

**Michigan Department of Education**  
**2015-2016 Title III Program/District**  
**Review of Monitoring Indicators**

**Self-Assessment Checklist**

**School District: Richfield Public School Academy**

**Address: 3807 N. Center Road Flint, Michigan 48506**

**Telephone: (810) 736-1281**

**Name of Person Authorized to Complete this Report: Ms. Lauren Zion**

**Date: June 28, 2016**



## District Rating Guidelines

These guidelines have been developed to provide a set of indicators that constitute a high, moderate or low rating. To receive a particular rating, a district should have a majority of the indicators for that category in place.

### **H (HIGH) = present to a high degree/well developed**

- Process is fully in place
- School community is well informed
- Process to improve is focused
- Is part of the school culture
- Consistently guides program decision making
- Analysis of student performance measures is consistently used to make program decisions
- **Where appropriate**, high quality products are used
- Could serve as a model for best practice

### **M (MODERATE) = present to moderate degree/progressing**

- Process is in various stages of implementation
- School community is somewhat informed
- Process to improve may lack focus or be limited in scope
- Is becoming part of the school culture
- May guide program decision making
- Analysis of student performance measures is rarely used to make program decisions
- Products exist but are unused

### **L (LOW) = present minimally/in early stages**

- Process is in the beginning stages
- School community is inadequately informed
- Process to improve is primarily in development and yet to be applied
- Unrelated to program decision making
- Analysis of student performance measures is rarely used to make program decisions
- Products exist but are unused

### **CR (CHANGE REQUIRED) = required indicator**

## Program/District Review of Monitoring Indicators Self-Assessment Checklist

H = High      M = Moderate      L = Low      CR = Change Required

### ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

Question Regulatory References from ESEA <a href="http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02">www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02</a> and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, <a href="http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm">http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm</a>	Evidence/ Documentation  (District notes on evidence)	Level of Compliance				Actions Taken (or to be taken) to fulfill requirements and/or improve in areas of concern  (MDE/OFS notes)
		H	M	L	CR	
1. Does the district ensure that a plan for use of Title III funds has been submitted? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3116(a)-(d)]</i>	Title III application  District Improvement Plan (DIP) with EL subgroups specific goals/objectives, strategies and activities/ Title III Consortium Plan  Title III/EL Handbook that addresses any other program components not included in the DIP/Consortium Plan	x				
2. Does the district's educational program design include provisions for ELs to meet state academic content and performance standards required of all students? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3116]</i>	ALP Service Chart and Plan toward HQ requirement	x				
3. Does the district have procedures to determine the effectiveness of programs and activities in assisting ELs in achieving State content standards and attaining English language proficiency? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3121]</i>	Evaluation Procedures  EL Program Evaluation – Summary and Implications  Self-assessment	x				
4. Is the application for Title III funds on file at the district office? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3116(a)]</i>	Title III application	x				

<p>5. If the LEA has been awarded a Title III subgrant of less than \$10,000, does the LEA ensure that it has entered into a consortium agreement with one or more other LEAs to be eligible to receive Title III, Part A funds? [ESEA Sec. 3114(b)]</p>	<p>Title III consortium application &amp; plan</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p>6. Does the district maintain separate fiscal records for Title III? [ESEA Sec. 1120A(a)]</p>	<p>Invoicing is evidence that the district pays for the Highly Qualified ESL Staff and EL Facilitators (GISD) out of the general fund. The district does not receive TIII funds from the state.</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p>7. Does the district spend no more than 2 percent of the Title III subgrant funds for administrative and indirect costs? [ESEA Sec. 3115(b)]</p>	<p>Title III application</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p>8. What funds does the district use to pay for the costs of administration, scoring and reporting of the English Language Proficiency Assessment (WIDA) and the WIDA screener? [ESEA Sec. 1111(b)(7) and 3113(b)(2)]</p>	<p>Invoicing is evidence that WIDA related expenses (HQ staff and EL Facilitators who administer W-APT screeners) are paid out of the General Fund; it is included in our district wide Student Assessment accounting.</p>	<p>X</p>				

