

**Helen Y. Davis Leadership Academy Charter Public (District)**

**Targeted and Focused Monitoring Report**

**Review Dates:** **March 20-21, 2024**

**Date of Final Report:** **04/12/2024**



Jeffrey C. Riley

Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

During the 2023-2024 school year, Helen Y. Davis Leadership Academy Charter Public (District) 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).

Helen Y. Davis Leadership Academy Charter Public (District)

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 1 - Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of WIDA certifications of staff revealed that the district staff did not renew their WIDA certifications every two years as required. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 3 - Initial Identification of ELs and FELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Student records indicate that the charter school does not consistently use Home Language Surveys to identify potential English learners and Former English Learners. Additionally, the written procedures for initial identification do not include the staff responsible, timeline, relevant forms, parental notification, nor specific steps to identify FEL students. The Department concludes that the district does not properly identify students who need English language support and the current initial identification procedures, and practices are not in compliance with 603 CMR 14.02(1) that requires districts and charter schools to establish procedures in accordance with the Department guidelines. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **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 charter school'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.  Interviews, documentation, and a review of student records indicated that the charter school lacks the ESL staffing capacity to effectively provide essential components of an effective ELE program, such as placing students in ESL courses with peers at appropriate levels, 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, providing effective oversight and monitoring of the ELE program, and advocating for English Learners at the administrative level.  Documentation and staff interviews also indicated that the charter school has not adopted procedures to identify English learners who do not meet English proficiency benchmarks and has not established a process for the district to: (i) identify areas in which identified English learners needs improvement and establish personalized goals for the identified English learners to attain English proficiency; (ii) assess and track the progress of English learners in the identified areas of improvement; (iii) review resources and services available to identified English learners that may assist said learners in the identified areas of improvement; and (iv) incorporate input from the parents or legal guardian of the identified English learner as required under M.G.L. c. 71A, §11  Finally, the review indicated that the charter school does not consistently support an ESL curriculum across all grades. Literacy and reading programs and materials 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. |

| **Improvement Area 5** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 6 - Program Exit and Readiness |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Staff interviews and documentation submitted indicated that the written procedures for reclassfication do not include the staff responsible, timelines, monitoring forms, or the four years of monitoring required. The charter school also has additional criteria students must meet to be reclassified including achieving proficient or advanced on MCAS and achieving an A or B in their ELA class. The charter school’s current reclassification procedures are not in compliance with 603 CMR 14.02 that requires districts to establish exit criteria in accordance with the Department guidelines. |

| **Improvement Area 6** |
| --- |
| **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.  Interviews indicated that although the charter school 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 7** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 8 - Declining Entry to a Program |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Submitted documentation and student records indicate that the district does not have proper policies and procedures to require annual written confirmation of the parents' request to withdraw their children from an English learner education program as required by G.L. c. 71A §12. |

| **Improvement Area 8** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 10 - Parental Notification |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documentation submitted indicates that parent notification and progress reports are not always translated and provided in a language the parent can understand. Documentation also indicated that the charter school does not consistently send initial and annual notification letters to parents to inform them of their child's placement in an ELE program and other required information that needs to be communicated to parents annually. |

| **Improvement Area 9** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 13 - Follow-up Support |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Although interviews indicate that ELs are monitored frequently and consistently, documentation submitted indicated that the written procedure for FEL monitoring does not clearly include the four years of monitoring required. |

| **Improvement Area 10** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 14 - Licensure Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Documentation, interviews, and a review of ELAR data indicated 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.  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. |

| **Improvement Area 11** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 15 - Professional Development Requirements |
| **Rating:** Not Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Submitted documentation reveals that charter school does not have a professional development plan and therefore does not provide 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. |

| **Improvement Area 12** |
| --- |
| **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. |