
An Analysis of District Systems and Practices Addressing the Needs of English Language Learners

May 2011

Table of Contents	
Summary	1
Purpose	1
Methodology	1
Introduction	2
Promising Practices Supporting Effective ELL Instruction	5
Teaming Structures	7
Collaboration	8
Focus on Literacy	8
District Support	9
Other Emerging Practices	10
Challenges	11

Summary:

The study identified four factors supporting English language learner (ELL) achievement. One factor was effective use of staff teams that concentrated supports and attention to ELL students. Another factor supporting English language learner achievement was ongoing and collegial collaboration between school administrators and district administrators and among regular (content) teachers, English as a Second Language (ESL)¹ teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff. A third was a strong focus on literacy and extensive in-class student support (e.g., multiple teachers in the classroom) in inclusion classes. Finally, schools were more successful when districts provided effective support, with the clearest examples identified in districts that had integrated their English language arts and English language learner departments. The study also identified three other emerging practices. 1) Sheltered content training for all teachers teaching ELL students as a crucial component supporting an effective ELL program. 2) Parent information centers playing an important role in supporting ELL students and families by serving as the central hub for student intake and initial language assessment and placement, and as a known place where parents of ELL student can ask questions and access services. 3) Before- and after-school programs providing ways to connect with community organizations as well as additional academic support. Challenges met by some districts in the study included developing a strong ESL curriculum aligned with the English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes, developing systematic practices to analyze student achievement data, and addressing the need for cultural competency among district and school staff.

Purpose:

The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Center for District and School Accountability conducted a set of reviews to identify district and school factors contributing to relatively high and improved achievement for English language learners in selected schools, to provide recommendations for improvement on district and school levels to maintain or accelerate the improvement in student achievement, and to promote the dissemination of promising practices among Massachusetts public schools. These reviews were carried out to execute the charge of Mass. Gen. Laws c. 15, s. 55A, to conduct district audits in districts whose students achieve at high levels relative to districts that educate similar student populations, and as part of ESE’s program to recognize schools as “distinguished schools” under section 1117(b) of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which allows states to use Title I funds to reward schools that have significantly narrowed the achievement gap.

Methodology:

Reviews explored district systems for Leadership and Governance, Curriculum and Instruction, Assessment, Human Resources and Professional Development, and Student Support, seeking to identify those systems and practices that are most likely to be contributing to positive results, as well as those that may be impeding rapid improvement. Systems and practices that are likely to be contributing to positive results were identified from the ESE’s District Standards and Indicators and from a draft report of the English Language Learners Sub-Committee of the Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education’s Committee on the Proficiency Gap.² Reviews were evidence-based and data-driven. Review teams, consisting of experts in each district standard, previewed selected documents and ESE data and reports before conducting a two-day site visit in the district and a two-day site visit to schools.

¹ESL teachers teach English language development to English language learners as opposed to academic content; however, in some districts ESL teachers teach both content and English language development. In some districts ESL teachers team teach alongside a content teacher.

² *Halting the Race to the Bottom: Urgent Interventions for the Improvement of the Education of English Language Learners in Massachusetts and Selected Districts,*

Introduction

As shown by Displays 1 and 2 below, 16.4 percent of Massachusetts students (156,420) do not speak English as their first language, and 7.1 percent (67,567) are limited English proficient (LEP), otherwise known as English language learners (ELL students or ELLs). The proficiency gap between ELL students and all students in the state is substantial: in 2010 22 percent of state ELL students scored Proficient or Advanced in English Language Arts on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS), as compared to 68 percent of all state students. In mathematics, 24 percent of state ELL students scored Proficient or Advanced, as compared with 59 percent of all students statewide. Although ELL students are by definition still learning English, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) nevertheless makes it a priority to improve their achievement and narrow the proficiency gap.