<p>9. Does the district comply with the supplement, not supplant provision of Title III, Part A? How has the district demonstrated that services provided with Title III funds are in addition to services that students would otherwise receive from State, local and other Federal funds? How has the district demonstrated that it is not using Title III funds to provide services that it provided in the prior year with State, local or other Federal funds? [ESEA Sec. 3115(g); 1120A and 9021]</p>	<p>Audit is evidence that we have no revenue and do not use TIII funds; We only receive services.</p> <p>There are no district costs for substitute teachers</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p>10. Has the district submitted all required reports to the MDE? [ESEA Sec. 3116(a)]</p>		<p>X</p>				
<p>11. Does the district maintain appropriate Title III records in a central location? Central administration files should include correspondence, documentation for identifying ELs, program placement decisions, parental involvement and other information related to implementation of the program. [ESEA Sec. 3116]</p>	<p>Information (i.e. <i>Eligibility Documents, Translation line communication in writing, Goal Planning Accommodation Forms, EL Coordinator involvement in IEPs</i>) is housed in students LEA ESL File with the EL Coordinator and Assessment and Eligibility Documents are housed in students' CA60s in the main office.</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p>12. Does the district have evidence that procedures are in place to monitor students who have exited the program for at least two years after their exit notification? [ESEA Sec. 3121(a)(4)]</p>	<p>All students are tested with NWEA at the start, middle and end of the year which can be viewed by all district staff.</p> <p>End of year Program Evaluation Eligibility/FEL documents</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p>13. Does the district have processes in place to annually measure the English proficiency of ELs? [ESEA Sec. 3116(b)(3)(C)]</p>	<p>WIDA Participation AIMS Writing and Reading assessments</p>		<p>X</p>			<p>Not all students on our Accountable Student List were tested during the 2015-2016 academic year, due to a clerical error ("as of" date in MSDS was incorrect) The MSDS person and EL Coordinator will attend the Special Populations Conference in Fall of 2016 to attain more training in MSDS and check our participation count</p>

						to ensure students we thought were exited properly are not erroneously re-entered into the program due to a clerical error and not WIDA tested. The 9 students who did not test will be screened in the fall by our GISD Liason.
14. Does the district have a clear process for handling complaints related to services to ELs? Does the district annually disseminate to parents and private school officials, free of charge, information clearly describing the district's complaint procedures in a language that parents of EL students can understand? <i>[Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - OCR Guidelines]</i>	Start of Year Parent Eligibility Packet includes Complaint Procedure in both Spanish and English.  Parent Surveys (in English and Spanish) collected at events and conferences	X				
15. Does the district have evidence of policies and provision of services on an equitable basis to EL children enrolled in participating private schools? <i>[ESEA Sec. 9501]</i>	Annual notification Participation Nonpub plans	X				

<p>16. Does the district facilitate meaningful and timely consultation with area private schools regarding the participation of EL students, their teachers, or other educational personnel in Title III programming? [ESEA Sec. 9501]</p>	<p>Timeline of district-initiated contact with private school officials</p> <p>Invitations/letters, agendas, sign-ins, minutes from consultation</p> <p>Certification/assurances of attendance in consultation</p> <p>Documentation of all private schools noting their intent to participate or not to participate</p> <p>Record of eligible EL students within each private school</p> <p>Documentation of identification, assessment and determination of student and, as applicable, teacher need</p>	<p>X</p>				
<b>Districts with Immigrant Fund Allocations</b>						
<p>17. Does the district have documentation to support the identification and eligibility determinations of immigrant students? [ESEA Sec. 3301(6)(A-C)]</p>	<p>Language on district enrollment documentation has been updated</p> <p>Language Literacy Background Survey provided in English and Spanish with enrollment documentation.</p>	<p>X</p>				
<p>18. Does the district have an effective plan for implementing allowable activities? [ESEA Sec. 3115(e)(1)]</p>	<p>Description of the plan with the allowable activities designed to meet the needs of immigrant students</p> <p>Procedures in plan to monitor the effectiveness of the plan</p>	<p>X</p>				

