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During the 2023-2024 school year, South Hadley participated in a Targeted and Focused Monitoring Review conducted by the Department’s Office of Language Acquisition (OLA). The purpose of the Targeted and Focused Monitoring Review is to monitor compliance with regulatory requirements focusing on English Learner Education.

District/charter schools are reviewed every six years through Targeted and 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

The monitoring process differs depending on the thorough data analysis the Department conducts.

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 Targeted and 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 Targeted and Focused Monitoring approach, please visit the Department’s [website](https://www.doe.mass.edu/ele/cpr/default.html).

South Hadley

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 1 - Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** The district has consistently assessed less than 95% of its English learners on ACCESS for ELLs since 2020. For instance, in 2023 it assessed 84%. Furthermore, it has assessed less than two thirds of its high school English learners since 2021. Therefore, the district is out of compliance with federal and state requirements to assess all English learners’ English language proficiency until they meet the criteria set by the state to exit the ELE program. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 3 - Initial Identification of ELs and FELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Staff interviews and a review of student documents indicated that the district does not have a process for identifying Former English Learners (FELs) who come from other districts so that the district can continue monitoring them for a total of four years.  Documentation indicated that the district does not have appropriate procedures in place to determine the EL status of students who move to the district from another district and to provide them with appropriate ELE services without delay. For example, there is a lack of access to data platforms, such as EDWIN Analytics, to determine the EL status of students who move to the district from another district, particularly, Former English Learners. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Interviews and a review of documentation indicate that the district does not consistently support an ESL curriculum that is aligned to the WIDA and Massachusetts Frameworks across all grades. Although the district started to develop K-12 ESL curriculum maps, there is no systematic process to fully review, monitor, and align them to state and district content, literacy, and language acquisition standards. Partial maps and resources do not replace an ESL curriculum which is integral to an effective ELE program in which ELs of all grades and proficiency levels become English proficient at a rapid pace.  Conversely, interviews, documentation, and a review of student records indicated that the district lacks the systems for administrators to effectively provide essential components of an effective ELE program, such as providing time for ESL collaboration with content teachers to identify language objectives, student needs, and to provide appropriate supports and scaffolds for students with emerging levels of English proficiency in content courses, as well as providing effective oversight and monitoring of the ELE program, and advocating for English Learners at the administrative level. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 6 - Program Exit and Readiness |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of ACCESS data indicated that the district keeps students in the language acquisition program after they have met the district's reclassification scores of 4.2 overall and 3.9 for literacy. Several previously reclassified students took ACCESS in SY22. The district's current reclassification practices are not consistent with the district's reclassification policy and procedures. |

| **Improvement Area 5** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 7 - Parent Involvement |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** 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. |

| **Improvement Area 6** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 14 - Licensure Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Staff interviews and the relevant SEI Endorsement data indicated that many core academic teachers assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to English learners hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement, but some do not. |

| **Improvement Area 7** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 15 - Professional Development Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documentation and interviews reveal that district professional development plans do not include district level activities for all 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. Interviews indicate that there is a need for ongoing comprehensive districtwide professional development for all teachers of English learners. 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. |

| **Improvement Area 8** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 18 - Records of ELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of the documents requested from the district indicated that the district does not consistently keep all the required documents in students' EL records. |