In the spring of 2010, ESE's Center for District and School Accountability conducted a series of reviews of 11 school districts where the achievement of English language learners in one or more of the district's Title I schools improved and was higher than achievement across the state. Districts with *gap closers*³—those schools that markedly improved academic achievement for ELL students—were invited to participate in a comprehensive review to identify district and school practices associated with gains in ELL students' achievement. Display 1 shows general demographic information for these 11 districts, Display 2 shows more specific demographic information relating to ELL students, and Display 3 shows the numbers and percentages of ELL students scoring at the lowest level, Level 1, on the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) in 2010, as well as the numbers and percentages of ELL students who achieved proficiency on MCAS and the median student growth percentiles (SGPs) for ELL students that year.

³ The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) identified 36 Title I schools in 14 districts with relatively high levels of improvement for English language learners. ESE staff analyzed MCAS data from 2008 and 2009 to identify schools that narrowed performance gaps between ELL students and all students statewide. The methodology compared the MCAS raw scores of ELL students enrolled in the schools with the predicted MCAS raw scores of ELL students statewide. The methodology also incorporated whether ELL students improved their performance from 2008 to 2009. "Gap closers" did not have to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) performance or improvement targets, but did have to meet 2009 AYP targets for participation, attendance and high school graduation, as applicable.

Display 1: Eleven Participating Districts with Gap Closers: 2011 General Demographic Information

District Name	Total Enrollment	# of Schools	# of Gap Closers	ELL %	Special Ed %	Low-Income %
Dedham	2,879	7	1	4.8%	22.4	23.2
Lowell	13,600	21	8	33.1%	15.4	72.5
Lynn	13,547	24	3	21.6%	16.1	78.6
Malden	6,565	7	2	14.3%	14.0	58.7
Peabody	6,075	10	1	4.9%	19.6	30.6
Pittsfield	5,978	12	1	4.2%	17.0	54.7
Revere	6,229	11	1	10.8%	16.5	73.3
Watertown	2,649	5	1	11.0%	19.7	30.4
Westborough	3,513	7	1	6.8%	13.4	7.5
Westfield	5,938	12	1	4.0%	18.0	31.3
Worcester	24,192	45	6	31.8%	20.9	70.1
State	955,563	0	0	7.1%	17.0	34.2

Source: School/District Profiles on ESE website and other ESE data

Note: The term “LEP,” equivalent to “ELL,” is used in source data.

Display 2: Eleven Participating Districts with Gap Closers: 2011 Demographic Information Relating to English Language Learners

District Name	ELL		First Language Not English (FLNE)		Immigrants		1st Major Language			2nd Major Language			3rd Major Language		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	Language	#	%	Language	#	%	Language	#	%
Dedham	137	4.8%	315	10.9%	47	1.6	Spanish	122	4.2%	Arabic	34	1.2%	Greek	22	0.8%
Lowell	4,495	33.1%	5,965	43.9%	549	4.0	Khmer/Khmer	2,388	17.6%	Spanish	2,125	15.6%	Portuguese	203	1.5%
Lynn	2,920	21.6%	7,135	52.7%	804	5.9	Spanish	5,267	38.9%	Khmer/Khmer	711	5.2%	Vietnamese	155	1.1%
Malden	941	14.3%	2,807	42.8%	548	8.3	Chinese	463	7.1%	Spanish	447	6.8%	Portuguese	398	6.1%
Peabody	299	4.9%	1,193	19.6%	200	3.3	Spanish	463	7.6%	Portuguese	374	6.2%	Albanian	71	1.2%
Pittsfield	250	4.2%	351	5.9%	118	2.0	Spanish	224	3.7%	[Other]	36	0.6%	French	10	0.2%
Revere	675	10.8%	2,912	46.7%	293	4.7	Spanish	1,758	28.2%	Arabic	329	5.3%	Portuguese	132	2.1%
Watertown	291	11.0%	796	30.0%	148	5.6	Spanish	153	5.8%	Armenian	143	5.4%	Portuguese	72	2.7%
Westborough	238	6.8%	562	16.0%	209	5.9	Spanish	76	2.2%	Telugu	68	1.9%	Chinese	63	1.8%
Westfield	239	4.0%	710	12.0%	262	4.4	Russian	306	5.2%	Ukrainian	183	3.1%	Spanish	17	0.3%
Worcester	7,689	31.8%	10,453	43.2%	1,698	7.0	Spanish	6,156	25.4%	Vietnamese	1,196	4.9%	Albanian	406	1.7%
State	67,567	7.1%	156,420	16.4%	20,970	2.2	Spanish	77,104	8.1%	Portuguese	12,910	1.4%	Chinese	7,163	0.7%