## Program/District Review of Monitoring Indicators Self-Assessment Checklist

H = High      M = Moderate      L = Low      CR = Change Required

### STUDENT IDENTIFICATION, PLACEMENT AND EXIT

Question (Regulatory References from ESEA <a href="http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02">www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02</a> and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, <a href="http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm">http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm</a> )	Evidence/ Documentation  (District notes on evidence)	Level of Compliance				Actions Taken (or to be taken) to fulfill requirements and/or improve in areas of concern  (MDE/OFS notes)
		H	M	L	CR	
19. What is the district's process for initial identification and placement of eligible EL students ages 3 to 21? <i>[Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - OCR Guidelines]</i>	Procedure Secretary / Front office packets given to all buildings in the district Enrollment paperwork and Home Language Survey given to students upon enrollment	x				
20. Does the district have a home language survey to identify student's first or home language? Does the district have evidence that every K-12 student has completed home language surveys? <i>[Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - OCR Guidelines]</i>	Included in Enrollment Paperwork  HLS documentation is included in all students' CA-60s upon enrollment	x				



<p>21. Does the district have evidence that all students with home or primary language other than English have been assessed for English proficiency within thirty days at the beginning of the school year or two weeks if enrolled during the school year? [ESEA Sec. 3302 and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - OCR Guidelines]</p>	<p>Enrollment Procuedure: Secretaries notify EL Coordinator who contacts GISD to screen the student and initiate services within the 30/10 day timeline (<i>entrance / exit criteria: 30 days at the start of the year, 10 days after</i>)</p> <p><u>Dates evident in/on:</u> ESL Database maintained by POC Screener/Eligibility Paperwork: kept in students' ESL &amp; CA-60 files</p>	<p>x</p>				
<p>22. Does the district have procedures for determination of language proficiency by trained personnel? Does the district ensure that all eligible EL students receive services? What are the entrance and exit criteria used by the district? [ESEA Sec. 3302 and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - OCR Guidelines]</p>	<p>Enrollment procedure (within the 30/10 day timeline students are screened) and eligibility is determined.</p> <p>Parent packets are immediately sent (copy of letter kept in ESL file)</p> <p>GISD Liason/EL Facilitators are notified &amp; a service start date is chosen and documented on both the LEA &amp; GISD District ESL Database (maintained by both the EL POC and GISD District Liason)</p>		<p>x</p>			<p><b>2015-16 Situation:</b> Due to HLS discrepancies (parents marked No, No in district enrollment documents but previously marked Yes in prior district), we did not find out that 3 students were eligible until an MSDS error appeared, causing us to miss the 30/10 day timeline as set by the state.</p> <p><b>Actions taken to improve:</b> Upon seeing the MSDS warning, the district immediately reviewed previuos CA60 documentation, contacted parents reagrind language background, &amp; contacted the GISD Liason to screen students &amp; ensure participation; students were included in WIDA Assessment participation.</p> <p><b>Future Actions:</b> MSDS LEP Flags will be checked and participation counts will be run to ensure students (previously eligible) will not be missed if parents mistakenly check "No, No" on HLS documentation/enrollment paperwork.</p>
<p>23. Does the district have evidence that their data system (MSDS) updates with limited English proficient (LEP)/EL information timely and accurately? [ESEA Sec. 3114]</p>	<p>SRM Pushes occur when new students enter district</p> <p>Participation Counts are ran to ensure MSDS List matches ESL Database</p>		<p>x</p>			<p><b>Situation in 15-16:</b> 9 students were exited on 6/30/15 (50 met criteria to exit), however an issue arose with an inaccurate "As of" date in MSDS. *The Exit date and certification dates were before the deadline, however the "as of" date caused these students to automatically resume eligible status,</p>

