Student A’s parents on January 25, 2016, was received by the District on January 26, 2016, and was effective until June 14, 2016.
Complainant A alleged that Student A’s IEPs were not fully implemented with respect to certain provisions that required multi-sensory instruction, structured reading, a quiet and non-distracting learning environment, and movement breaks. As a result of the District’s failure to implement these provisions of Student A’s IEPs, Complainant A alleged that Student A’s learning and socio-emotional welfare were negatively affected, as evidenced by limited growth in reading and increase in classroom anxiety.

Legal Standards

The Section 504 regulation, at 34 C.F.R. § 104.33, requires school districts to provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to students with disabilities. An appropriate education is regular or special education and related aids and services that are designed to meet the individual educational needs of students with disabilities as adequately as the needs of students without disabilities are met and that are developed in compliance with Section 504’s procedural requirements. Implementation of an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is one means of meeting this standard. OCR interprets the Title II regulation, at 28 C.F.R. §§ 35.103(a) and 35.130(b)(1)(ii) and (iii), to require school districts to provide a FAPE to the same extent required under the Section 504 regulation.

Analysis

A. Multi-Sensory Instruction

Student A’s IEPs in effect during the 2015-2016 academic year required the District to provide multi-sensory instruction to Student A in a small group. The 2/3 Teacher explained in interviews with OCR that multi-sensory instruction aims to engage at least two senses at the same time. The 2/3 Teacher explained that she implemented multi-sensory instruction in the 2/3 Class through the Wilson Reading Program (Wilson), Fluency, Lexia Reading Core 5 (Lexia), Framing Your Thoughts, Applied Writing, and Sentence Construction programs. The 2/3 Teacher also explained that she is Level 2-certified in Wilson.

Complainant A asserted that the multi-sensory instruction that Student A received only required to move items around at a table or move sections of a paragraph at a table. Complainant A was concerned that Student A was not engaging in gross motor learning, which can include activities such as bouncing a ball towards sight words on the wall.

The 2/3 Teacher demonstrated the multi-sensory techniques she used in the classroom that involved gross motor learning, including having students trace letters or words in the air or on the wall while sounding them out (a technique known as skywriting), play a card game requiring students to determine the number of sounds in each word, diagram sentences using hand motions.

---

5 Student A’s June 2015 Amendment required “[m]ultisensory, systematic, explicit reading instruction (encoding, decoding, fluency and comprehension).” Student A’s November 2015 Amendment and 2016 IEP required specially designed instruction delivered through an “[e]vidence-based, multi-sensory, systematic, explicit, cumulative structured reading instruction (encoding, decoding, fluency and comprehension) by a certified teacher qualified to teach the program.”
for different parts of speech, and place sentences in a bucket to form a paragraph relating to the key point of the paragraph.

The 2/3 Teacher also reviewed a Wilson lesson plan with OCR and provided examples of instructional techniques that she used in the 2/3 Class. For example, 2/3 Teacher would use magnetic board and magnetic letter tiles and would have students (1) sound out the letters or letter groupings when the 2/3 Teacher pointed to the magnets; (2) count the sounds in a word and tap on the magnetic letter tiles; and (3) spell using the magnetic letter tiles. The 2/3 Teacher also used a magnetic sketch board and would have students say a word, write it on the sketch board, and trace over each letter of the word to erase it. Students would also sort words into categories, highlight sight words in a binder, read words off of flash cards, and trace their fingers over large printed text or stiff needlepoint. The 2/3 Teacher explained that Wilson provides instructional techniques and she was “pretty strict in following the Wilson lesson plan,” but that teachers have discretion on how they implement Wilson.

While OCR understands Complainant A’s concerns that the classroom set-up may have limited the 2/3 Teacher’s ability to implement her multi-sensory instruction techniques given that the 2/3 Class shared classroom space with the 2/3 Learning Center, OCR found insufficient evidence to suggest that the District failed to implement the multi-sensory instruction provisions of Student A’s IEPs.

**B. Structured Reading Services**

Student A’s IEPs in effect during the 2015-2016 academic year required structured reading services provided by a special education teacher four times during a 5-day cycle for 60 minutes (240 minutes of reading per cycle).

The 2/3 Teacher explained that she implemented structured reading through Wilson, Fluency, Lexia, and Word Work. Word Work and Lexia are activities that students execute independently. The District provided four classroom schedules for the 2/3 Teacher that were in effect during the 2015-2016 academic year: (1) a schedule from September through October 2015 (September Schedule); (2) a schedule from October 14 through December 2015 (October Schedule); (3) a schedule from January through March 2016 (January Schedule); and (4) a schedule from March through June 2016 (March Schedule). The District also provided three classroom schedules for the 2/3 Paraprofessional that corresponded to the September Schedule, the January Schedule, and the March Schedule. The District explained that it did not have a schedule for the 2/3 Paraprofessional that corresponded to the October Schedule and that it believes it was deleted by mistake during the 2015-2016 academic year.

Based on the September Schedule, Student A received structured reading through Wilson and Word Work with the 2/3 teacher approximately nine times during a 5-day cycle for 30 minutes (270 minutes of structured reading per weekly cycle). Student A also received structured reading through Lexia and Fluency with the 2/3 Paraprofessional. As a result, OCR determined that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the District failed to implement the structured reading provision in Student A’s IEP from the start of the 2015-2016 academic year through the end of the September Schedule on October 13, 2015.
However, OCR found that as of October 14, 2015, and for the remainder of the academic year, the structured reading services in Student A’s IEPs were not fully implemented. Based on the October Schedule, January Schedule, and March Schedule, Student A received structured reading through Wilson with the 2/3 Teacher five times during a 5-day cycle for 30 minutes (150 minutes of Wilson per weekly cycle, or 62.5% of the structured reading required by IEPs).

OCR acknowledges that the schedules showed that Student A received Fluency with the 2/3 Paraprofessional and that the 2/3 Teacher explained that the 2/3 Paraprofessional oversees students’ independent Lexia and Word Work. However, Student A’s IEPs specifically stated that structured reading services were to be provided by a special education teacher. Therefore, it is not sufficient that the 2/3 Paraprofessional provided Fluency and supervised Student A’s Lexia and Word Work.

The District did not take steps to ensure that it faithfully implemented the structured reading services in Student A’s IEPs after the implementation of the October Schedule on October 14, 2015. To fully implement Student A’s IEPs, the 2/3 Teacher should have provided Student A with 90 additional minutes of structured reading each 5-day cycle starting on October 14, 2015. As a result, the District failed to implement the structured reading provisions of Student A’s IEPs from October 14, 2015 through the end of the 2015-2016 academic year.

C. Quiet and Non-Disturbing Learning Environment

During the 2015-2016 academic year, Student A’s IEPs included an accommodation that “[Student A] should be seated in the most distraction-free location in the classroom when possible.” Complainant A asserted that while this accommodation was implemented in the general education classroom, it would have been difficult to implement in the 2/3 Class because the 2/3 Class shared classroom space with the 2/3 Learning Center and was noisy. Complainant A also asserted that the 2/3 Class did not have access to noise-cancelling headphones, despite an accommodation in Student A’s 2016 IEP that required that Student A have access to such headphones.

