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During the 2024-2025 school year, Lunenburg 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 6, ELE 8, ELE 10, ELE 13, ELE 15, ELE 18 |
| **PARTIALLY**  **IMPLEMENTED** | ELE 3, ELE 5, ELE 7, ELE 14 |

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 3 - Initial Identification of ELs and FELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of district documentation found that written policies do not fully address the identification of Former English Learners. Furthermore, written policies do not clarify the roles and responsibilities of staff members responsible for different tasks in the process of identifying ELs and do not include clear procedures to interpret and act upon Home Language Survey (HLS) responses. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** The Department conducted an on-site visit to the school district to evaluate the effectiveness of programs serving English learners as required by G.L. c. 71A,§ 7A and identified the following compliance issues:   * Interviews with staff members revealed that when students are scheduled to receive ESL instruction through a push-in model, English language development doesn't always happen. In many cases, the ESL teacher pushing in assists the content teacher in teaching content standards but does not provide explicit ESL instruction. * A review of district documentation and interviews with staff members revealed 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. * Interviews with staff members indicated that English learners do not always have equitable access to rigorous, grade-level content instruction. Procedures shepherd English Learners into Essentials level courses due to their language proficiency, rather than courses appropriate to their grade and content levels with SEI strategies. * Finally, interviews with staff members found that the district lacks the capacity to support essential elements of SEI instruction, such as systematic co-planning time or clear expectations for SEI strategies and language objectives from evaluators. These practices do not align with the requirements of G.L. c. 71A,§7, and 603 CMR 14.04(3), which mandate that SEI programs deliver content instruction that is comprehensible and supports English language development. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 7 - Parent Involvement |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Interviews indicated 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. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **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. |