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During the 2024-2025 school year, Auburn 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).
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**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 3 - Initial Identification of ELs and FELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documentation and staff interviews indicated that the district does not have procedures in place to identify Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE) consistently to meet their unique linguistic and academic needs. Further, the district does not code them as SLIFE in the Student Information Management System (SIMS) that districts use to submit data and be in compliance with state reporting requirements. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **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 district'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. The Department also identified the following compliance issues:   * Interviews and documentation indicated that the district lacks the ELE staffing capacity to effectively provide essential components of an effective ELE program for its rapidly growing EL population. * The district does not have procedures in place to identify ELs who do not meet English proficiency benchmarks nor a process to identify the areas in which identified ELs need improvement and establish personalized goals for attaining English proficiency. Interviews indicated that teachers who work with students who have not met their English language proficiency benchmarks do not plan their lessons to support students' learning goals and there is not a process to get parental input during the process or to track and assess the progress of ELs in the identified areas in need of improvement as it is required by M.G.L 71 A §11. * The district does not have a process to determine what SLIFE students' academic and linguistic needs are and to provide instruction that is specifically designed for them with the overarching goals of English language development and academic content achievement as the state laws require. * Beyond SEI in full inclusion classrooms, the district relies largely on "EL Tutors" who do not hold an ESL license to deliver explicit ESL instruction. * When students are scheduled to receive ESL instruction through a push-in model, English language development does not always happen. In many cases, the EL tutor pushing in assists the content teacher in teaching content standards but does not provide explicit ESL instruction. * Interviews indicated that there is no clear staffing system established to ensure ELE programming is in place in accordance with state and federal laws. There is no designated clearly designated EL director/coordinator in place, despite growing EL numbers in the district. * Documentation and interviews indicated that there is no newcomer's nor SLIFE programming in place to sufficiently meet the needs of students in or coming into the district with the exception of the high school which offers a class for ELD instruction but, due to scheduling, students are likely to miss an elective or class required for graduation to attend that course, which raises concerns around equitable access for EL students. * The review indicates that the district 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. While some interviews noted the Ellevations program as helpful, other interviews indicated that it is being implemented inconsistently across the district. Interviews noted a lack of sufficient resources to effectively serve EL students in the district. * Further, documentation and interviews indicated that the district does not implement procedures to identify ELs who do not meet English proficiency benchmarks and a process to identify the areas in which identified ELs need improvement and establish personalized goals for attaining English proficiency and there is not a process to get parental input during the process or to track and assess the progress of ELs in the identified areas in need of improvement as it is required by M.G.L 71 A §11. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 6 - Program Exit and Readiness |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of data indicated that the district exits students from the ELE program prematurely before they meet the exit criteria overall ACCESS score of 4.2 and literacy score of 3.9 as determined by the Department. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 8 - Declining Entry to a Program |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of the district documentation and staff interviews indicate that the written confirmation of the withdrawal (opt-out request) is not provided annually to the school by the parent or legal guardian and such confirmation is not retained in the student's cumulative folder as required by G.L. c. G.L. c. 71A ?12.A review of documentation submitted also indicated that there are no formal monitoring mechanisms in place to monitor the progress of students whose parents declined ELE services to ensure they make adequate progress academically and linguistically. |

| **Improvement Area 5** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 13 - Follow-up Support |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documentation submitted indicates that the district has formal monitoring mechanisms in place; however, a review of the monitoring form submitted by the district shows that the district does not analyze the information collected as a result of the monitoring process and act on it when the student does not demonstrate progress linguistically and academically by providing necessary supports. |

| **Improvement Area 6** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 14 - Licensure Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** SEI Endorsement data indicates that most core academic teachers assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to English learners hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement, but some do not. Additionally, ESL instruction is not always provided by educators who hold ESL license. |