With respect to noise-cancelling headphones, the 2/3 Teacher explained that the 2/3 Class borrowed noise-cancelling headphones from the 4/5 Class until the 2/3 Class received additional headphones for their own use. As a result, OCR found insufficient evidence to suggest that the District failed to implement the provisions of Student A’s 2016 IEP related to access to noise-cancelling headphones.

With respect to seating Student A in the most distraction-free location when possible, the 2/3 Teacher explained that if a student was distracted, she would pull them back in, redirect them, and ask that they repeat the directions she had just provided. The 2/3 Teacher also explained that the 2/3 Class had privacy shields that students could use to separate their work space off from other students and minimize distractions. However, as described above, noise travelled between the 2/3 Class and the 2/3 Learning Center because there was no door or full wall separating the 2/3 Class from the 2/3 Learning Center. While the level of noise is disputed between the District and Complainant A, OCR notes that the 2/3 Teacher explained that approximately once a week
or less, the Bridge Program Class would ask the Learning Center to quiet down, or vice versa. While OCR recognizes that students may overhear other classes throughout the school day, the unique structure of the 2/3 Class supports a finding that the District more likely than not failed to fully implement the provisions of Student A’s IEPs related to providing a non-distracting learning environment because the 2/3 Class’s shared classroom space was, on the whole, more distracting than if the 2/3 Class had had its own classroom space.

D. Movement Breaks

During the 2015-2016 academic year, Student A’s IEPs required that Student A should have movement breaks built into [redacted] school day. Student A’s 2016 IEP also provided an accommodation that “[Student A] may benefit from a nonverbal color-coded card system for structured breaks if [redacted] is not engaged in a structured instructional time.” Complainant A stated that Student A’s therapist believed that the Student was not getting enough movement breaks, which caused Student A’s anxiety to escalate. Complainant A also explained that the color-coded card system was not implemented after Student A’s 2016 IEP went into effect in June 2016.

The 2/3 Teacher explained that movement breaks were built into the instructional day as students moved between lessons and small groups in the 2/3 Class and as students moved from the 2/3 Class to their general education classes, specials, and lunch. While the 2/3 Teacher explained that she did not specifically schedule additional movement breaks for the students, she permitted movement breaks when a student asked, or when she observed that a student needed a break.

The 2/3 Teacher estimated that Student A took three to four movement breaks per day during the 2015-2016 academic year, in addition to the built-in movement breaks discussed above. During these three to four movement breaks, Student A would walk around or go to the nurse. The 2/3 Teacher also explained that Student A had not needed the nonverbal color-coded card system for structured breaks that was suggested, but not required, by Student A’s 2016 IEP.

As a result, OCR found insufficient evidence to suggest that the District failed to implement the provisions of Student A’s IEPs related to movement breaks.

E. Conclusions Regarding the Implementation of Student A’s IEP

In conclusion, OCR found it more likely than not that the District failed to properly implement the following provisions: (1) in Student A’s IEPs, the provisions that required a total of 240 minutes of structured reading per five-day cycle with a special education teacher from October 14, 2015 through the end of the 2015-2016 academic year; and (2) in Student A’s IEPs, the provisions that explained that Student A “should be seated in the most distraction-free location in the classroom when possible” for the entirety of the 2015-2016 academic year.

As a result of these instances where the District failed to implement Student A’s IEPs during the 2015-2016 academic year, OCR determined that it was more likely than not that Student A’s progress was negatively affected. Therefore, OCR found that the District’s failure to implement these aspects of Student A’s IEPs rose to the level of a denial of FAPE. The Resolution
Agreement includes provisions to remedy the harm suffered by Student A as a result of this denial of FAPE.

**Allegation 2(b): The Implementation of Student B’s IEPs**

Student B has a specific learning disability in the areas of reading, writing (dyslexia), and math, ADHD, and generalized anxiety disorder. As a result, Student B is a qualified student with a disability who is afforded the protections provided under Section 504 and Title II.

Student B had two IEPs in effect during the 2015-2016 academic year after [joined the 2/3 Class in January 2016. As a result, OCR analyzed:

- Student B’s IEP dated January 15, 2015 to January 14, 2016 (Student B’s 2015 IEP), which went into effect when the Complainant signed Student B’s 2015 IEP and was not modified after Student B joined the 2/3 Class.

- Student B’s IEP dated January 27, 2016 to January 27, 2017 (Student B’s 2016 IEP), which went into effect after the District received Complainant B’s partial rejection of this IEP on May 24, 2016.

Complainant B alleged that Student B’s IEPs were not fully implemented with respect to certain provisions that required multi-sensory instruction, structured reading, a quiet and non-distracting learning environment, a variety of work locations and positions, and movement breaks. As a result of the District’s failure to implement these provisions of Student B’s IEPs, Complainant B alleged Student B’s learning was affected, as demonstrated by the results of neuropsychological testing which revealed that Student B had only made four months’ worth of progress from spring 2015 through spring 2017.

**Legal Standards**

The Section 504 regulation, at 34 C.F.R. § 104.33, requires school districts to provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to students with disabilities. An appropriate education is regular or special education and related aids and services that are designed to meet the individual educational needs of students with disabilities as adequately as the needs of students without disabilities are met and that are developed in compliance with Section 504’s procedural requirements. Implementation of an Individualized Education Program (IEP) developed in accordance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is one means of meeting this standard. OCR interprets the Title II regulation, at 28 C.F.R. §§ 35.103(a) and 35.130(b)(1)(ii) and (iii), to require school districts to provide a FAPE to the same extent required under the Section 504 regulation.
Analysis

A. Multi-Sensory Instruction

Student B’s IEPs in effect during the 2015-2016 academic year required the District to provide multi-sensory instruction to Student B in a small group. Complainant B asserted that did not see any evidence of multi-sensory instruction as described in Student B’s IEPs, but rather saw Student B doing Lexia on the iPad and sitting with the 2/3 Teacher reviewing flash cards.

The 2/3 Teacher explained in interviews with OCR that she implemented multi-sensory instruction in the 2/3 Class through the Wilson Reading Program (Wilson), Fluency, Lexia Reading Core 5 (Lexia), Framing Your Thoughts, Applied Writing, and Sentence Construction programs. The 2/3 Teacher also explained that she is Level 2-certified in Wilson.

The 2/3 Teacher explained that multi-sensory instruction is designed for students to engage at least two senses at the same time. The 2/3 Teacher noted that the provisions in Student B’s 2015 IEP related to Student B receiving multi-sensory instruction “utilizing one sense at a time” may have been a typo, but she added that in using a multi-sensory approach she would start by engaging one sense (i.e., seeing a letter on a magnetic board) and then add a second sense (i.e., hearing how the letter is sounded out).

The 2/3 Teacher demonstrated the multi-sensory techniques she used in the classroom that involved gross motor learning, including having students trace letters or words in the air or on the wall while sounding them out (a technique known as skywriting), play a card game that requiring students to determine the number of sounds in each word, diagram sentences using hand motions for different parts of speech, and place sentences in a bucket to form a paragraph relating to the key point of the paragraph.