Source: School/District Profiles on ESE website and Student Information Management System (SIMS)

Note: The term “LEP,” equivalent to “ELL,” is used in source data.

Display 3: Eleven Participating Districts with Gap Closers: 2010 Assessment Information for English Language Learners

District Name	Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA)			Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS)		ELL Median Student	ELL Median Student
	# Included	# Scoring at Level 1	% Scoring at Level 1	% ELL Scoring	% ELL Scoring	Growth Percentile	Growth Percentile
				Advanced/Proficient ELA	Advanced/Proficient Math	(SGP) ELA	(SGP) Math
Dedham	115	6	5.2%	49%	39%	51.0	47.5
Lowell	4,191	225	5.4%	28%	27%	48.0	56.0
Lynn	3,446	280	8.1%	22%	24%	48.0	51.0
Malden	788	61	7.7%	16%	26%	60.5	70.0
Peabody	345	34	9.9%	32%	29%	62.0	45.0
Pittsfield	230	13	5.7%	26%	24%	64.5	67.0
Revere	671	61	9.1%	19%	23%	56.5	48.0
Watertown	276	14	5.1%	26%	31%	45.5	48.5
Westborough	253	15	5.9%	62%	52%	70.0	60.0
Westfield	237	37	15.6%	16%	25%	69.0	59.0
Worcester	6,055	363	6.0%	28%	26%	56.0	58.0
State	58,288	4585	7.9%	22%	24%	50.0	53.0

Source: School/District Profiles on ESE website and MEPA data
 Note: The term “LEP,” equivalent to “ELL,” is used in source data.

To document and to better understand the systems and practices being used by districts and exemplary schools, ESE conducted a research-based analysis of the district reviews, with the goal of *distilling key themes, systems, and practices to inform the ongoing work of ESE and contribute to district efforts to continually improve systems of support for ELL and other students*. The district reviews provide a rich source of information on how districts are currently working to improve teaching and learning; they provide a detailed snapshot of district systems, practices, behavior, and beliefs that directly support efforts to improve teaching and learning for English language learners. The identification of promising practices is based on the analysis of data, classroom observations, and interviews of district and school staff, carried out with reference to ESE’s research-based District Standards. The reviews of districts with gap closers included a two-day visit to one or more schools and a two-day visit at the central office. As a result, many of the ELL district reviews provide a greater level of detail about the district’s impact on the selected school or schools than about its impact on other district schools.

Promising Practices Supporting Effective ELL Instruction

An analysis of the ELL district reviews suggests that schools having success in meeting the needs of ELL students have developed a set of reinforcing structures and programs that promote collaboration and inclusion among administrators, teachers, and students, which in turn has contributed to strong instructional practices for both

ELL students and non-ELL students. There is evidence that many of the gap closers have moved beyond compliance (meeting the legal programmatic requirements to serve ELLs) to develop a culture of high expectations supported by structures and programs that ensure that ELLs are full members of the school community. In some districts reviewed, leaders have created systems that support staff teams and collaboration across the district and in schools with significant ELL populations. In others, district leaders have provided schools with the flexibility to develop strong ELL programs that rely on strong and passionate school leadership.