						<p>unknown to LEA until the WIDA Accountable Student List appeared in Spring 2016.</p> <p><u>Actions taken to improve:</u> Students were re-entered into the program due to this inaccuracy of data.</p> <p><u>Future Actions:</u> MSDS personnel and EL POC of district will attend training on MSDS data entry during the Special Populations Conference in Fall 2016. Participation counts will be run more often to check LEA ESL list with Participation count from MSDS.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Program/District Review of Monitoring Indicators Self-Assessment Checklist

H = High      M = Moderate      L = Low      CR = Change Required

### PARENT AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Question (Regulatory References from ESEA <a href="http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02">www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02</a> and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, <a href="http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm">http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm</a> )	Evidence/ Documentation  (District notes on evidence)	Level of Compliance				Actions Taken (or to be taken) to fulfill requirements and/or improve in areas of concern  (MDE/OFS notes)
		H	M	L	CR	
24. Does the district have an effective means of parent outreach to EL parents (programs, activities, training, family literacy)? Does the district have evidence that EL parents are involved stakeholders? Does the district have evidence that there is a means for evaluating and determining the effectiveness of the parent outreach? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3302(e)]</i>	<p>Calendar of events, with dates and topics offered to all students</p> <p>Monthly newsletters provided to all students with announcement of parent activities and opportunities for involvement</p> <p>Translation Procedures &amp; Protocols established and shared with all district staff to ensure an understanding of translating written documents and the Language Line Services for meetings/phone calls.</p> <p>Parent Surveys offered to families in both English and Spanish at all Parent Conferences and most school events (ex: science fair, parent conferences, T1 Carnival) to evaluate of the effectiveness of the outreach</p>		X			<p><u>Future Actions:</u> District needs to maintain better records as evidence for compliance with parent outreach (descriptions of activities, agendas with dates, meeting minutes, handouts, surveys and attendance forms).</p>

<p>25. Does the district have procedures to notify parents promptly (within 30 days after the beginning of the school year or two weeks during the school year after their student enrolls) regarding participation in the EL/Title III program? [ESEA Sec. 3302(a)-(d)]</p>	<p>Parent Packet Procedure: Welcome letter, Eligibility Letter, WIDA Parent Report, School Calendar, LEA &amp; GISD Family Event Flyer, Adult English classes application, Complaint procedure, Language Line availability for communication, etc. sent</p> <p>Evidence of date sent: kept in Database kept by EL POC and GISD Liason</p>	<p>x</p>				
<p>26. Does the district provide parental information in an understandable format and, to the extent possible, in a language that the parent can understand? [Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - OCR Guidelines; ESEA Sec. 3302(a) and 3302(e)]</p>	<p>Language Line (for translation) is offered/used with consistency among all buildings in the district. Information is shared with staff at each parent conferences and at the start of the year. Parent Notice of translation line is sent home in parent packet. Front office packet, field trips announcements are translated.</p> <p><u>Current Evidence:</u> EL Start of the Year PD Documents saved to Staff Drive Email communications throughout the year</p>	<p>x</p>				<p><u>Future Actions:</u> *Language Line Usage Document will be created to provide further evidence of this item (shared with all staff).</p>
<p>27. Does the district have evidence that parents who did not wish language support signed an informed refusal of service? [ESEA Sec. 3302(a)]</p>	<p>ESOL Program Waivers are given to families who request it and are kept in the ESL File and CA-60 (in writing). (Coded as a waiver in MSDS)</p>	<p>x</p>				

