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**MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION**

**TIERED FOCUS MONITORING REPORT**

**Boston Green Academy Horace Mann Charter School (District)**

**SCOPE OF TIER FOCUSED MONITORING REVIEWS**

As one part of its accountability system, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education oversees local compliance with education requirements through Tiered Focused Monitoring (TFM). All reviews cover selected requirements in the following areas:

**Federal:**

(**Note**: “*U.S.C.” refers to the United States Code)*

**Title VI: *Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964***

Prohibits discrimination, exclusion from participation, and denial of benefits based on race, color or national origin in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance. Title VI is codified at 42 U.S.C. 2000d *et seq.*; regulations have been promulgated in the Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) at 34 C.F.R. Part 100.

**EEOA: *the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974***

Prohibits the denial of equal educational opportunity to English learners in public schools on account of national origin, by the failure “to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation …in its instructional programs.” See 20 U.S.C. 1703(f)*.* (The EEOA also prohibits the denial of equal educational opportunity based on race, color, or sex.)

**ESEA: *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965***

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) was reauthorized through the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA). ESEA governs elementary and secondary education. It is codified at 20 USC 6301 *et seq.*

**Massachusetts:**

(**Note:** *Most Massachusetts education statutes are available at* [*http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/statelaws.html*](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/statelaws.html). *Legislation that has been filed may be found at* [*https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/Search*](https://malegislature.gov/Laws/GeneralLaws/Search) *. Department of Elementary and Secondary Education regulations are available at* [*http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/stateregs.html*](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/stateregs.html)*.)*

**G.L. c. 69: *Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 69***

Establishes the powers and duties of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

**G.L. c. 71A: *Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 71A***

Governs the education of ELs. Regulations have been promulgated under it at 603 CMR 14.00.

**G.L. c. 71B: *Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 71B***

Governs the education of students with disabilities. State special education regulations are at 603 CMR 28.00.

**G.L. c. 76: *Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 76***

Governs school attendance and various other school-related matters. Section 5 prohibits discrimination in all public schools on the basis of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, or sexual orientation. See also Access to Equal Educational Opportunities Regulations: 603 CMR 26.00.

**St. 2002, c. 218: *Chapter 218 of the Massachusetts Acts of 2002***

Section 24 requires each school district to have at least one teacher licensed in ESL, TBE, or ELL. (See Implementation Guidance under ELE14.) In districts of 200 or more ELs, any person appointed as director of an ELE program must be licensed in ESL or bilingual education, or hold such other license required by law for such other ELE program.

**TIERED FOCUSED MONITORING ELEMENTS**

**Team:** Depending upon the size of a school district and the number of programs to be reviewed, a team of one to eight Department staff members conducts onsite activities over one to five days in a school district or charter school (district).

**Timing:** Each school district in the Commonwealth is scheduled to receive a Tiered Focused Monitoring Review every six years except the districts and charter schools 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. The statewide Tiered Focused Monitoring cycle is posted at <<<http://www.doe.mass.edu/psm/tfm/6yrcycle.html?district=all>>>.

**Tier Level:** Each district is assigned to one of four tier levels: Tier 1/Self-Directed Improvement; Tier 2/Directed Self-Improvement; Tier 3/Corrective Action; and Tier 4/Cross-unit Support and Corrective Action. The Tiered Focused Monitoring process and subsequent technical assistance varies by monitoring tier. Each district is assigned to a monitoring tier based on a risk assessment. The risk assessment will identify the potential for which districts may need support in improving outcomes for English learners (ELs). The risk assessment is based on the districts’ results on the ESE Accountability measure of progress towards achieving English language proficiency and other relevant data. Districts in Tiers 1 and 2 have been determined to have no or low risk. Districts in Tiers 3 and 4 have demonstrated greater risk. Agency intervention, additional onsite monitoring, and provision of technical assistance varies based on districts’ tier level, allowing the Department to direct resources to those districts requiring the most support.

1. Tier 1/Self-Directed Improvement: Data points indicate no concern on compliance and performance outcomes – meets requirements.
2. Tier 2/Directed Self-Improvement: No demonstrated risk in areas with close link to student outcomes – low risk.
3. Tier 3/Corrective Action: Areas of concern include both compliance and student outcomes – moderate risk.
4. Tier 4/Cross-unit Support and Corrective Action: Areas of concern have a profound effect on student outcomes and ongoing compliance – high risk.