The 2/3 Teacher also reviewed a Wilson lesson plan with OCR and provided examples of instructional techniques that she used in the 2/3 Class. For example, 2/3 Teacher would use magnetic board and magnetic letter tiles and would have students (1) sound out the letters or letter groupings when the 2/3 Teacher pointed to the magnets; (2) count the sounds in a word and tap on the magnetic letter tiles; and (3) spell using the magnetic letter tiles. The 2/3 Teacher also used a magnetic sketch board and would have students say a word, write it on the sketch board, and trace over each letter of the word to erase it. Students would also sort words into categories, highlight sight words in a binder, read words off of flash cards, and trace their fingers over large printed text or stiff needlepoint. The 2/3 Teacher explained that Wilson provides instructional techniques and she was “pretty strict in following the Wilson lesson plan,” but that teachers have discretion on how they implement Wilson.

---

6 Student B’s 2015 IEP required an accommodation that “tasks [should be presented] in a multi-sensory format (i.e., 3-D letters, segmentation sliders, moving body to act out sight words while spelling them) when possible to promote [Student B’s] focus, however present information to one sense at a time (i.e. [v]erbal, then visual (pictures, objects, manipulatives)[)]) and [r]epeated practice targeting individual senses.” Student B’s 2015 IEP also included a related specially designed instruction provision of “multi-sensory repeated practice presented utilizing one sense at a time.” Student B’s 2016 IEP required the following specially designed instruction: “Small group multi-sensory targeted reading instruction.”
While OCR understands Complainant B’s concerns that the classroom set-up may have limited the 2/3 Teacher’s ability to implement her multi-sensory instruction techniques given that the 2/3 Class shared classroom space with the 2/3 Learning Center, OCR found insufficient evidence to suggest that the District failed to implement the multi-sensory instruction provisions of Student B’s IEPs.

B. Lexia During the School Day

Student B’s 2015 IEP included the requirement that “**Lexia will not be used during school**.” However, the 2/3 Teacher explained to OCR that students in the 2/3 Class, including Student B, used Lexia on the classroom iPads. Based on the classroom schedules and student-specific schedules that the District provided to OCR, Student B received approximately 45 to 195 minutes of Lexia per week.

The 2/3 Teacher explained to OCR that she had told Complainant B about the various instructional techniques the Bridge Program used, including Lexia. Complainant B could not recall whether this conversation occurred, but explained that the prohibition on Lexia was put into Student B’s 2015 IEP because Student B was already using Lexia at home, as a supplement to the classroom instruction that Student B was to receive from teachers and paraprofessionals.

OCR notes that the District did not revise Student B’s 2015 IEP to remove this prohibition on Lexia use during school when Student B joined the 2/3 Class in January 2016. Thus, Student B had an IEP in effect through May 2016 that prohibited the District from using Lexia during the school day, but the District provided Lexia on an iPad in lieu of small-group reading instruction involving interaction with the 2/3 Teacher or the 2/3 Paraprofessional. As a result, the District failed to properly implement Student B’s 2015 IEP, which required that “Lexia will not be used during school.”

C. Reading and Structured Reading Services

The 2/3 Teacher explained that she implemented structured reading through Wilson, Fluency, Lexia, and Word Work. Word Work and Lexia are activities that students do independently. The District provided classroom schedules for the 2/3 Teacher that were in effect while Student B was a member of the 2/3 Class: (1) a schedule from January through March 2016 (January Schedule); and (2) a schedule from March through June 2016 (March Schedule). The District also provided classroom schedules for the 2/3 Paraprofessional that corresponded to the January Schedule and the March Schedule.

a. Reading Services in Student B’s 2015 IEP

Student B’s 2015 IEP, which was in effect from when Student B joined the 2/3 Class until May 24, 2016, required reading services provided by a special education teacher or paraprofessional three times during a 5-day cycle for 30 minutes (90 minutes of reading per cycle). Based on the January Schedule and the March Schedule, Student B received reading instruction in Wilson with the 2/3 Teacher five times during a 5-day cycle for 30 minutes (150 minutes of Wilson per
weekly cycle). Student B also received reading instruction through Lexia, Fluency, and Word Work with the 2/3 Paraprofessional.

The District also provided specific schedules for Student B: (1) a schedule dated February 3, 2016; (2) a schedule dated March 15, 2016; and (3) an undated schedule. OCR reviewed these schedules and noted that Student B’s February 3, 2016 schedule and Student B’s undated schedule were substantially similar and appeared to correspond to the January Schedule; and Student B’s March 15, 2016 schedule appeared to correspond to the March Schedule. While there were some minor discrepancies between the specific schedules for Student B with respect to the January Schedule and March Schedule, these discrepancies did not impact OCR’s conclusion regarding the implementation of the reading provisions of Student B’s 2015 IEP.

As a result, OCR determined that there was insufficient evidence to suggest that the District failed to implement the reading provisions in Student B’s 2015 IEP from January 2016 until May 24, 2016.

b. Structured Reading Services in Student B’s 2016 IEP

Student B’s 2016 IEP, which was in effect from May 25, 2016 until the end of the 2015-2016 academic year, required structured reading services provided by a special education teacher five times during the week for 60 minutes (300 minutes per week). The March Schedule that the District provided is the relevant schedule for the time period that Student B’s 2016 IEP was in effect, as the District could not locate any schedule that was created after Student B’s 2016 IEP went into effect on May 24, 2016.

Under the March Schedule, Student B received structured reading through Wilson with the 2/3 Teacher five times during the week for 30 minutes (150 minutes of Wilson per week, or 50% of the structured reading required by 2016 IEP). Student B also received structured reading through Lexia, Fluency, and Word Work with the 2/3 Paraprofessional.

OCR also considered Student B’s March 15, 2016 schedule, which showed that Student B received structured reading through Wilson with the 2/3 Teacher five times during a week for 30 minutes and an additional two hours of Fluency, Lexia, and Word Work with either the 2/3 Teacher or the 2/3 Paraprofessional. In total, this would be 270 minutes of structured reading per week, or 90% of the structured reading required by his 2016 IEP, assuming that the 2/3 Teacher provided Student B these additional two hours of services. This seems unlikely when one compares Student B’s March 15, 2016 schedule to the March Schedule because the 2/3 Teacher was teaching Wilson and math during these periods. It is more likely that the 2/3 Paraprofessional provided these services, as she was teaching Word Work, Lexia, and Fluency to other students during these periods.

Because the District provided OCR with conflicting schedules for this period of time (the March Schedule for the 2/3 Teacher and the 2/3 Paraprofessional as compared to Student B’s March 15, 2016 schedule) and because the District could not locate Student B’s specific schedules for April, May, or June 2016, OCR cannot confirm with certainty which schedule accurately reflects
the structured reading services provided to Student B and who provided those services to the Student.

