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During the 2019-2020 school year, Westwood 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/>
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**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **English Learner Education Requirements** |
| **IMPLEMENTED** | ELE 2, ELE 3, ELE 5, ELE 6, ELE 7, ELE 8, ELE 10, ELE 13, ELE 14, ELE 15, ELE 17, ELE 18 |
| **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 2.0 for ELLs participation rate, as shown in the state database, revealed that the district's participation for Access was 77% and not the required minimum of 95%. |