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

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: Follow-up Support

ELE 14: Licensure Requirements

ELE 15: Professional Development Requirements

ELE 17: Program Evaluation

ELE 18: Records of ELs

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, parents and community members as applicable

**Report:** **For Tier 3 & 4 Tiered Focused Monitoring Reviews**

At the end of the onsite visit, the onsite team holds an informal exit meeting to summarize its comments for the superintendent or charter school leader and anyone else he or she chooses. Within approximately 45 business days of the onsite visit, the onsite chairperson forwards to the superintendent or charter school leader a Draft Report containing comments from the Tiered Focused Monitoring Review. The Draft Report comments for English Learner Education program are provided to the district/school on-line through the Web-based Monitoring System (WBMS). Within10 business days of receipt of the Draft Report, the district/charter school reviews and comments on the report for factual accuracy before the publication of a Final Report with ratings and findings (see below). The Tiered Focused Monitoring Final Report will be issued within approximately 60 business days of the conclusion of the onsite visit and posted on the Department’s website at <<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/cpr/>>.

**Content of Final Report:**

*Ratings.* In the Final Report, the onsite team gives a rating for each compliance criterion it has reviewed; those ratings are “Commendable,” “Implemented,” “Implementation in Progress,” “Partially Implemented,” “Not Implemented,” and “Not Applicable”.

*Findings.* The onsite team includes a finding in the Final Report for each criterion that it rates “Commendable,” “Partially Implemented,” “Not Implemented,” or “Implementation in Progress,” explaining the basis for the rating.

**Response:** Where criteria are found “Partially Implemented” or “Not Implemented,” the district or charter school must propose corrective action to bring those areas into compliance with the relevant statutes and regulations. This corrective action plan (CAP) will be due to the Department within 20 business days after the issuance of the Final Report and is subject to the Department’s review and approval. Department staff will offer districts and charter schools technical assistance on the content and requirements for developing an approvable CAP.

Department staff will also provide ongoing technical assistance as the school or district is implementing the approved corrective action plan. **Districts and must demonstrate effective resolution of noncompliance identified by the Department as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from the issuance of the Department’s Final Tiered Focused Monitoring Report.**

# **INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL REPORT**

# 

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education conducted a Tiered Focused Monitoring Review in Boston Green Academy Horace Mann Charter School (District) during the week of November 18, 2019 to evaluate the implementation of English Learner Education and other related general education requirements. The team appreciated the opportunity to interview staff and parents, to observe classroom facilities and to review the programs underway in the district.

The Department is submitting the following Tiered Focused Monitoring Report containing findings made pursuant to this onsite visit. In preparing this report, the team reviewed student records, extensive written documentation regarding the operation of the district's programs, together with information gathered by means of the following Department program review methods:

Interviews of:

* Administrative staff
* Teaching and support services staff (as applicable)
* English Learner Education parent advisory council representative(s) (as applicable)
* Persons from the general public (as applicable)

Surveys:

* Parents of English learners

The report includes findings in the program areas reviewed based on the ELE criteria below:

**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**

|  |
| --- |
| The Tiered Focused Monitoring Report includes those criteria that were found by the team to be implemented in a “Commendable” manner, as well as criteria receiving a rating of "Partially Implemented," "Not Implemented," and “Implementation in Progress.” (Refer to the “Definition of Compliance Ratings” section of the report.) The Tiered Focused Monitoring Reports do not include criteria receiving a rating of “Implemented” or “Not Applicable.” This will allow the district/school and the Department to focus their efforts on those areas requiring corrective action. Districts are expected to incorporate the corrective actions into their district and school improvement plans, including their professional development plans. |

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

Boston Green Academy Horace Mann Charter School (District)

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT**

The Department reviewed extensive written documentation regarding the operation of the district's ELE program(s), together with information gathered by staff interviews, a review of documentation from student records and parent surveys. This report includes those criteria that were found by the team to be implemented in a “Commendable” manner, as well as criteria receiving a rating of "Partially Implemented," "Not Implemented," or “Implementation in Progress.” (Refer to the “Definition of Compliance Ratings” section of the report.)

