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During the 2023-2024 school year, Tyngsborough 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).

Tyngsborough

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** 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 grades and proficiency levels become English proficient at a rapid pace. While the district has the flexibility to choose the appropriate setting and method of ESL instruction as part of their SEI program, the ESL instructional focus must include at a minimum unit plans of ESL curriculum that integrate the WIDA 2020 standards. Academic tutoring of content subjects or sheltering the content for ELs in a regular education classroom as a part of a push-in model is not a substitute for the ESL component of SEI programs.  Documentation and staff interviews 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, not 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.  Interviews, documentation, and a review of student records indicates that the district lacks the ESL staffing capacity to effectively provide essential components of an effective ELE program, such as meeting with all EL students at regular intervals and providing time for ESL collaboration with content teachers to identify language objectives, student needs and to provide appropriate supports and scaffolds for students with low levels of proficiency in content courses, completing the required paperwork, filing and notifications, and providing effective oversight and monitoring of the ELE program, and advocating for English Learners at the district administrative level. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 7 - Parent Involvement |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Staff interviews indicate that interpreters are not always provided for parents who have requested this at events such as IEP meetings. Additionally, interviews and the self-assessment and documentation submitted indicate that although the district provides translated documents and interpretation for families who need them, it does not have policies and procedures in place to ensure that competent, appropriately trained staff or outside resources provide translation and interpretation. Appropriate and competent translators or interpreters have proficiency in target languages, ease of written and oral expression, knowledge of specialized terms or concepts, expertise in the content being interpreted and as they are trained in their role they are knowledgeable on the ethics of interpreting and translating, and the need for confidentiality. The district needs to ensure that its interpreters are qualified to provide services that meet its legal obligations. 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 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 14 - Licensure Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Staff interviews and the relevant SEI Endorsement data indicated that most core academic teachers assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to English learners hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement, but some do not.  Documentation, interviews, and a review of ELAR data indicate that not all ESL staff hold a license or current waiver issued by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education for the subject matter and grade levels they teach. |