

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Early Education and Care
100 Myles Standish Blvd. Suite 100, Taunton, MA, 02780

INVESTIGATION REPORT

Intake #: 00121315
Investigation #: 027378
Provider #: P-250575
Name of Provider: Starboard Academy
Address: 114 Industrial Park Road, , Plymouth, MA,
02360
Intake date: 04/17/2024
Report date: 05/10/2024
Report Printed date: 05/20/2024

Facility Description:

This is a large group and school-age program licensed for one hundred sixty-one infants, toddlers, preschool, and school-aged children.

Reason for Investigation:

Statute
Statute
Statute It was reported that an incident occurred in a toddler classroom. An educator was said to have been observed picking up a Privacy child who was lying on Priv nap cot and "slamming" Privacy down face first. The child let out a "huge screech" and began to cry. The educator then was observed "shoving" the child's head onto the cot and shaking Privacy in an aggressive manner. Statute the incident was reported to one of the program's co-owners, who appeared to "brush it off" because the involved staff member was Privacy easily frustrated. It was further reported that the staff members at this program are afraid to go to administrators/licensees with concerns for fear of retaliation. Statute
Statute

Investigation Activities:

A scheduled visit was made to the program on 4/23/2024. Visit activities included the following:

Interviews/Collateral Contacts: Licensees, Regional Director, Program Directors, Educators, Childcare Parents, [Redacted] Statute

Documentation Review: EEC licensing and BRC databases, [Redacted] Statute
personnel files, child's enrollment records, staff schedule, classroom attendance, written statements, personnel policies [Redacted] Statute

An Exit meeting was held on 5/17/2024.

Determinations:

[Redacted] Statute EEC investigations supported allegations of neglect by a classroom educator on behalf of a childcare child. The educator's interactions were found to have presented a risk to the child, who was physically managed at nap time. The educator's interactions with the involved child did not support the child's development. The educator was further found to yell at children and, on one occasion, to use profanity when speaking to children. EEC regulations strictly prohibit any form of abuse or neglect of children while in care and further mandate that educators be nurturing and responsive to the children in care.

Other regulatory concerns were identified as a result of this investigation, including the following: Mandated Reporting policies and procedures were not followed. The involved educator remained working with children after the program's Director had been notified [Redacted] Statute. The child's parents were not immediately notified of the incident [Redacted] Statute until several days after [Redacted] Statute. The policies and procedures for handling allegations of abuse or neglect were incomplete. An educator did not offer alternative activities to children who chose not to sleep. On two occasions, parents did not receive an injury/incident report following an incident involving their child sustaining an injury while at the program.

Investigation Findings:

[Redacted] Statute
[Redacted] Statute
[Redacted] Statute an educator heard screaming in a toddler classroom and then observed Educator A pick up Child A and "slam" [Redacted] Privac face-first into [Redacted] Priv cot. Child A's

head was said to have gone "flying back," causing [Privac] to screech and cry. In response, Educator A "shoved" [Priv] head into the cot and shook [Privac] in an aggressive manner. The incident was reported to one of the program's co-owners (Licensee A), who, according to the reporter, "brushed it off," indicating it was related to Educator A's [Privacy]. It was further shared that other program educators have reported concerns with Educator A, but ". . . nothing appears to be happening." [Statute]

[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]

[Statute] the Director contacted the EEC Licensur. The Licensur's notes indicate the call occurred on 4/18/2024 at 8:55 a.m. Information and technical assistance related to Mandated Reporting policies and procedures were provided by the Licensur. It was learned that the program had not yet removed Educator A from working directly with children. The Director was instructed to follow that mandate. The program became aware of the incident and identified the educator at 10:35 a.m. on 4/17/2024 but removed the educator from working with children the following day. This investigator contacted the Director on 4/18/2023 to discuss the investigation process. At 10:37 a.m., an email was sent to the Director and her supervisor - the Regional Director (RD). The email confirms the scheduled visit and identifies the documentation needed for the visit. The first item on the list is Child A's enrollment record. Child A is identified by name. Follow-up emails were sent inquiring if the program had video surveillance footage of the alleged incident. The RD responded on 4/18 at 5:36 p.m., stating the cameras were "live feed" only [Statute]