OCR acknowledges that the March Schedule and Student B’s March 15, 2016 schedule showed that Student B received Fluency, Lexia and Word Work with the 2/3 Paraprofessional and that the 2/3 Teacher explained that the 2/3 Paraprofessional oversees students’ independent Lexia and Word Work. However, Student B’s 2016 IEP specifically states that she is to receive structured reading services from a special education teacher. OCR notes that during the 2015-2016 academic year, other students in the 2/3 Class received structured reading in Fluency, Lexia and Word Work with the 2/3 Teacher. As a result, it is not sufficient that the 2/3 Paraprofessional provided Fluency and supervised Student B’s Lexia and Word Work. Rather, to fully implement Student B’s 2016 IEP, the 2/3 Teacher should have provided Student B with between 30 to 150 additional minutes of structured reading each week as of May 25, 2016. As a result, the District failed to implement the structured reading provisions of Student B’s 2016 IEP from May 25, 2016 through the end of the 2015-2016 academic year.

D. Quiet and Non-Disturbing Learning Environment

Student B’s IEPs included the following accommodations related to her need for a quiet and non-distracting learning environment: “Decrease environmental and visual distractions, when possible” and “use of a privacy shield” or private work spaces. Student B’s 2016 IEP included an additional accommodation that she should have access to noise-cancelling headphones. Complainant B asserted that the constant flow of students entering and exiting the 2/3 Learning Center, was distracting and adversely affected Student B’s ability to focus and process information. Complainant B further asserted that Student B had not mentioned that she had access to privacy shields in the 2/3 Class.

With respect to noise-cancelling headphones and privacy shields, the 2/3 Teacher explained that the 2/3 Class borrowed noise-cancelling headphones from the 4/5 Class until the 2/3 Class received additional headphones for their own use and that the 2/3 Class had used privacy shields. As a result, OCR found insufficient evidence to suggest that the District failed to implement the provisions of Student B’s IEPs related to access to noise-cancelling headphones and privacy shields.

With respect to decreasing environmental and visual distractions when possible, the 2/3 Teacher explained that if a student was distracted, she would pull them back in, redirect them, and ask that they repeat the directions she had just provided. The 2/3 Teacher also explained that the 2/3 Class had privacy shields that students could use to separate their work space off from other students and minimize distractions. However, as described above, noise travelled between the 2/3 Class and the 2/3 Learning Center because there was no door or full wall separating the 2/3 Class from the 2/3 Learning Center. While the level of noise is disputed between the District and Complainant B, OCR notes that the 2/3 Teacher explained that approximately once a week or less, the Bridge Program Class would ask the Learning Center to quiet down, or vice versa. While OCR recognizes that students may overhear other classes throughout the school day, the unique structure of the 2/3 Class supports a finding that the District more likely than not failed to fully implement the provisions of Student B’s IEPs related to providing a non-distracting
learning environment because the 2/3 Class’s shared classroom space was, on the whole, more
distracting than if the 2/3 Class had had its own classroom space.

E. Work Locations and Positions

Student B’s IEPs included provisions to allow for a variety of work locations and positions.\textsuperscript{7} Complainant B alleged that because the 2/3 Class shared space with the 2/3 Learning Center, there was not enough room for alternative work locations. Complainant B also asserted that never observed seat cushions or bean bag chairs in the classroom.

The 2/3 Teacher explained that Student B rarely sat on the floor, but would sometimes stand or kneel on chair. The 2/3 Teacher also explained that students in the 2/3 Class, including Student B, had the option of using seat cushions that the 2/3 Class received at the end of the 2015-2016 academic year to sit more comfortably on the floor. As a result, OCR found that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the District failed to implement the provisions in Student B’s IEPs related to allowing to use a variety of work locations and/or positions.

F. Movement Breaks

Student B’s IEPs included movement breaks as an accommodation. Complainant B explained that at the end of the 2015-2016 academic year, Student B was wandering during the school day, which suggested that Student B was not receiving sufficient movement breaks.

The 2/3 Teacher explained that movement breaks were built into the instructional day as students moved between lessons and small groups in the 2/3 Class and as students moved from the 2/3 Class to their general education classes, specials, and lunch. While the 2/3 Teacher explained that she did not specifically schedule additional movement breaks for the students, she permitted movement breaks when a student asked, or when she observed that a student needed a break.

The 2/3 Teacher explained that, in addition to the built-in movement breaks discussed above, Student B’s visits to the bathroom provided movement breaks. The 2/3 Teacher noted that she discussed with Student B the appropriate time to ask for movement breaks and how to advocate for when needed a break. Further, the 2/3 Teacher noted that Student B would wander during lunch and would wander between 2/3 Class and general education class. The 2/3 Teacher explained that when this occurred, she would redirect Student B and maintain open communication with general education teacher.

As a result, OCR found insufficient evidence to suggest that the District failed to implement the provisions of Student B’s IEPs related to movement breaks.

G. Conclusions Regarding the Implementation of Student B’s IEP

In conclusion, OCR found it more likely than not that the District failed to properly implement the following provisions: (1) in Student B’s 2015 IEP, the provision that required that “Lexia

\textsuperscript{7} The accommodation in Student B’s 2015 and 2016 IEPs stated, “Allow variety of work locations and/or positions (i.e. standing, sitting, lying on stomach, sitting in bean bag chair, at desk or sitting on the rug, etc.).”
will not be used during school”; (2) in Student B’s 2016 IEP, the provision that required a total of 300 minutes of structured reading per weekly cycle with a special education teacher from May 25, 2016 through the end of the 2015-2016 academic year; and (3) in Student B’s 2015 and 2016 IEPs, the provisions that the District should “decrease environmental and visual distractions, when possible.”

As a result of these instances where the District failed to implement Student B’s IEPs during the 2015-2016 academic year, OCR determined that it was more likely than not that Student B’s progress was negatively affected. Therefore, OCR found that the District’s failure to implement these aspects of Student B’s IEPs rose to the level of a denial of FAPE. The Resolution Agreement includes provisions to remedy the harm suffered by Student B as a result of this denial of FAPE.

Conclusion

On August 22, 2017, the District agreed to implement the enclosed Resolution Agreement, which commits the District to take specific steps to address the identified areas of noncompliance. The Resolution Agreement entered into by the District is designed to resolve the issues of noncompliance. OCR will, however, monitor the District’s implementation of the Agreement. Should the District fail to fully implement the Agreement, OCR will take appropriate action to ensure the District’s compliance with Section 504 and Title II.

This concludes OCR’s investigation of the complaint. This letter should not be interpreted to address the District’s compliance with any other regulatory provision or to address any issues other than those addressed in this letter. This letter sets forth OCR’s determination in an individual OCR case. This letter is not a formal statement of OCR policy and should not be relied upon, cited, or construed as such. OCR’s formal policy statements are approved by a duly authorized OCR official and made available to the public. The complainant may have the right to file a private suit in federal court whether or not OCR finds a violation.