## Program/District Review of Monitoring Indicators Self-Assessment Checklist

H = High      M = Moderate      L = Low      CR = Change Required

### INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS AND ASSESSMENT

Question (Regulatory References from ESEA <a href="http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02">www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02</a> and <a href="http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm">Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,</a> <a href="http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm">http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm</a> )	Evidence/ Documentation  (District notes on evidence)	Level of Compliance				Actions Taken (or to be taken) to fulfill requirements and/or improve in areas of concern  (MDE/OFS notes)
		H	M	L	CR	
28. Does the district have a program of service that provides coherent, sustained English language development based on research or accepted theories? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3115(a) and 3115(c)]</i>	Highly qualified teaching staff (with ESL Endorsement) and EL Facilitators of GISD (trained in strategies and often with EL background) provide services to EL population. EL Facilitators keep a daily log of instruction (kept by GISD Liason).		x			<u>Area of Improvement:</u> ELD is embedded into push-in services yet there is no set curriculum used when providing services. Best practices for EL (and features of SIOP) are implemented yet better records must be kept for evidence of coherence with this checklist. <u>Future Actions:</u> GISD holds logs for district EL Facilitators; EL POC will request access for future records of evidence purposes.
29. Does the district ensure that the language instruction program focuses on the development of English language proficiency and academic content? What is the evidence that EL students are developing English proficiency and are able to meet the state content and performance standards? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3115(f); 3116(b)(2); 3121 and 3122]</i>	Amao's weren't reported recently due to the change in assessments: ELPA to WIDA ACCESS to WIDA ACCESS 2.0. Traditionally, evidence of students developing EL Proficiency is kept in EL Database and ESL & Academic files of each student with score reports. The LEA EL Program typically has ~65 students. In June 2014, 1 exited; In June 2015, 9 exited; In June 2016, 4 exited.	x				
30. Does the district have a program of services that provides meaningful access to all aspects of the instructional program including elective classes and special programs such as programs for talented and gifted students? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3302(f) and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - OCR Guidelines]</i>	District only includes grades PreK-8 <sup>th</sup> . As it is not a high school there are no AP classes. Honors Math is offered to only 8 <sup>th</sup> grade students. A Project Based Learning (PBL) Enrichment classes was taught (specifically to EL during intercession in 2014-15) and was again offered in 15-16 yet attendance requirement was not met due to lack of interest by invited students.		x			*Moderate is marked due to RPSA not being a high school (therefore is unable to offer AP classes) however LEA tries to offer enrichment programs during intercessions. <u>Future Actions:</u> In hopes of getting a higher turn out for PBL/Enrichment classes, additional parent communication will take place by EL POC.

<p>31. Does the district have evidence that appropriate interventions are made when exited students are not succeeding, such as tutorials, intensified instruction, and/or extended day/year? [ESEA Sec. 3115 and 3121(a)(4)]</p>	<p>Due to a lack of need for this over the past 3 years, nothing is checked. A procedure is actively in place yet no students were required to re-enter due to lack of success. FEL Monitoring Procedure includes reviewing data from assessments, classroom teachers, and establishing parent contact. Date when additional support initiated would be documented in database and data would be again reviewed at the end of the term/year to decide whether to re-enter student into the program.</p>	<p>x</p>				
<p>32. Has the district implemented a referral process for special education eligibility that attempts to rule out the possibility of ELs being identified for special education programs based on LEP? [ESEA Sec. 3302(f)]</p>	<p><u>Procedure</u>: When EL are put on child study list, EL POC is notified. If student is considered for Special Education Program and is EL, GISD is contacted for Bilingual Verbal Ability Test (B-VAT) to ensure students are not incorrectly identified and serviced. If identified as SE, ESL Staff will attend all IEP meetings and share goals and accommodations with EL Facilitators and instructional staff.</p>		<p>x</p>			<p><u>Future Actions</u>: Procedure should be written and disseminated among district Special Education staff.</p>
<p>33. Does the district have a program of service for ELs that includes a comprehensive high school education leading to graduation with a high school diploma? [ESEA Sec. 3115(d)(5) and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - OCR Guidelines]</p>	<p>N/A</p>					<p>RPSA is a PreK-8<sup>th</sup> grade district and does not offer grades 9-12.</p>
<p>34. Does the district have a program of service that includes appropriate strategies for reading development that is coordinated with other relevant reading programs and services? [ESEA Sec. 3115]</p>	<p>Sign in sheets available from EL PD over the past 2 years, provided by HQ staff from GISD to RPSA instructional &amp; intervention staff regarding EL basics, specific literacy strategies, resources, and tiers of intervention. Students are provided additional reading assistance with LLI program (tiered support based on scores)</p>	<p>x</p>				