[Statute]. This investigator responded at 6:47 a.m. on 4/19/2024, stating [Statute] [Statute] the incident involved an interaction with Educator A and Child A, which was described as aggressive. [Statute]

[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]
[Statute]

[Statute] The parents were not immediately notified [Statute] [Statute] when the information was shared with the Director for three days. The RD sent an email explaining the parents had not been notified because ". . . we were unaware that this specific child was involved as we never received an official report [Statute]

[Statute] The RD states that the Director did not share this with her and then told investigators she

did. Communication broke down, and it was recommended the program develop a specific step-by-step guide for documenting and disseminating information [Statute]

[Statute]

This investigator [Statute] conducted a phone interview with the reporter on 4/18/2024. It was explained that Child A was in the Toddler 1A classroom with Educator A and an assistant educator. A Toddler 1B classroom abuts the room, and there is a glass door and windows between the two rooms, making it possible to see into each other's rooms. The reporter was in the 1B classroom and heard Educator A yell, "Go to sleep!" This caught the reporter's attention, and when the reporter looked into the 1A classroom, Educator A was observed yelling at Child A, who was lying on [Priv] nap cot. The reporter saw Educator A pick Child A up off [Priv] cot, flip [Privacy] over, and "drop" [Privac] face-first onto the cot. Child A was crying, and the reporter described the interaction as very rough. The reporter said that the Director was not working that day, but one of the owners (Licensee A) was in the building and was told what had been observed. Licensee A told the reporter she would speak to Educator A about what was shared and then later told the reporter she had reviewed the video footage but saw no concerns. The reporter told investigators Licensee A seemed to "brush off" the worries and commented that Educator A [Privacy] indicating an explanation of the behavior. The reporter recalled the incident on a Friday and said the Director had been at the center the following Monday when the information was also shared with her. After sharing concerns with the licensee and Director and seeing that the issue was not being addressed, the reporter said a feeling of "helplessness" prompted further reporting outside of program administration. The reporter expressed concern that administrators did nothing in response to the incident and further shared that many educators at the program felt afraid to report anything.

Investigators conducted a scheduled visit to the program on 4/23/2024 and first met with Licensee A and co-owner Licensee B along with RD. Following introductions and a tour of the facility, investigators were directed to an office to interview staff members. The Director told investigators that she was off one day in April and had received a phone call from the assistant director letting her know there was an incident in the Toddler 1A classroom. The Director was informed that educators in the Toddler 1B classroom were upset; one was crying after witnessing Educator A place Child A on [Priv] cot in an aggressive manner. The next day, Licensee A called the Director and discussed the concerns. Licensee A told the Director she had talked to Educator A about what had been reported, and the Director was advised to monitor the classroom. Several days later, she received a phone call [Statute] [Statute]. She confirmed that the report identified the name of the educator involved as well as the name of the child involved.

The Director said she then notified both the RD and Licensee A. (Note: The RD and Licensee A told investigators they were never given this information.) According to the Director, she also shared with administrators [redacted] Statute that the person who observed the incident reported it to Licensee A on the same day it occurred. (Note: Licensee A denies being told specifically what happened; however, the reporter said Licensee A was told and responded by checking video surveillance.) On 4/17/2024, the program had a staff meeting, and the Director, along with the RD and both licensees, met [redacted] Statute. The Director said "everyone" was "unsure" what to do, so an email was sent to the EEC Licensor asking for guidance. The Director admitted that Educator A was never removed from the classroom until 4/18/2024. She had no knowledge of when Child A's parents were notified and said, "Admin took it from there."

Regarding Educator A, there had been no prior concerns specific to inappropriate physical incidents. An educator in the toddler room next to Educator A's room shared concerns with the Director and told her children to cry a lot in the room and spend a lot of time sitting on the rug. The Director conducted observations and spoke to Educator A about having more activities and spending less time having children sit and wait.

