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During the 2022-2023 school year, Somerset and Somerset-Berkley Regional School Districts participated in a Tiered Focused Monitoring Review conducted by the Department’s Office of Language Acquisition (OLA). The purpose of the Tiered Focused Monitoring Review is to monitor compliance with regulatory requirements focusing on English Learner Education.

District/charter schools are reviewed every six years through Tiered Focused Monitoring. There are 12 ELE criteria that target implementation of the requirements related to ELE programs under state and federal law and regulations:

ELE 1: Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

ELE 2: State Accountability Assessment

ELE 3: Initial Identification of ELs and FELs

ELE 5: ELE Program and Services

ELE 6: Program Exit and Readiness

ELE 7: Parent Involvement

ELE 8: Declining Entry to a Program

ELE 10: Parental Notification

ELE 13: Fallow-up Support

ELE 14: Licensure Requirements

ELE 15: Professional Development Requirements

ELE 18: Records of ELs

Tiered Focused Monitoring allows for differentiated monitoring based on a district’s level of need, the Tiers are defined as follows:

Districts in Tiers 1 and 2 have been determined to have no or low risk:

* Tier 1: Data points indicate no concern on compliance and performance outcomes – meets requirements.
* Tier 2: No demonstrated risk in areas with close link to student outcomes – low risk.

Districts in Tiers 3 and 4 have demonstrated greater risk:

* Tier 3: Areas of concern include both compliance and student outcomes – moderate risk.
* Tier 4: Areas of concern have profound effect on student outcomes and ongoing compliance – high risk.

The monitoring process differs depending on the tier assigned to the district as well as the district’s previous tier assignment.

The review process includes the following:

1. Self-Assessment
* District reviews English Learner Education documentation for required elements including document uploads.
* District reviews a sample of English learner (EL) student records selected across grade levels and EL focus areas such as opt-out students, former ELs and students and/or parents who need translation and/or interpretation.
* Upon completion of these two internal reviews, the district’s self-assessment is submitted to the Department for review.
1. Verification
* Review of EL student records: The Department may select a sample of student records and request certain documentation to be uploaded to the WBMS as evidence of implementation of the ELE criteria.
* Review of additional documents for English Learner Education
* Surveys of parents of ELs: Parents of ELs are sent a survey that solicits information regarding their experiences with the district’s implementation of English Learner Education program(s), related services, and procedural requirements.
* Interviews of staff
* Classroom observations as applicable
* Parent and student focus groups as applicable

**Report:**

Within approximately 20 business days of the onsite visit, the onsite chairperson will forward to the superintendent or charter school leader the findings from the Tiered Focused Monitoring Review. Within 10 business days of receipt of the findings, the district reviews and comments on the findings for factual accuracy before they are finalized. After the report is finalized, districts develop a Continuous Improvement and Monitoring Plan (CIMP) for any criteria receiving a rating of "Partially Implemented," "Not Implemented," and “Implementation in Progress.” The CIMP outlines an action plan, identifies the success metric, describes the measurement mechanism and provides a completion timeframe to bring those areas into compliance with the controlling statute or regulation. District and charter schools are expected to incorporate the CIMP actions into their district and school improvement plans, including their professional development plans.

# **DEFINITION OF COMPLIANCE RATINGS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Implemented** | The requirement is substantially met in all important aspects. |
|  |  |
| **Implementation in Progress** | This rating is used for criteria containing new or updated legal requirements and means that the district has implemented any old requirements contained in the criterion and is training staff or beginning to implement the new requirements in such a way that the onsite team anticipates that the new requirements will be implemented by the end of the school year. |
|  |
| **Partially Implemented** | The requirement, in one or several important aspects, is not entirely met. |
|  |
| **Not Implemented** | The requirement is totally or substantially not met. |
| **Not Applicable**  | The requirement does not apply to the school district or charter school. |

For more information on the Tiered Focused Monitoring approach, please visit the Department’s [website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/cpr/default.html).
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**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **English Learner Education Requirements** |
| **IMPLEMENTED** | ELE 1, ELE 2, ELE 3, ELE 6, ELE 8, ELE 15 |
| **PARTIALLY****IMPLEMENTED** | ELE 5, ELE 7, ELE 10, ELE 13, ELE 14, ELE 18 |

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Interviews, documentation, and a review of student records indicate that the district lacks the ESL staffing capacity to effectively provide essential components of an effective ELE program, such as providing time for ESL collaboration with content teachers to identify language objectives and student needs. Documentation also indicates that the district has adopted procedures to identify English learners who do not meet English proficiency benchmarks and has established procedures for the district to identify areas in which identified English learners needs improvement, establish personalized goals for the identified English learners to attain English proficiency, review resources and services available to identified English learners that may assist said learners in the identified areas of improvement and incorporate input from the parents or legal guardian of the identified English learner; however, the district has not ensured all staff are trained in and implement these processes in their daily instruction and additionally the district has not established a process to assess and track the progress of English learners in the identified areas of improvement as required under M.G.L. c. 71A, § 11.Interviews and a review of documentation also indicate that the district does not consistently support an ESL curriculum across all grades and English proficiency levels.  |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 7 - Parent Involvement |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of district documentation indicates that it provides translations and interpreters through contracted services: however, student records submitted by the district indicates that translations are not always provided for parents who have requested documents in languages other than English. Additionally, even though report cards are available in Spanish, they are not translated for the languages of those parents who require translated documents. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 10 - Parental Notification |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Interviews and review of documentation indicates that the district does not include the program information letter when students enroll. The district's current parent notification practices are not consistent with Department guidelines consistent with 603 CMR 14.02 § 6. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 13 - Follow-up Support |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documentation submitted indicates that at the high school there are no formal monitoring mechanisms in place to indicate whether language or academic deficits may exist for students who have been exited from the ELE program and provide support to those students, if needed. |

| **Improvement Area 5** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 14 - Licensure Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Staff interviews and the relevant SEI Endorsement data indicated that most core academic teachers assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to English learners hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement, but some do not. |

| **Improvement Area 6** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 18 - Records of ELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of the documents requested from the district indicated that the district does not consistently keep all the required documents in students' EL records, especially at the secondary level. |