35. Does the district have a program of service that includes a plan for adding reading in English, if literacy is introduced in the native language? Is the plan based on scientific research? [ESEA Sec. 3115]	n/a					
36. Does the district annually assess the English proficiency of <u>all</u> ELs in grades K-12? [ESEA Sec. 1111(b)(7); 3113(b)(3)(D) and 3116(d)(2)]	All students in the EL Program (from EL Database, Pre-ID list & MSDS Participation Count) are assessed annually to assess EL proficiency (previously: ELPA / WIDA ACCESS), even if services were waived.		x			<u>Issue:</u> All students from EL database/Participation count/Pre-ID list participated in WIDA ACCESS 2.0 in Spring 2015. However, 9 students who were thought to be FEL were re-entered by the state through an MSDS clerical error, triggering all to be shown as "actively receiving services" and therefore accountable to take the assessment. <u>Future Actions:</u> The district re-entered the students into the program and they will take WIDA this upcoming year. The MSDS person & EL Coordinator will attend additional training on MSDS data entry to prevent future clerical issues in the future.
37. Does the district ensure that ELs are included in the M-STEP, MME/SAT or WIDA? [ESEA Sec. 3121(c)(1)(D)]	All are required to participate. M-STEP Score Reports NWEA Score Reports WIDA Score Reports		x			*see above #36.
38. Has the district implemented reasonable adaptations and accommodations for students with diverse learning needs (inclusive of ELs who may also be special education students) necessary to measure the achievement of such students relative to State content standards? [ESEA Sec. 3121 and 3122]	IEP's for EL/SE students Goal & Accommodation Forms for EL students		x			The district ensures that all students (EL and EL who may be SE) receive appropriate adaptations and accommodations. Future Actions: District must ensure communication among EL Facilitators, Special Education, Intervention and Instructional staff regarding implementing accommodations with consistency to ensure these are provided during daily instruction, with the EL Facilitator, and during state assessments.

## Program/District Review of Monitoring Indicators Self-Assessment Checklist

H = High      M = Moderate      L = Low      CR = Change Required

### TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question (Regulatory References from ESEA <a href="http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02">www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02</a> and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, <a href="http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm">http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm</a> )	Evidence/ Documentation  (District notes on evidence)	Level of Compliance				Actions Taken (or to be taken) to fulfill requirements and/or improve in areas of concern  (MDE/OFS notes)
		H	M	L	CR	
39. Does the district have the staff necessary to implement their chosen program properly within a reasonable period of time? Does the district have documentation of proper certification / license / endorsements for instructional staff of ELs in district office? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3115(c); 3116(a) and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 - OCR Guidelines]</i>	RPSA has a Highly Qualified, EL Endorsed staff member who works with ELs at the 3-8 building. This currently meets the ratio requirement by MDE.  Certification / license / endorsements are kept with HR (district staff).		x			The HQ EL Staff does not provide instruction consistently with students at the K-2 level, however EL certified staff implements the chosen program for the entire district.  A plan has been put into place by all members of the GISD consortium to attain additional HQ ESL/Bilingual certified staff to assist in providing services.
40. Are all teachers teaching in any language instruction program for ELs fluent in English and any other language used for instruction including having written and oral communication skills? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3116(c)]</i>	Highly Qualified EL Endorsed Staff of RPSA is a native English speaker (the only language used for instruction) and is also certified in Spanish (the primary native language/home language of most EL's in the district).	x				
41. Does the district have procedures that provide for the supervision of instructional assistants and which ensure that certified personnel are planning instructional programs? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3301(12)]</i>	Certified staff plan all instruction in the district Evidence: lesson plans of district instructional staff.  Parapros / additional assistants are not used in the district.	x				