Child A and [redacted] Priv parent were at the program on the day of this visit for a scheduled event [redacted] Privacy. [redacted] Privacy Child A's parent said there were no significant concerns with the childcare before this incident but did mention her concern with the program not notifying her sooner. Due to [redacted] Priv age, Child A was said to have some unexplained bumps and bruises, which were likely sustained while learning gross motor skills. The parent recalled noticing a bump on Child A's head and a bruise on the child's right temple. The program was asked about this but reported they had no idea if/when/where/how the child sustained the injuries. In early April, Child A had a small bruise on [redacted] Priv head. The parent noticed the mark while the child was in the bath and had taken a picture, which she shared with investigators. Child, A's parent, said the licensees and RD met with her and her husband on 4/21/2024 and said they received a report about Educator A being "handsy" with Child A. The parents did not feel the administrators were apologetic for not sharing the information sooner. A decision about whether Child A would remain enrolled had not yet been made. [redacted] Privacy [redacted] Privacy

The Assistant Director (AD) told investigators she worked from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. on the day of the incident. Licensee A and co-owner Licensee B were both in the building that day. From 10 a.m. to 3 p.m., the AD covered classroom breaks. When asked about Educator A, the AD said she had noticed the educator had a loud tone while directing toddlers but denied she ever observed anything physically abusive. Licensee A called

the AD to the office later that day and asked her if she had any concerns about the Toddler 1A classroom. The AD had not covered break for anyone in that classroom that day. Licensee A then told the AD that Educator A forced Child A onto the cot, and [Priv] head hit the cot. Licensee A then joked about Educator A "losing it" because of her [Privacy]. The AD spoke to an educator in the Toddler 1B classroom, who asked AD if she had seen the video. When asked for clarification, the educator said she reported the incident to Licensee A and was told that the video was reviewed, but nothing of concern was found. The AD had not been shown any video of this incident but mentioned that investigators should ask to see it. When investigators said the video surveillance camera did not record, the AD said in the past, she watched a recorded video, which included audio. The video was of an incident between a parent and child in a classroom unrelated to this intake.

When asked about the center's video surveillance cameras, the Director said she believed the cameras recorded both video and audio. There was a camera in the office where the interview was being conducted. Investigators asked the licensees and RD about the surveillance camera system. They denied the cameras recorded audio and said there were only video recordings in "real-time," and the system did not save any footage. Every room in the building has a camera except for the bathrooms and the laundry room. Licensees said the surveillance footage is not saved and is only used to play on a screen in the lobby for parents and visitors to view. Parents do not have remote access to the live stream. Investigators made clear they did not consent to being recorded and were escorted to the laundry room, which was said to be void of cameras. All interviews that followed took place in the laundry room.

Educator A has worked at the program since June 2022. When asked if she knew why she was being interviewed, Educator A replied, "No idea why I'm here." She then commented on being told by the Director [Statute] that Licensee A had told her she "might" have been a little "loud" with a child. According to Educator A, Licensee A told her she "looked over" the video footage and then asked to speak with her on 4/2/2024. Educator A met with Licensee A around 3:50 p.m. that day and said Licensee A first asked her if she was "frustrated" because of her loud tone and then told her to use a "gentler" voice. Educator A denies being asked any questions about a nap time incident and/or being physically aggressive with a child. Investigators asked Educator A about Child A. She said [Priv] was a "pretty happy" baby. When asked about Child A's napping habits, Educator A said the classroom goes down for a nap at 12:15 p.m. Child A likes [Priv] binky and generally falls asleep without issue. Educator A said if Child A needed soothing, she would "tap" [Priv] behind a few times. The educator recalled an incident in which Child A woke during nap time, and she told [Priva] to go back to sleep. Educator A denies that she yelled at the child but did comment, "I have a loud voice." Child A did not fall asleep, so Educator A responded by, as she said, "flipping" Child A over so [Priv] was on [Priv] stomach.

When asked if she "flipped" the child in a rough manner, Educator A said, "It could be seen as that," but added that she was only attempting to reposition **Priva**. When asked how Child A responded to being turned over, Educator A said, "**Priv** maybe whined a little, not a huge screech, just a whine." Educator A said the whining could have resulted from Child A's binky being displaced when **Priv** was moved. **Statute** investigator asked, "Could flipping **Privac** cause a bruise?" Educator A replied, "I don't know, but maybe unintentionally. I had a stressful day, and it could have happened, but I'm not sure if **Priv** hit **Priv** head. It was not done aggressively, and I think it was perceived the wrong way." Educator A said she never observed Child A's head hitting the cot, nor did she observe any marks or bruises on the child.