Please be advised that the District must not harass, coerce, intimidate, discriminate, or otherwise retaliate against an individual because that individual asserts a right or privilege under a law enforced by OCR or files a complaint, testifies, assists, or participates in a proceeding under a law enforced by OCR. If this happens, the individual may file a retaliation complaint with OCR.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, it may be necessary to release this document and related correspondence and records upon request. If OCR receives such a request, we will seek to protect personally identifiable information that could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy if released, to the extent provided by law.
If you have any questions, you may contact Civil Rights Attorney Amy Fabiano at (617) 289-0007 or by e-mail at Amy.Fabiano@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Meena Morey Chandra w/p AMM
Acting Regional Director

Enclosure

cc: Michael Joyce, Esq.
Resolution Agreement  
Reading Public Schools

OCR Complaint No. 01-16-1234  
[Redacted]  
(Student A)

OCR Complaint No. 01-16-1235  
[Redacted]  
(Student B)

Reading Public Schools (the District) has entered into the following agreement (Agreement) with the U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR), to resolve the above-referenced complaints alleging disability discrimination under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and its implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. Part 104 (Section 504); and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and its implementing regulation at 28 C.F.R. Part 35 (Title II).

In order to address the compliance violations and concerns identified in Complaint Nos. 01-16-1234 & 01-16-1235 the District agrees to the following terms:

**Action Item 1: Compensatory Services for the Bridge Program Students**

a. By September 15, 2017, the District will send written notice to the parents/guardians of each student placed in the Grade 2/3 and Grade 4/5 Bridge Program Classes at the Joshua Eaton School (School) during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years (the Bridge Program Students) offering compensatory services relative to the provision of comparable facilities for those students.

b. The written notice shall include the following statements:

1. Compensatory services are being offered to remedy any effects of different treatment that students may have experienced due to the Bridge Program Student’s placement in Bridge Program Classes that shared classroom space with the Learning Centers during the 2014-2015 and/or 2015-2016 academic years.

2. The Bridge Program Student is eligible to receive compensatory services from a licensed special education teacher during the 2017-2018 academic year or during an extended school year program in the amount of fifteen (15) hours to thirty (30) hours, based on the academic years that the Bridge Program Student was placed in the Bridge Program Classes that shared classroom space with the Learning Center.¹

3. The compensatory services will be in the areas of structured reading, reading and/or mathematics. These services shall be in addition to the

¹ A student who was a Bridge Program Student during both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years will have the opportunity to receive thirty (30) hours of compensatory services pursuant to Action Item 1(b). A student who was a Bridge Program Student during either the 2014-2015 academic year or the 2015-2016 academic year will have the opportunity to receive fifteen (15) hours of compensatory services pursuant to Action Item 1(b).
services to which each Bridge Program Student is entitled on his or her last-accepted IEP and shall be delivered at the District or other mutually agreed-upon location.

c. For the Bridge Program Students who have accepted the District’s offer of compensatory services, the District shall deliver those services by September 1, 2018, unless the parents/guardians and the District have agreed otherwise in writing.

Reporting Requirements

a. By November 1, 2017, the District will provide OCR with documentation demonstrating that it notified the parents/guardians of each Bridge Program Student of the opportunity to receive compensatory services described in Action Item 1. The documentation will include:

1. A list of Bridge Program Students during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years. The list will include the name, academic year(s) in the Bridge Program Classes, and current grade level of each Bridge Program Student.

2. For each student identified, the District will provide:

   a. A copy of the notice sent to each of the parents/guardians and any other documentation of reasonable efforts to provide notice to each of the parents/guardians;

   b. A list of staff, identified by name and title, who are responsible for the provision of compensatory services to the Bridge Program Students;

   c. A schedule identifying the anticipated dates and times for the delivery of such compensatory services;

   d. Should the Bridge Program Student’s parents/guardians decline the compensatory services, the District will provide a statement containing the parents'/guardians’ signature attesting to their decision to decline such services, or documentation of the District’s request for such an attestation; and

   e. If the Bridge Program Student’s parents/guardians are non-responsive to the District’s offer of compensatory services, the District will provide documentation of the reasonable efforts which the District took to ensure that the parents/guardians were aware of the offer.

b. By October 1, 2018, the District will provide documentation to OCR of the dates, times, and locations that the compensatory services were provided to each Bridge Program Student, including the name(s) and title(s) of the service provider(s).
**Action Item 2: Services for Student A**

a. After OCR completed its investigation, the District and Complainant A advised OCR that they were in the process of negotiating a settlement agreement regarding the implementation of Student A’s IEP during the 2015-2016 academic year. Complainant A and the District have represented that when fully executed, the settlement agreement will resolve all of the allegations regarding related to Action Item 1 and the implementation of Student A’s IEP during the 2015-2016 academic year.

**Reporting Requirement**

a. By September 15, 2017, the District shall provide OCR an executed copy of such written settlement agreement. The District’s provision of such written settlement agreement will satisfy the District’s obligations under Action Item 2.

**Action Item 3: Services for Student B**

a. The District will ensure that Student B’s teacher(s) are aware of all provisions set forth in Student B’s IEP, including any subsequent revisions to Student B’s IEP.

b. The District will maintain copies of all classroom schedules developed for Student B during the 2017-2018 academic year. Each schedule should include the effective date of the schedule, the programs Student B was provided, and the teacher(s) and/or paraprofessional(s) who provided Student B such programs.

c. By September 15, 2017, the District will send written notice to Student B’s parents offering compensatory services to remedy violations found regarding the implementation of Student B’s IEP during the 2015-2016 academic year.

1. The written notice shall include the following statements:

   i. An offer of ten (10) hours of compensatory services from a licensed special education teacher in structured reading to remedy the District’s failure to fully implement Student B’s structured reading services from May 25, 2016 through the end of the 2015-2016 academic year; and

   ii. An offer of ten (10) hours of compensatory services from a licensed special education teacher in structured reading, reading and/or mathematics to remedy the District’s failure to fully implement (a) the provision that Lexia would not be used during school from the date Student B joined the Grade 2/3 Bridge Program Class in January 2016 through May 25, 2016; and (b) the accommodation to decrease environmental and visual distractions when possible from the date Student B joined the Grade 2/3 Bridge
Program Class in January 2016 through the end of the 2015-2016 academic year.

2. These compensatory services shall be in addition to the compensatory services to which Student B is entitled on his last-accepted IEP and in addition to those provided for in Action Item 1 of this Agreement.

3. These compensatory services shall be delivered at the District or other mutually agreed-upon location.

4. The District may also satisfy its obligation under Action Items 3(a), 3(b), and 3(c) through a written settlement agreement with Student B’s parents.

d. By April 1, 2018, the District will provide all compensatory services detailed in Action Item 3(c) unless Student B’s parents and the District have agreed otherwise in writing, or the District provides the attestation referenced in Reporting Requirement (a)(4) of this Action Item.

**Reporting Requirements**

a. By November 1, 2017, the District will provide OCR with documentation demonstrating that it offered the compensatory services described in Action Item 3(c). The documentation will include:

1. A copy of the notice sent to Student B’s parents and any other documentation of reasonable efforts to provide notice to Student B’s parents;

2. A list of staff, identified by name and title, who are responsible for the provision of compensatory services to Student B;

3. A schedule identifying the anticipated dates and times for the delivery of such compensatory services to Student B;

4. Should Student B’s parents decline the compensatory services detailed in Action Item 3(c), the District will provide a statement containing the parents’ signature attesting to their decision to decline such services. Under such circumstance, Student B’s parents’ attestation shall constitute full compliance with Action Item 3(c).

