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During the 2022-2023 school year, Phoenix Academy Public Charter High School Springfield (District) 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).

Phoenix Academy Public Charter High School Springfield (District)

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 1 - Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment |
| **Rating:** Not Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of ACCESS participation rates as shown in the state database revealed that the district did only assess the English proficiency of 24 % of the English learners in the district. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** The Department conducted a TFM review to evaluate the effectiveness of programs serving English learners as required by G.L. c. 71A, § 7A. A review of data as a part of the evaluation of the district'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 indicated 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. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 14 - Licensure Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Staff interviews and the relevant SEI Endorsement data indicated that some core academic teachers assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to English learners hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement, but some do not. Similarly, the administrator assigned to supervise or evaluate core academic teachers who provide sheltered English instruction to English learners does not hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement or the SEI Administrator Endorsement. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 15 - Professional Development Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documentation reveals that district professional development plans do not include district level activities for teachers to earn 15 PDPs related to SEI, English as a Second Language or Bilingual Education in order to be eligible to renew their licenses. The Department concludes that this practice is not in compliance with 603 CMR 44.06(1) which requires districts to develop a professional development plan and provide training for teachers in second language acquisition techniques for the re-certification of teachers and administrators. |