Educator A continued her normal work schedule following the 4/2/2024 meeting with Licensee A **Personnel** **Privacy**

Privacy Educator A said she was "not happy" working at this program, commenting, "Communication is a huge issue." She further shared that administrators "yell" at educators a lot, and educators often do not get bathroom breaks due to staffing shortages and high staff turnover. **Personnel**

Educator B has worked at the program since August of 2023 and has no prior experience working with children. When asked overall how things were going at the program, Educator B said the toddler classroom needed more assistance, but the "leadership team" does not provide support, and administrators themselves seemed "stressed out." According to the educator, the Director informed her of the **Statute** on 4/19/2024 and shared that it was **Statute** due to Educator A interacting in an aggressive manner with children. The educator was not given specifics on the child or the actual incident. When asked if Educator B had any concerns with Educator A's interactions, she said, "In general, she gets frustrated and yells at them in a loud voice." Educator B admitted to observing Educator A put children down on their nap cots in a "rough" manner and confirmed that sometimes it did appear too rough, causing the child to cry. Educator B denied observing any injury to any child as a result of the interaction and told investigators she never told the Director or any administrator about the concerns and had assumed administrators were aware because there are cameras in the classroom, which she believed recorded video and audio. Child A had been observed with a bruise on **Priv** forehead around the time of the reported allegation, but Educator B did not know how, when, or where the injury was sustained. The educator recalled one incident in which Child A was flipped from **Priv** back to **Priv** stomach by Educator A and had cried during the encounter, but again, she could not recall noticing any marks or bruises. When asked directly if Educator A used proper child guidance with children, Educator B replied, "Absolutely not." Educator B said Educator A was deliberate in her actions, which seemed to be done out of frustration, and noted, "It made me feel uncomfortable when I saw this."

Three additional educators were interviewed. One educator told investigators working with Educator A was "uncomfortable" because she was "rough and deliberate" in her interactions. The educator spoke of observing Educator A aggressively put children down and said it was done in such a rough way it often made the children cry. The incidents that were shared involved Educator A "pushing" children down to force them into sitting. The involved children appeared frightened by Educator A. It was further shared that Educator A "tossed" and "flipped" children at nap time if the child was not sleeping. Educator A was said to have flipped a [Privacy] child who hit her head on the cot, but the educator did not see any injury/marks afterward. These incidents were not reported to any administrator. Another educator told investigators when working with Educator A the educator seemed to anger quickly and raised her voice a lot. Educator A was said to frustrate easily and had been heard yelling at children at nap time, saying, "Lay the fuck down!" Children had been observed crying in response to interactions with Educator A. Once the educator was observed "ripping" a toy out of a child's hands with such force, the child immediately cried and seemed afraid. Educator A also moved children at nap time and was observed picking them up, turning them over, and forcing them down on their cots in a rough manner. These incidents were not reported to any administrator. The third educator interviewed recalled a day in early April when an educator in the Toddler 1B classroom was upset and was crying. Licensee A came into the classroom and was told that Educator A was being rough with Child A and had "roughly" placed [Privacy] on [Priv] stomach on the nap mat in response to Child A not sleeping. Licensee A was heard telling the reporting educator she would look at the video footage and then address the situation. Educators were told, a few days later, nothing was found on the recorded footage. (Note: Licensees maintain the video surveillance cameras and do not save recorded footage.) Educator A had been observed by this educator yelling at children, grabbing children by the arm in a rough manner, and physically moving children out of frustration. The educator said children in the Toddler 1A classroom spend a significant amount of time sitting on the rug with no planned activities because the educators in the classroom do not want to take out / put away too many toys. All educators interviewed in person and by phone reported concerns about being retaliated against by the Licensees, who were said to be demeaning and unsupportive. One educator said, "Our concerns are not valued."