<p>42. Does the district have evidence that high quality professional development is available to the instructional staff of ELs, administrators and parents / community? High quality professional development designed to: 1) improve instruction and assessment of ELs; 2) enhance the ability of teachers to understand curricula, assessment and instructional practices to meet the needs of ELs; 3) based on scientifically-based research demonstrating the effectiveness of the professional development; and 4) of sufficient intensity and duration that it has a positive and lasting impact on the teacher's performance. <i>[ESEA Sec. 3115(c)(2)]</i></p>	<p>Annual ALL STAFF in district ESL PD <u>Evidence:</u> Powerpoint Presentation shared with district staff in Staff Drive &amp; Attendance record / Sign in sheet(s)</p> <p>PD with General Education Staff: Cohort for 3-5 <u>Evidence:</u> Attendance record / Sign in sheet(s)</p> <p>EL Coach providing EL specific PD (approx. ~8 times/year) <u>Evidence:</u> Attendance record / Sign in sheet(s)</p>	<p>x</p>				
<p>43. Does the district have procedures to determine the effectiveness of professional development activities provided to teachers of ELs? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3115(c)(1)]</i></p>	<p>Two surveys are shared annually with staff and results are reviewed to determine effectiveness of EL PD and to inform decisions on what staff feel is needed for upcoming PD. Survey 1: Local district perceptions of EL practices; Survey 2: local district perceptions of ESOL program evaluation.</p>	<p>x</p>				

## Program/District Review of Monitoring Indicators Self-Assessment Checklist

H = High      M = Moderate      L = Low      CR = Change Required

### PROGRAM EVALUATION AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Question (Regulatory References from ESEA <a href="http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02">www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02</a> and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, <a href="http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm">http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/cor/13166.htm</a> )	Evidence/ Documentation  (District notes on evidence)	Level of Compliance				Actions Taken (or to be taken) to fulfill requirements and/or improve in areas of concern  (MDE/OFS notes)
		H	M	L	CR	
44. Does the district have evidence that the Title III program is regularly evaluated and improved? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3121 and 3122]</i>	End of the Year Program Evaluation Summary and Implications	x				
45. Does the district have a process for tracking the progress of ELs in regard to: 1) the number of students making progress toward attaining English language proficiency based on the WIDA; 2) the number of students who have attained full English Language proficiency, are exited from the program and placed on a two year monitoring status; 3) the number of students who have been reclassified as non-EL; and 4) the performance of students on MEAP or MME assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics? <i>[ESEA Sec. 3121(c) and 3122(a)]</i>	End of the Year Program Evaluation Summary and Implications	X				

46. Does the district have on file at the district office a description of the progress made by ELs on English proficiency? [ESEA Sec. 3121(a)(2)]	ESL Database  End of the Year Program Evaluation Summary and Implications	x				
47. Does the district have on file at the district office a description of the progress made by former English learners (Former Limited English Proficient) in meeting challenging state academic content and performance standards for each of the two years after exiting the program? How many were found to be succeeding? How many were not successful? If not, was it due to English proficiency? How many returned to the EL program? [ESEA Sec. 3121(a)(4)]	Previous End of the Year Program Evaluation Summary and Implications	x				
48. Does the district have documentation of district-wide plans for restructuring, reforming and upgrading all relevant programs, activities and operations relating to language instructional education programs and academic content instruction? [ESEA Sec. 3115(a)(3) and 3121]	Annual EL All staff meeting (attendance) and Powerpoint presentation (includes: Areas targeted for growth based on WIDA results and current needs and Data from ESOL Program Summary and Implications		x			
49. Is there evidence that the district is fulfilling its program improvement responsibilities? [ESEA Sec. 3122]	School Improvement Plan District Improvement Plan  Annual All Staff Local district perceptions of EI Best Practices / ESOL Program Evaluation Survey data		x			
50. Does the district have a process for publicizing and disseminating the results of its biennial review of EL programs in appropriate schools? [ESEA Sec. 3121]	TIII Monitoring Checklist (Self-assessment)  Overall/End of Year Program Evaluation Summary and Implication		x			EL POC will request that the this document, the TIII monitoring checklist (self-assessment) be made public by being shared on the district website and/or shared with the district Board of Education.

Format adapted from Oregon Department of Education, *Self-Assessment and On-Site Review Process: Programs for English Language Learners, Title III.*