5. If Student B’s parents/guardians are non-responsive to the District’s offer of the compensatory services detailed in Action Item 3(c), the District will provide documentation of the reasonable efforts that the District took to ensure that Student B’s parents/guardians were aware of such an opportunity.
b. By May 1, 2018, the District will provide OCR documentation of the dates, times, and locations that the compensatory services were provided to Student B, including the name(s) and title(s) of the service provider(s).

c. By June 30, 2018, the District will provide OCR with any revisions made to Student B’s IEP during the 2017-2018 academic year. The District will provide OCR documentation demonstrating the District’s compliance with Action Item 3(a), including the names of Student B’s teacher(s) and a description of how Student B’s teacher(s) were informed of the provisions of and any revisions to Student B’s IEP.

d. By January 1, 2018, and June 30, 2018, the District will provide OCR copies of all classroom schedules developed for Student B during the 2017-2018 academic year.

e. In the event that the District and Student B’s parents execute a written settlement agreement which resolves the District’s obligations under Action Items 3(a), 3(b), and/or 3(c), the District shall provide OCR an executed copy of such written settlement agreement. The District’s provision of such written settlement agreement will satisfy the District’s obligations under Action Item 3(a), 3(b), and/or 3(c), as applicable.

Action Item 4: Location of the Bridge Program Classes

a. During the 2017-2018 academic year, if the District decides to relocate the two Bridge Program Classes at the School, it will ensure that that the Bridge Program Classes are provided in an educational setting that is comparable to those the School provides to similarly situated non-disabled students.

Reporting Requirements

a. Within 15 calendar days after any decision to relocate the two Bridge Program Classes at the School and no later than June 30, 2018, the District will provide OCR documentation outlining the District’s decisions and any supporting documentation for OCR’s review and approval.

Monitoring

The District understands that by signing this Agreement, it agrees to provide data and other information in a timely manner in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. Further, the District understands that during OCR’s monitoring of this Agreement OCR may visit the District, if necessary, to interview staff and students and request such additional reports or data as are necessary for OCR to determine whether the District has fulfilled the terms of this Agreement and is in compliance with the regulations implementing Section 504, at 34 C.F.R. §§ 104.4, 104.33, and 104.34(c), and Title II, at 28 C.F.R. § 35.130, which were at issue in this case. Upon completion of the obligations under this Agreement, OCR shall close this case.
The District understands and acknowledges that OCR may initiate administrative enforcement or judicial proceedings to enforce the specific terms and obligations of this Agreement. Before initiating administrative enforcement (34 C.F.R. §§ 100.9, 100.10), or judicial proceedings to enforce this Agreement, OCR shall give the District written notice of the alleged breach and a minimum of sixty (60) calendar days to cure the alleged breach.

This Agreement will become effectively immediately upon the signature of the District's representative below.

8/21/2017
Date

[Signature]
John F. Doherty
Superintendent
Reading Public Schools
September 14, 2017

Dear Parent or Guardian,

As a result of a recent finding of the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), the District is offering compensatory services from a licensed special education teacher for your child. During the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years the Bridge program (LLD program) shared a space with the Learning Center at Joshua Eaton. As a result of the investigation, the Reading Public Schools agreed to offer compensatory services to students to remedy any effects of any different treatment those students may have experienced due to the shared space.

If your child was enrolled in the Bridge program for both the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years you are eligible to receive 30 hours of compensatory services. If your child was just enrolled in the program for 1 of the 2 years your child is eligible for 15 hours of compensatory services.

There are 2 potential options for accessing these services—each option will be offered at the elementary level and the middle school level.

**Option 1:**
Starting December 4, 2017, the District will offer three 1-hour sessions of services after school on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday each week. For those students accessing 15 hours this will end on Thursday January 18 and will be provided by a licensed special educator. For those students accessing 30 hours this session will end on February 22, 2018. These sessions will consist of services in the areas of structured reading, reading and/or math depending upon your selection.

**Option 2:**
Starting July 9, 2018 and running through August 9, 2018 the District will offer either 3 hours per week of services or 6 hours per week of services depending on your child’s individual situation. These services will be provided by a licensed special education teacher and will take place at the completion of ESY programming each day. These sessions will consist of services in the areas of structured reading, reading and/or math depending upon your selection.
If neither of these options work for you please contact my office directly and we can discuss other options of providing compensatory services, including provision of services in the District or other mutually agreeable location. Please note that these services, if accepted, will be in addition to the services your child currently receives through his or her last accepted IEP.

Attached to this letter you will find a sheet that needs to be completed and returned by October 13, 2017. The District will then contact you with the schedule and the staff names for Option 1 so you can plan accordingly by October 27, 2017. If you choose Option 2 the District will provide you with a schedule and the staff names by May 15, 2018.

Please contact me if you have further questions.

Sincerely,

Carolyn J. Wilson, M. Ed., JD
Director of Student Services

CC: Building Principal
    Team Chair
    Student Record

The Reading Public Schools does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, age or disability.
Compensatory Services

Student Name: ___________________________  Current School: ________________
Parent Name: ___________________________  Parent Phone: ________________

My child was enrolled in the Bridge Program at Joshua Eaton:

_____ 2014-2015
_____ 2015-2016

I would like to access Compensatory Services in the following manner:

_____ Option 1: 15 hours
_____ Option 1: 30 hours
_____ Option 2: 15 hours
_____ Option 2: 30 hours

I would like the focus of these sessions to be:

_____ Structured Reading  _____ Math  _____ Structured Reading and Math

If you do not wish to access these services or an alternate method of compensatory services please sign below:

_________________________________________  ________________
Parent/Guardian  Date

Please return the enclosed Document to the Student Services Office by Friday October 13, 2017
TO:                   Reading School Committee
FROM:                John F. Doherty, Ed.D.
                     Superintendent of Schools
DATE:                September 21, 2017
TOPIC:               Email Correspondence from the Community

Please find attached, for your information, copies of email correspondence received by School Committee members and Central Office administrators from community members. I have included our responses as well.

If you have any questions, please contact me.
Hi Linda,

Please put in the next School Committee packet under information.

Thanks!

John F. Doherty, Ed.D.
Superintendent
Reading Public Schools
781-944-5800
John.doherty@reading.k12.ma.us

Hi Ms. Liberman,

I apologize for the delay in replying. We have had a very busy last several weeks in order to prepare for a successful opening of the school year, but I did want to follow up on your emails. First, as we have done in past years, we definitely anticipate providing updates to the School Committee again this year regarding curriculum and student achievement data. Most of the topics you mention should be included in those updates. We are also working hard to establish public curriculum documents in all the core content areas. As we do not have curriculum coordinators or any other similar positions, this has been challenging, but our staff is committed to this goal. I am grateful to all of them for their support in this ongoing effort. As our curriculum is aligned with the state standards however, the state curriculum framework is the guiding document we use for all content areas. For math at the secondary level, the state document is especially key, and can be found at the below link. Many of your questions may be answered within this document.