Prior to concluding the in-person visit, investigators met with Licensee A. In addition to this program, Licensee A, along with Licensee B, owns a total of four childcare centers. All centers maintain a director apart from the licensees. Licensee A recalled being at this program in early April due to the Director being off that day. She remembered that a male educator in the Toddler 1B classroom asked to speak with her and said the conversation had to do with a payroll issue, but the educator talked nonchalantly about concerns with Educator A being too "handsy" with children and was "not gentle" with her interactions. The educator, according to Licensee A, never mentioned a specific incident and/or specific child. Later that same day Licensee A was called to the Toddler 1B classroom to talk to the male educator along with a female educator who was covering the classroom. Licensee A said she was told

Educator A was being "rough" with a child. Licensee A denied that educators said the name of the child. Two educators reported that the educator who directly observed this incident was crying "hysterically" when she reported what she saw to Licensee A. Investigators asked Licensee A if she asked for the name of the child involved and/or had someone check to see if the child was okay. Licensee A said she did not but should have. Licensee A said she had the assistant director cover the Toddler 1A classroom and then spoke in the office with Educator A. The licensee told Educator A she was told the educator was being rough with a child at naptime. Licensee A recalled talking to Educator A about her stress level, which may be increased by [redacted] Privacy [redacted], and her need to be "mindful" and ask for help when needed. Licensee A said Educator A was her "usual happy self" and did not present as frustrated. Educator A was not removed from working with children, and the educator who observed the incident was not asked to complete an incident report. Licensee A did not document what had been reported to her and did not ask for the child's identity.

After investigators discussed concerns related to the lack of follow-up, Licensee A said the allegations told to her were that Educator A was being "rough," but she was never told of a specific incident. The female educator who observed the incident and then reported her concerns was said to be crying at the time due to being upset by what she saw. Licensee A said the disclosure was not presented to her in the way reported and commented, "I didn't hear it that way." Licensee A further stated that she would have removed Educator A if the educator was more specific because what was told to her wasn't presented as involving one child adding, "I was told a generalization." Licensee A did speak with the Director the next day and said she told the Director to monitor Educator A's classroom.

Licensee A told investigators that the video surveillance cameras throughout the building do not record audio and do not save video footage. Administrators and educators at the program believed differently. Licensee A said the cameras are only live feed, and the feed is not accessible to anyone as it is used to play on a large screen in the lobby. Following the disclosure about Educator A, Licensee A said she watched the live feed of the Toddler 1A classroom and saw nothing of concern. During this interview Licensee A was asked to share the IT contact information in order for this information to be verified. Investigators were told they did not have an IT contact, but later, as a result of an interview with RD, it was learned they did. In a follow-up email, it was communicated that IT is contracted out and, therefore, not considered a staff member of the program, so the contact information was not provided.

On 4/26/2024, this investigator, [redacted] Statute [redacted] conducted a virtual interview with the RD. She has worked at the program since March of 2021 and was promoted to regional Director in May 2023. On the day of the alleged incident RD said she was at the Marshfield center but did receive a phone call from Licensee A sharing

that Licensee A had met with a male educator who expressed concerns about a "team member" being frustrated with children. RD said she asked Licensee A what the educator meant by that, and Licensee A told her the educator didn't say anything more specific than that. The RD believed the situation was handled by Licensee A, and only after [Statute] contacted the Director did RD become aware of an actual concern. After [Statute] shared the allegations with the Director, she called the RD. The RD said the Director was "frazzled," and it was a "vague" conversation because the Director was "overwhelmed" and kept saying she couldn't believe what was happening. RD denied she was made aware of what child was involved in the intake and did not ask. [Statute]

[Statute]

[Statute]

[Statute]

[Stat]. Child A's parents were not contacted until 4/19/2024. RD said she didn't know what child was involved which was why the parents were not called, however, this investigator sent an email to Director and RD on 4/18/2024 at 10:37 a.m. and within the email Child A was identified. Child A's father called [Statute] after speaking with RD and said she told him Educator A was "accused of something inappropriate" but she had no idea what the allegations were. The RD also sent a letter to parents identifying Educator A by name; she told investigators Licensee A and B told her she could identify the educator. In discussing the miscommunication and lack of following policies and procedures, the RD said she wasn't "directly involved," and she didn't know it was her responsibility because she didn't have all the details. Mandated reporting policies and procedures need to be developed.

