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During the 2024-2025 school year, Essex North Shore Agricultural and Technical School 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).

Essex North Shore Agricultural and Technical School District

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 3 - Initial Identification of ELs and FELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of district documentation indicates that the district does not have clear procedures for identifying English Learners or Former English Learners (FELs), analyzing Home Language Survey (HLS) responses, addressing unclear or contradictory responses, identifying SLIFE, or determining the persons responsible for steps in the identification and initial placement process. Additionally, the Home Language Survey is not consistently provided with other registration documents, making its completion appear optional and delaying the district's ability to send follow-up notifications within the required timeline.  The Department concludes that the district's current initial identification procedures and practices are not in compliance with 603 CMR 14.02(1), which requires districts and charter schools to establish procedures in accordance with Department guidelines. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documentation and staff interviews indicated that the district does not have an ESL curriculum for ESL instruction. ESL instruction provided in a push-in model primarily functions as content support rather than explicit English language instruction. Without a district-provided ESL curriculum aligned with WIDA standards, students do not receive the structured, explicit instruction necessary to build proficiency in the four language domains: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. These practices do not align with 603 CMR 14.04, which requires ESL instruction to be a distinct and integral component of an ELE program.  In SEI courses, the district does not ensure that content teachers consistently use sheltered English instruction strategies or develop language objectives aligned with WIDA standards. While the district provides collaboration time between SEI content teachers and ESL staff, it does not set clear expectations for these sessions to focus on identifying language objectives or planning strategies to meet the linguistic needs of English learners. Additionally, the district does not effectively communicate the shared responsibility of all educators in supporting English language development. As a result, the district is not providing an effective SEI program that meets the academic and linguistic needs of English learners, as required under 603 CMR 14.07, which mandates integrating rigorous, grade-level instruction with language-focused scaffolding.  The district has recently begun developing formalized benchmark plans for students who have not met their English proficiency benchmarks; however, these plans are not yet fully developed or implemented. Without established benchmarks, the district does not have a consistent process to identify areas where students need additional support, track their progress, or provide targeted interventions. These steps are critical to ensure equitable and effective support for English learners.  These practices do not meet the standards set forth in 603 CMR 14.04 and 603 CMR 14.07, which require districts to implement high-quality SEI programs and provide structured ESL instruction to promote English learners' academic and linguistic success. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 7 - Parent Involvement |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documentation and staff interviews indicated that the district does not have policies or procedures in place to ensure that translation and interpretation services are provided by competent, appropriately trained staff or external resources. Instead, the district relies primarily on automated tools such as Google Translate and ParentSquare, which do not meet the standards for high-quality translation or interpretation.  The district's reliance on these tools does not guarantee accurate or culturally appropriate translations and may prevent effective communication with parents and guardians whose preferred language is not English. Additionally, current policies do not ensure that all families who request interpretation services will receive them.  These practices do not align with M.G.L. c. 71A,§6A, which requires districts to provide effective language assistance services to parents to ensure meaningful participation in their children's education. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 10 - Parental Notification |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of documentation and staff interviews indicates that the district is not using the prescribed state and federal forms to notify parents of English learners about their child's placement in an English Learner Education (ELE) program. Additionally, these forms do not include all of the required information outlined in state and federal guidelines.  The district does not have policies or procedures to ensure that these forms are distributed within the required timelines. State regulations require that the notification form be provided annually within 10 days of enrollment or the start of the school year, and federal regulations mandate that placement forms be distributed within 30 days. Without these procedures, the district cannot ensure timely and consistent communication with parents.  Additionally, report cards are only partially and inconsistently translated into parents' requested languages. This practice limits parents? ability to access essential information about their child’s academic progress and participation in the ELE program.  These practices are not in compliance with 603 CMR 14.02(6) and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), which require districts to provide timely and accessible information to parents to ensure meaningful participation in their children’s education. |

| **Improvement Area 5** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 18 - Records of ELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of district documentation and student records indicated that the district is not consistently maintaining required documents, such as the Home Language Survey, Opt-Out Monitoring Forms, and Parent Notification Forms, in designated English Learner (EL) folders.  The absence of these documents in EL folders limits the district’s ability to ensure compliance with state and federal requirements for documenting English learners’ identification, placement, and parental communication. |