2017 Massachusetts Mathematics Curriculum Framework
http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/math/2017-06.pdf

In regards to some of the information you stated in your previous email, I think you might be accidentally citing data points that are not comparable, or you perhaps may be misunderstanding some of the changes that have occurred with the state curriculum and the state’s standard assessments over the last several years. For instance, when you cite the overall percentage of students who received advanced scores on the math MCAS in 2012 (as a concerning comparison), it’s important to remember that a separate Algebra assessment only existed for 2015 and 2016—but any 8th grade students taking this assessment must obviously be included in the percentage of total advanced scores in order to make
an accurate comparison to previous years. (If not, the data for many 8th grade students would be essentially excluded from the comparison.) It’s important of course to remember as well that several other significant changes have occurred in the state framework and recommended pathways, resulting in much more rigorous standards and assessments. Although making the issue more complex, I believe these changes are also variables that must be taken into account for a thoughtful and accurate analysis of the data. In 2012 for instance, MCAS was still assessing the old 2000/2004 standards. In 2014, the new state standards were being assessed for the first time, but still with “MCAS 1.0.” Starting in 2015, in addition to assessing the new standards, the state also began utilizing a revised, more rigorous assessment tool. Overall, as we look at our data from 2010-2012 for instance, approximately 74% of our students by 8th grade were achieving proficient or advanced scores on the state assessment. While the transition to the assessment of new standards did initially result in some overall lower percentages of proficient/advanced scores (approximately 60% overall in 8th grade), we have been pleased that there has been a steady increase for a few years—with approximately 70% of all 8th grade students in 2016 receiving proficient/advanced scores (much closer to the percentages prior to the change in standards). We will obviously keep monitoring all results.

It’s important also to keep in mind that our goal has always been to have our curriculum and pathways aligned with the state’s framework and assessments. And while our goal is to have as many students as possible access the full Algebra 1 course in 8th grade, we also realize that doing so may actually hinder some students’ success in subsequent math courses if they were to enroll in this course before they are ready. Pages 165-167 of the state framework address this issue directly and provide guidance to districts regarding this issue. Because Algebra 1 is the foundational course for most all other future math courses, the mastery of this course material (much more so than the year in which a student takes the course) is absolutely essential. Our position on this is not only consistent with the Massachusetts framework and the National Council of the Teachers of Mathematics, but also has produced promising overall improvements thus far for our students.

The stronger foundation that students are now receiving over the last few years in both elementary and middle school has also allowed us to provide new math pathways now available to all students, allowing a straight path to calculus without having to double-up and without missing content. In addition, for the last two years now, even before offering our newest enhanced pathway for entering 9th graders, we have had higher percentages of 11th/12th graders in an AP Calculus course than we have ever had in the last decade. We are currently projecting that for three years in a row (2015-2018) the percentage of 11th/12th grade students in AP Calculus will be nearly double the percentage in the previous three years (2012-2015). Even with higher numbers of students in these courses, we are also pleased that our students are still scoring consistently high on the AP Calculus exams, with the RMHS mean score significantly above not only the global mean score—but also still well above the mean score for the state of Massachusetts. Most importantly perhaps, by ensuring that more students are successfully completing a rigorous and aligned Algebra 1 course at the “start” of their upper-level pathway in mathematics (whether that’s in 8th or 9th grade), we have been able to reduce the large attrition that used to take place in the advanced pathways and increase the number of students who successfully reach their desired “finish” by 12th grade. In preparing students for their future beyond the Reading Public Schools, this of course is our ultimate goal.

As I’ve mentioned to you previously, we will obviously continue to monitor multiple data points as we continue to ensure that more students are accessing desired courses—and most importantly, experiencing success as they proceed. As we do this, we will also be looking for sustainable trends over multiple years—and not settle for any single year’s results or measures (good or bad) to be the indicators for progress. Like any substantive change, improvement is often not immediate and can take time—but results so far are promising and represent an improvement over the past. As we continue to move forward in these areas, we will of course also be updating the School Committee and the Community on our progress.

Thanks again for your email.

Best,

Craig
Craig Martin
Assistant Superintendent for Learning & Teaching
Reading Public Schools
82 Oakland Road
Reading, MA 01867
781-944-5800
Email: craig.martin@reading.k12.ma.us

⚠️ Please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to
When writing or responding, please remember that the Secretary of State's Office has determined that email is a public record. This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, or believe that you have received this communication in error, please do not print, copy, retransmit, disseminate, or otherwise use the information. Also, please indicate to the sender that you have received this email in error, and delete the copy you received.

From: Rebecca Liberman [mailto:rflberman@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 31, 2017 9:24 PM
To: Doherty, John <John.Doherty@reading.k12.ma.us>; Martin, Craig <Craig.Martin@reading.k12.ma.us>; Borawski, Jeanne <jeanne.borawski@reading.k12.ma.us>; Webb, Elaine <Elaine.Webb@reading.k12.ma.us>; Robinson, Charles <Charles.Robinson@reading.k12.ma.us>; Nihan, Gary <gary.nihan@reading.k12.ma.us>; Boivin, Nick <Nick.Boivin@reading.k12.ma.us>; Dockser, Linda <linda.Dockser@reading.k12.ma.us>

Subject: Fwd: Access to middle school algebra and Math curriculum maps

Dear Dr. Doherty, Mr. Martin, and Members of the School Committee,

I am sending this message again, urging you to schedule a hearing on the 5-year experience with the new math curriculum and also to make changes to allow all middle school students to access algebra. In addition, I would like to know when the math curriculum maps and pacing guides will be completed.

Thank you, and I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Liberman
RMHS Parent

p.s. I corrected my previous email to indicate that 63% of Math 8 students scored proficient or better, not 58% as I had mistakenly said previously.

-------- Forwarded Message --------
Subject: Access to middle school algebra and Math curriculum maps
Date: Sun, 23 Jul 2017 22:24:26 -0400
From: Rebecca Liberman <rflberman@verizon.net>
To: Doherty, John <John.Doherty@reading.k12.ma.us>, Martin, Craig <Craig.Martin@reading.k12.ma.us>, Dockser, Linda <linda.Dockser@reading.k12.ma.us>, Elaine Webb <elaine.webb@reading.k12.ma.us>, Borawski, Jeanne <jeanne.borawski@reading.k12.ma.us>, Robinson, Charles <Charles.Robinson@reading.k12.ma.us>, Nihan, Gary <gary.nihan@reading.k12.ma.us>, Boivin, Nick <nick.Boivin@reading.k12.ma.us>
I urge you to restore a pathway to middle school algebra for middle track students and to delay implementation of the track collapse for middle school math. I also ask that the math curriculum maps be completed as soon as possible.

Next month will mark the 5-year anniversary of the roll-out of the new math curriculum, in which over 80% of students are denied algebra in middle school and don't have a straight path to high school calculus with the full math curriculum. In 2015, Reading had the third lowest percentage of middle schoolers taking algebra of any PARCC district in the entire state.