This investigator contacted twelve childcare parents. Prior to the intake, most parents had no concerns. In hindsight some instances were now found concerning. Four parents stated their child had, on one occasion, an unexplained mark or bruise. One child was said to have a bruise and a scratch, and educators told the parent they had "no idea" how it happened. One child had a bruise on the leg, which the parent thought may have been sustained during a diaper change due to its location. Educators did not notice the bruise. A parent spoke of an incident in which her child had "three huge gouge marks" across [Privacy]. She immediately noticed the marks at pick up, and when questioned, educators could provide no explanation. The parent said she eventually got an incident report three days later. The parent thought it was odd that when she received the incident report, it had all the information as to the time, location, and cause of injury. It was believed that the form had been fabricated. Parents said initially they weren't overly concerned as their children were toddlers, and developmentally, bumps and bruises were expected. One parent said her child's hand was closed in a door. The program notified the parent, and the parent believed the incident to be accidental, however the parent reported to not receiving a written injury report. One parent said that she did feel Educator A had a "loud voice" but was "shocked" when the program told her about the incident. Two parents commented on having "gut" feelings of "red flags." One explained by saying her child would "freeze" when they entered the classroom. Initially, the parent thought it was normal since the child was likely adjusting to transitions but then noticed at pick-up time that the child's eyes were

red as if from crying. The behavior stopped recently, [Personnel] [Personnel] The second parent shared that her child always cried when dropped off and would only go to Educator B. The parent said there was a lot of yelling by Educator A and felt the classroom environment was not "warm and cozy." Another parent commented that Educators A and B were not affectionate in their interactions.

Several parents spoke of the lack of consistent communication, stating that the daily child information about diapering, nap, and eating was sent on an app, but often the information was incomplete and/or did not appear accurate. One parent shared that on one occasion, the app said her child finished all their lunch, but at pick up, it was noticed that the food had not been touched. Two parents said their children were "starving" and thirsty almost every day at pick-up time. Parents who also had preschool children enrolled said the portion size for preschoolers was insufficient. One parent felt educators did not offer water to the toddlers regularly and often noticed the child's water bottle was still full at pick up, but the child would gulp liquids in the car ride home as if they hadn't had any during the day. One parent reported that her child's diaper often was not changed towards the end of the day, and on one occasion, the diaper was full of feces at pick up, and when the parent got home and cleaned the child, the feces was hardened. The parent believed the child sat in a soiled diaper for an extended period of time. A parent said that one day, she picked her child up early, before naptime. The children were observed sitting on the rug for what she felt was a long period of time while the educators set up cots. The parent commented that the children looked unhappy.

Parents questioned this investigator about the program's surveillance cameras. Upon enrollment, many parents believed the purpose of the cameras was to record video, which could then be saved for review should an administrator need to look at something. Parents were confused as to why the program has live feed only, which only plays in the center's lobby, which most parents only see at drop off and pick up. This investigator explained that surveillance cameras were not mandated by state regulations and referred them to the program administration to answer further questions.

The following documentation was reviewed:

Child's Enrollment Record - [Privacy] record was found to be compliant with regulatory requirements.

Personnel File - Educator A was hired on 6/6/2022 [Statute] [Personnel] The most recent observation was made on 2/26/2024. [Personnel] the educator's training was current.

Attendance Log—The classroom attendance notes that Child A arrived at 7:52 a.m. and departed at 3:04 p.m. on 4/2/2024. Nine children were present that day.

Staff Schedule - The schedule identifies sufficient staffing scheduled for 4/2/2024.

Staff Statements - Written statements were provided.

Licensee A wrote that she had met with a male educator on the day of the incident, and he mentioned a concern about Educator A being a "little rough" recently with the children. Licensee A then monitored the live feed footage and made visits to Educator A's classroom. She received a call during nap asking for her to go to the toddler room. A female educator, according to the statement, ". . .proceeded to state she had witnessed (Educator A) through the window being rough with children during naptime trying to get children back on their cots to go to sleep. Licensee A then spoke with Educator A to check in on her frustration level, but the educator reported feeling fine and would be more "mindful" of her actions. On 4/17/2024, the Director called Licensee A, [redacted] Statute. The licensee spoke with Educator A's co-educator, who denied witnessing anything she considered abusive but did report, ". . . sometimes (Educator A) raised her voice and got a little grabby when she was stressed." Licensee B's statement notes she participated in a follow-up conversation with a male educator, and both licensees assured him his concerns were being taken seriously and administrators would continue to monitor the situation.