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | **ENGLISH LEARNER EDUCATION**  **LEGAL STANDARDS,**  **COMPLIANCE RATINGS AND**  **FINDINGS** | |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | **I. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 1Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment | 1. The district annually assesses the English proficiency of all ELs. 2. The ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is administered to ELs annually in grades K-12 by qualified staff. | | | |
|  | **State Requirements** | | **Federal Requirements** | |
|  | G.L. c. 71A, § 7; 603 CMR 14.02 | | ESEA | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Not Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *A review of ACCESS participation rates as shown in the state database revealed that the district did only assess the English proficiency of 91 % of the ELL students in the district.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | **II. STUDENT IDENTIFICATION AND PROGRAM PLACEMENT** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 5ELE Programs and Services | 1. The district uses assessment data to plan and implement educational programs for students at different instructional levels. 2. Children who are English learners shall be educated through sheltered English immersion or an alternative instructional program that meets the requirements of federal and state law, during a temporary transition period not normally intended to exceed the timelines established by the Department in benchmarks established pursuant to G.L. c. 71A, § 11. Alternative instructional programs include, but are not limited to, transitional bilingual education and dual language education or two-way immersion programs. 3. ELE programs shall be research-based and include subject matter content and an English language acquisition component. 4. The district only groups ELs of different ages together in instructional settings if their levels of English proficiency are similar. 5. The district’s grouping of students ensures that ELs receive effective content instruction at appropriate academic levels and that ESL instruction is provided at the appropriate proficiency level. ESL instruction should be aligned to the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and must integrate components of the WIDA English Language Development (ELD) Standards. 6. The evaluation of ELE programs (by the Department) shall include, but shall not be limited to: (i) a review of individual student records of English learners; (ii) a review of the programs and services provided to English learners; (iii) a review of the dropout, graduation, discipline and special education incidence rates of the English learner population in the district; (iv) using the best available data, a review of the dropout, graduation, discipline and special education rates of English learners who exited the English learner education program within the 3 school years preceding the on-site visit for that 3-year period; (v) a description of the processes by which school-based teams, consisting of educators, administrators and support staff, monitor the progress of English learners and former English learners; (vi) a review of the amount, frequency and effectiveness of English as a second language instruction; and (vii) a review of the administration and coordination of English learner education programs. | | | |
|  | **State Requirements** | | **Federal Requirements** | |
|  | G.L. c. 71A, §§ 4, 7A; 603 CMR 14.04 | | Title VI; EEOA | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *The Department conducted an on-site visit to the charter school to evaluate the effectiveness of programs serving English learners as required by G.L. c. 71A, § 7A. and identified compliance issues below:*  *-A review of data as a part of the evaluation of the charter school's ELE program indicated that English learners do not demonstrate sufficient growth in English language acquisition and the ELE program needs improvement to promote and support the rapid acquisition of English language proficiency by ELs.*  *-Documentation and interviews with staff also indicated that the charter school has not adopted procedures to identify English learners who do not meet English proficiency benchmarks and has not established a process for the charter school 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.*  *- The charter school has not conducted 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.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | **III. PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 7Parent Involvement | 1. The district develops ways to include parents or guardians of ELs in matters pertaining to their children's education and ELE programs. 2. A request by a student’s parent or guardian to enroll the student in or transfer the student into a specific English learner education program offered by the school district shall be reviewed by the superintendent or the superintendent’s designee. The school district shall respond to such requests in no more than 20 school days after receipt of the request. 3. If a school district receives requests from the parents or legal guardians of not less than 20 students to implement a specific program to provide language instruction in that school district, the school district shall, not later than 90 days after receiving the request, respond and provide: (i) a plan for implementation of the requested program; or (ii) a denial of the request, in writing, including an explanation of the denial. 4. Each school district serving 100 or more ELs or in which ELs comprise at least five percent of the student population, whichever is less, shall establish an English learner parent advisory council. 5. Each school designated as underperforming or chronically underperforming and operating a program for English learners shall establish an English learner parent advisory council. 6. A school district or school required to establish a parent advisory council shall annually notify parents and guardians of ELs of the opportunity to participate in the council and shall provide the notification in a language the parent or guardian can understand. | | | |
|  | **State Requirements** | | **Federal Requirements** | |
|  | G.L. c. 69, § 1J(x); G.L. c. 71A, §§ 5, 6A, 12; 603 CMR 14.04 and 14.09 | | Title VI; EEOA; ESEA | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Partially Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *Interviews and documentation indicated that the district does not have an English Learner Parent Advisory Council as required in M.G.L. c. 71A, § 6A.* |

| **CRITERION**  **NUMBER** | **VI. PROGRAM PLAN AND EVALUATION** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Legal Standard** | | | |
| ELE 17Program Evaluation | The district conducts 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.  Where the district documents that the program is not effective, it takes steps to make appropriate program adjustments or changes that are responsive to the outcomes of the program evaluation. | | | |
|  | **State Requirements** | | **Federal Requirements** | |
|  |  | | Title VI; EEOA; ESEA | |
|  | **Rating:** | **Not Implemented** | **District Response Required:** | **Yes** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Findings:** |
| *Please, see ELE 5.* |