

**Wareham**

**Tiered Focused Monitoring Report**

**Onsite Dates:** **June 7-11, 2021**

**Date of Final Report:** **07/01/2021**



Jeffrey C. Riley

Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

During the 2020-2021 school year, Wareham 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 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: [*https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/cpr/*](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/cpr/)
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**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 2 - State Accountability Assessment |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Documentation and interviews indicated that the district does not have policies and procedures that ensure that bilingual dictionaries and accommodations available for English learners who require them during MCAS testing. As a result, students do not have equal access to state testing as required under General Law chapters 69 and 71A that ELs participate in the annual administration of the MCAS exam as required and in accordance with Department guidelines. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 3 - Initial Identification of ELs and FELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Documentation, interviews, and student records indicate that the district uses outdated procedures and documents, such as the Home Language Survey to identify potential English learners and Former English Learners. Furthermore, documentation indicates that the Home Language Survey is not available in languages other than 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 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** The Department conducted the tiered focused monitoring review to evaluate the effectiveness of programs serving English learners as required by M.G.L. c. 71A, § 7A. Interviews and a review of documentation indicated that the district does not have an ESL curriculum that is integral to an effective ELE program in which ELs of all grade and proficiency levels become English proficient at a rapid pace.  Documentation and staff interviews also indicated that the district 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.  Further documentation revealed that the district has not adopted consistent 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. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 7 - Parent Involvement |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Submitted documentation indicates that translations are not always provided for parents who have requested documents in languages other than English and the district does not always provide translated report cards or progress reports.  Therefore, the Department has determined that the district does not always provide effective language assistance to parents whose preferred language is not English and therefore, does not always meet the obligation to communicate effectively with parents to include them in matters pertaining to their children's education. |

| **Improvement Area 5** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 10 - Parental Notification |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Documentation and student records indicate that the district does not consistently send initial and annual notification letters to parents to inform them of their child's placement in an ELE program and other required information that needs to be communicated to parents annually. Therefore, the district does not always meet the obligation to communicate effectively with parents to include them in matters pertaining to their children’s education. |

| **Improvement Area 6** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 13 - Follow-up Support |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of submitted documentation indicated that although some monitoring exists for FELs, there are no formal monitoring mechanisms or tools in place to indicate whether language or academic deficits may exist for students who have been exited from the ELE program. |

| **Improvement Area 7** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 18 - Records of ELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Student records and interviews indicated that the district does not have policies and procedures to maintain and regularly monitor English learner and Former English learner student files. As a result, student records do not provide accurate documentation as required under Title VI; EEOA; MA General Laws chapters 69, § 1I; c. 71A, §§ 5, 12, 603 CMR 14.02, 14.04. |