Director's statement notes that on the day after the incident, Licensee A contacted her and said there were reported concerns about Educator A and asked her to monitor the classroom. [redacted] Statute
[redacted] Statute
[redacted] Statute. After, I asked what the next steps were, he told me, he was going to "push it through" and that someone on the south shore was going to be in contact with us shortly." [redacted] Statute
[redacted] Statute. The Director told investigators she didn't document the conversation.) The Director wrote that she immediately called the RD to ". . . let her know of the situation."

The RD first wrote a statement that was similar to a reference and noted that Educator A was a ". . . very nurturing, positive, and patient teacher who follows our company policies and procedures." The RD sent an updated statement following the EEC [redacted] Statute interview. She was not at the program on the day of the incident but was contacted by Licensee A and told two educators who expressed concerns about Educator A. The RD wrote that Licensee A made no mention of any involved child. On 4/17/2024, the Director contacted RD [redacted] Statute. The RD wrote, "(Director) seemed very frazzled [redacted] Statute
[redacted] Statute
[redacted] Statute According to the statement, the RD notes that "to

the best of my knowledge" Director and Licensee A informed the EEC Licensor adding, ". . .we have never gone through something like this within our program."

Investigators did not get a written statement from the assistant director, but she said she had one when interviewed. Her statement is dated 4/2/2024 and notes that during most of the day, she covered breaks, but later in the day, Licensee A asked to speak with her and asked if "anything concerning" had happened in the Toddler 1A classroom. The assistant director replied that she had not covered breaks in that classroom, and then Licensee A told her she received a report from an educator that Educator A had aggressively put a child on **Priv** cot. Licensee A told the assistant director she planned to monitor the classroom.

Personnel Policies - Page 27 of the employee handbook notes that educators are responsible for notifying the Director and the ". . . local Child Protective Agency. . ." if there is suspicion that a child is being abused or neglected. It further reads, "Follow the guidelines you will learn in the Child Abuse Recognition and Prevention training course when making your report." The policy does not include the procedure for removing an educator from direct care, contacting the child's parent/guardian, or compensation for educators while on leave.

Statute

Technical Assistance Items

Non-compliances:

See attached Outstanding Compliance Issues report.

Investigation Leader

Christine Santone

Investigations Manager

Angela Peevy

Redaction Log

Total Number of Redactions in Document: 91

Redaction Reasons by Page

Page	Reason	Description	Occurrences
1	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	3
1	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	5
2	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	8
2	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	2
3	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	4
3	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	7
4	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	3
4	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	6
5	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	2

Redaction Log

Page	Reason	Description	Occurrences
5	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	5
6	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	8
6	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	1
7	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	10
7	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	3
7	Personnel	Certain personnel information have been redacted as is required by law. See G.L. c. 4, §7. Cl. 26(c).	2
8	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	3
9	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	1
9	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	1
10	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	4

Redaction Log

Page	Reason	Description	Occurrences
10	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	1
11	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	1
11	Personnel	Certain personnel information have been redacted as is required by law. See G.L. c. 4, §7. Cl. 26(c).	2
11	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	1
12	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	6
13	Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in the programs, the children's parents, and complainants, See G.L. c 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	1
13	Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	1

Redaction Log

Redaction Reasons by Exemption

Reason	Description	Pages (Count)
Personnel	Certain personnel information have been redacted as is required by law. See G.L. c. 4, §7. Cl. 26(c).	7(2) 11(2)
Privacy	Information has been redacted since it is not public information. That is information that relates to a third party that may involve an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, such as identities and ages of children enrolled in programs, the children's parents, and complainants. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(c), the privacy exemption.	1(5) 2(2) 3(4) 4(6) 5(5) 6(8) 7(10) 8(3) 9(1) 10(1) 11(1) 13(1)
Statute	Information exempted from disclosure by statute. See G.L. c. 4, §7, cl. 26(a); G.L. c. 119, § 51E; G. L. c. 6, § 167.	1(3) 2(8) 3(7) 4(3) 5(2) 6(1) 7(3) 9(1) 10(4) 12(6) 13(1) 11(1)