Meanwhile, as access to middle school algebra has declined, so have our achievement scores in math in Reading.

In 2012 38% scored advanced on 8th grade MCAS.
In 2016, only 10% of Math 8 students scored advanced on PARCC in the district overall, and at Parker only 3% of Math 8 students scored advanced.

Within the same cohort of students in the Class of 2018, the last class that took 8th grade MCAS, you can see a huge drop in the percentage of those scoring proficient or advanced on the MCAS between 6th and 8th grade, likely because so few of them got to take algebra in middle school.

These declines show what denying grade 8th algebra to so many students really does. The kids who took Algebra 1 in 8th grade (approximately 15%) did really well on the PARCC, with 100% scoring proficient or better, while only 63% of Math 8 students scored proficient or better.

In addition to poorer math achievement results we're seeing with the new curriculum, the delay of algebra until 9th grade denies high school students a straight path to calculus that provides the full math curriculum. This really hurts students who might want to pursue math, engineering or physics studies.

I would appreciate it if you would let me know what you plan to do to remedy this situation and when we can finally expect the math curriculum maps to be available for all grades. The date of the K-8 maps has been put off multiple times, and I don't even think there's a timeline for the grade 9-12 maps, even though a new high school math course pathway is being rolled out.

In addition, I would like to see the School Committee schedule an update on the results of our 5-year experiment with the new math curriculum.

Thank you, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Liberman
PARENT UNIVERSITY

WHEN
Saturday, October 21st
8:00am – 12:15pm

WHERE
Reading Memorial High School, 62 Oakland Road

Benefit from FREE workshops presented by community experts on a variety of topics.

FREE childcare for children in grades K through 5 will be provided by the Extended Day Program. You must pre-register for childcare when you are registering for Parent University workshops. Children will be participating in activities run by 1v1 Sports.

Pre-registration will begin on Monday, October 2nd at the following link:
https://www.reading.k12.ma.us/community/adult-and-community-education/

Sponsored By

Tentative Schedule

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS:
DAVID WALSH, PH.D.
& ERIN WALSH, M.A.

PRESENT:
“Connection Unleashes Children’s Potential”
8:40am – 9:30am
Performing Arts Center

Workshop Session 1:
9:40am – 10:30am
Navigating the Cyber World

Intentional Parenting

Workshop Session 2:
11:00am – 11:50am
Is There an App for That?
Raising Kids in the Digital Age

Raising Hardy and Resilient Children & Youth

Mindfulness & Parenting

College Process:
Roundtable Discussion with Parents

Student Mental Health

And more......
MEMORANDUM

TO:       Reading School Committee
FROM:     Gail Dowd
CC:       John Doherty
DATE:     September 22, 2017
RE:       FY 18 Capital Plan Update

At the Reading School Committee meeting on September 25th, we will provide the Committee during reports with an update on the FY’18 Capital Plan as it relates to repairs to skylights at the Wood End Elementary School. The Director of Facilities will be available during the meeting to discuss the specifics of the project.

Attached within the Information Section of the packet, please find a memo from the Town Manager explaining the funding of the change to the capital plan.

The request will be presented as part of November Town Meeting.
September 21, 2017

Reading School Committee
Dr. John Doherty
Gail Dowd
Sharon Angstrom
Reading Board of Selectmen
Reading Finance Committee

RE: November Town Meeting – FY18 update

While the Town and Schools are in constant contact about financial issues, the capital plan gets very careful scrutiny in the early fall each year, with the goal to bring a balanced capital plan to November Town Meeting that then only needs minor adjustments in the annual budget process aimed at April Town Meeting.

This year after meetings with all departments, the one item that stepped to the front of the line is a needed repair of the skylights at the Wood End School for an estimated $480,000. I will let the Superintendent and Facilities Director share more details on that issue, but in the reminder of this memo explain how we will fund this item in November, and not require any Free Cash (as of this moment) to do so, because of four positive developments

First, I am quite pleased to share that the DOR today has certified our New Growth at $841,972. This gives us an additional $341,972 to use in the current year – and more importantly becomes a new baseline for taxes in future years. This figure exceeds my best guess, and is a testament to the economic development that is already underway in the community.

Second, we budgeted a bit below the final state aid figure by $100,000 – which is another source of sustainable annual revenue, although increases will remain uncertain each year.

Third, Fire Chief Greg Burns and his staff are to be commended for securing a grant for much needed breathing apparatus equipment. The result of the grant is that Reading can reduce the capital outlay from an approved $190,000 to only $25,000 – which frees up $165,000 of budgeted expenses.

Fourth, we will spend $190,000 less on debt service for the RMHS litigation settlement than budgeted, although that savings will be reduced by about a $75,000 reduction in tax revenues, for a net savings of about $115,000 of budgeted expenses. The reasons are complex and involve the IRS, DOR and the town – I will explain briefly at the October Financial Forum. Broadly, the legal expenses incurred by the
general fund over the last few years have been shifted to the debt exclusion. Legally we could have shifted more, but morally I believe the reduction by $75,000 in taxes levied starting this fall will make the Reading taxpayer whole.

The combination of these four items will more than fund the capital request for the skylights at Wood End, which are our collective top need. It is too soon in the process for me to tell if there will be additional expenses or changes at Town Meeting, but at this point I am very comfortable in stating that the School capital need can be funded without the use of any Free Cash, and I would ask for your support.

Sincerely,

Robert LeLacheur, Jr.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 25</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 28</td>
<td>RCASA Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Ends slow PAC 6:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 11</td>
<td>Financial Forum</td>
<td>Budget Guidance</td>
<td>Senior Center 7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 16</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>Office Hours</td>
<td>Borawski &amp; Snow Dockser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 30</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 6</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>Office Hours</td>
<td>Boivin &amp; Nihan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 13</td>
<td>Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 16</td>
<td>Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 20</td>
<td>Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 21</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 27</td>
<td>Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 4</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>Office Hours</td>
<td>Borawski &amp; Webb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 18</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>Public Hearing FY2019 Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All meetings are in the Superintendent's Conference Room at 7:00 p.m. unless otherwise noted. Dates and locations subject to change. (Bold indicates new or changed date or location.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 8th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>FY2019 Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 11th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>FY2019 Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 13th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 16th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>FY2019 Budget</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 18th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>FY2019 Budget - Vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 5th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 7th</td>
<td>FY19 Budget Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 26th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 5th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7th</td>
<td>Fincom - 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 3rd</td>
<td>Local Election</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 23rd</td>
<td>Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 26th</td>
<td>Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All meetings are in the Superintendent's Conference Room at 7:00 p.m. unless otherwise noted. Dates and locations subject to change. (Bold indicates new or changed date or location.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 30th</td>
<td>Town Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3rd</td>
<td><em>Town Meeting</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>School Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robinson &amp; Snow Dockser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21st</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3rd</td>
<td><em>RMHS Graduation</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td>Staff Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18th</td>
<td>School Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.22.17    *Meeting dates subject to change*

All meetings are in the Superintendent’s Conference Room at 7:00 p.m. unless otherwise noted. Dates and locations subject to change. (Bold indicates new or changed date or location.)