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During the 2019-2020 school year, North Brookfield 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 except the districts that repeat as Tier 4 for three consecutive years. These districts’ ELE programs are reviewed every 3 years until such time they are no longer Tier 4.

There are 13 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 17: Program Evaluation

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/Self-Directed Improvement: Data points indicate no concern on compliance and performance outcomes – meets requirements.
* Tier 2/Directed Self-Improvement: 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/Corrective Action: Areas of concern include both compliance and student outcomes – moderate risk.
* Tier 4/Cross-unit Support and Corrective Action: 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

**Report: For Tier 1 & 2 Tiered Focused Monitoring Reviews**

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, all districts in Tiers 1 and 2, as part of the reporting process, will 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**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Commendable** | Any requirement or aspect of a requirement implemented in an exemplary manner significantly beyond the requirements of law or regulation. |
|  |  |
| **Implemented** | The requirement is substantially met in all important aspects. |
|  |  |
| **Implementation in Progress** | This rating is used for criteria containing new or updated legal requirements 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 go to: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/cpr/>

North Brookfield

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **English Learner Education Requirements** |
| **IMPLEMENTED** | ELE 1, ELE 2, ELE 6, ELE 7, ELE 8, ELE 14, ELE 15 |
| **PARTIALLY****IMPLEMENTED** | ELE 3, ELE 5, ELE 10, ELE 18 |
| **NOT IMPLEMENTED** | ELE 13 |
| **IMPLEMENTATION IN PROGRESS** | ELE 17 |

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 3 - Initial Identification of ELs and FELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Interviews and documentation indicated that the district uses the WIDA Screener for pre-K students for initial assessment of potential English learners although it is not a test approved for PreK level. Additionally, the submitted student roster and records do not identify the students' English proficiency levels. Furthermore, the Home Language Survey administered to parents upon registration does not include all the required questions and is not translated in other languages for parents whose preferred language is not English. The Department concludes that the district does not properly identify students who need English language support and the current initial identification procedures and practices are not in compliance with 603 CMR 14.02(1) that requires districts and charter schools to establish procedures in accordance with the Department guidelines. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** When determining whether a school district's ELE program complies with federal and state laws and regulations, the Department applies the three-pronged test established by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in Castañeda bv. Pickard. Castañeda's Three-Pronged Test is a tool developed by the Department for this purpose and is used to evaluate the adequacy of a district's program for ELs. Since the documentation submitted by the district did not include Castañeda's Three-Pronged Test there is no indication that ELE services provided by the district reflect a sound educational approach recognized as a legitimate educational strategy to teach ELs English language skills in the four language domains: speaking, listening, reading and writing.Documentation also indicated that the district has not adopted procedures to identify English learners who do not meet English proficiency benchmarks and has not established a process for the district to: (i) identify areas in which identified English learners needs improvement and establish personalized goals for the identified English learners to attain English proficiency; (ii) assess and track the progress of English learners in the identified areas of improvement; (iii) review resources and services available to identified English learners that may assist said learners in the identified areas of improvement; and (iv) incorporate input from the parents or legal guardian of the identified English learner as required under M.G.L. c. 71A, § 11. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 10 - Parental Notification |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documents indicate that the district sends notification letters to the parents or guardians of all ELs to inform them about the students' program placement, parental rights and other ELE program related information as required in 603 CMR 14.02. However, the letters do not provide all information required by state and federal laws, such as available programs, including opt-out, or specific exit requirements for the program. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 13 - Follow-up Support |
| **Rating:** Not Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Interviews and a review of documentation submitted indicate that there are no formal monitoring procedures in place to indicate whether language or academic deficits may exist for students who have been exited from the ELE program. The district's current monitoring procedures are not in compliance with Title VI or the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 and Every Students Success Act that require districts to monitor students classified as Former English learners (FELs) for four years. |

| **Improvement Area 5** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 17 - Program Evaluation |
| **Rating:** Implementation In Progress |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** The district did not have English learners before the SY 2019-20. Therefore, the district must initiate periodic evaluations of the effectiveness of its ELE program in developing students' English language skills and increasing their ability to participate meaningfully in the educational program. |

| **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. |