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During the 2024-2025 school year, Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical 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 3, ELE 6, ELE 7, ELE 8, ELE 10, ELE 13, ELE 15, ELE 18 |
| **PARTIALLY**  **IMPLEMENTED** | ELE 5, ELE 14 |

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Interviews, documentation, and a review of student records indicate that the district 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 at providing adequate ESL instructional time based on students needs, providing time for ESL collaboration with content and technical teachers to identify language objectives, student needs and to provide appropriate supports and scaffolds for students with low levels of proficiency in content courses and technical shops, providing effective oversight and monitoring of the ELE program, advocating for English Learners at the administrative level, monitoring opt out and FEL students and providing supports to these students and the staff supporting them, as well as administrative tasks such as parent notifications, SIMS data coding, EL folder maintenance, scheduling, and directing staff to existing resources/supports.  The review also found that English Learners in some buildings do not have equitable access to some academic programs available in the district. Equitable access issues identified during the review are as follows: ELs do not have equitable access to health and/or social studies courses, and EL students do not have equitable access to higher level courses such as honors, AP and dual enrollment.  Also, 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.  Finally, the review indicated that while ELE staff do review ACCESS data and target their ESL instruction based on this data, the benchmarking process is not implemented fully and with all required components including:  (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. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 14 - Licensure Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of the relevant SEI Endorsement data indicated that most core academic and career vocational technical teachers assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to English learners hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement, but some do not. |