Display 4: Promising Practices Supporting ELL Instruction

Practice	Impact of Practice
The use of teams , clusters, or professional learning communities to concentrate supports and attention to ELL students. ⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active collaboration among teachers (content and ESL). • The inclusion of ELL students in mainstream classes and activities. • The school’s ability to concentrate resources and supports.
<p>Ongoing and collegial collaboration among regular (content) teachers, ESL teachers, special education teachers and other support staff.</p> <p>Ongoing and collegial collaboration among and between school administrators and district administrators.⁵</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective co-teaching and inclusion classrooms. • Shared expectations for all students and a sense of ownership among all teachers for all students.
A strong focus on literacy and extensive in-class student support (e.g., multiple teachers in the classroom) in inclusion classes. ⁶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective instructional practices for ELL students and all students. • A shared sense of inclusivity, so that ELL students feel that they are full members of the school community.
Support from the district for schools in providing effective literacy practices, a culture of inclusiveness, and high expectations. ⁷	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased ability of teachers and leaders to use staff teams and common planning time to work together. • Strong systems of support for schools in implementing strong literacy practices and promoting a culture of inclusivity and high expectations. • Promote a shared responsibility to support ELL students as equal members of the school community • Articulated and visible high expectations for ELL students that are on par with expectations for all students.

The districts and gap closing schools reviewed had different approaches, as described in greater detail in the following pages. It is also important to note that there are additional district practices, such as supporting sheltered content training of all teachers, using a parent resource center as a central hub for support, intake, and placement of students, and implementing before- and after-school programs, that support overall efforts to provide comprehensive support to ELL students (and their families), described in greater detail on page 10.

⁴ Please see Essential Condition for School Effectiveness #7 on **Professional development and structures for collaboration**, at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/review/school/process.html?section=essential>.

⁵ Please see Essential Condition for School Effectiveness #7 on **Professional development and structures for collaboration** (see link in previous footnote).

⁶ Please see Essential Condition for School Effectiveness #4 on **Effective Instruction** and #8 on **Tiered instruction and adequate learning time** (see link in footnote 4 above).

⁷ Please see Essential Condition for School Effectiveness #1 on **Effective district systems for school support and intervention** (see link in footnote 4 above).

Team Structures: How are gap closers using staff teams to support ELL students?

Many gap closers are characterized by the use of teams, clusters, or professional learning communities to concentrate supports to ELL students. Gap closing schools in 6 of the 11 districts have developed formal staff teams and professional learning communities across the school that are intended to leverage available resources (teachers, staff, and time) to provide ELL students with instructional support. While gap closers may use different team configurations, the team structures are implemented consistently across all grades and provide teachers with multiple (two to three) common planning periods during each week.

The use of teams, clusters, and professional learning communities directly supports ELL students by supporting collaboration among regular and ESL teachers, by ensuring that ELL students are included in mainstream classes and activities and by concentrating the supports to ELL students, for instance by having up to three or four teachers in a single classroom.

Team structures support ELL students by:

- Supporting collaboration among regular and ESL teachers;
- Ensuring that ELL students are fully supported in mainstream classes; and
- Concentrating supports to ELL students.

Examples of effective team structures

The Reid Middle School in Pittsfield uses professional learning communities and other communication structures to promote shared ownership of all students, and particularly ELL students. Grade-level teams have four common planning time periods each week and also meet by content area across grades once a week. The ESL teacher and tutors participate in grade-level common planning time as full members, focusing on the analysis of data and co-developing lessons and instructional strategies. ELL and regular education teachers have also worked closely to integrate the curriculum outlined in pacing guides with ELPBO objectives.

Watertown Middle School in Watertown uses a grade-level team structure to maximize services and supports to its ELL population. Two teams at each grade level serve the approximately 200 students per grade. One team at each grade level is designated as an ELL team, and the ESL teacher functions as a full member of the team. The grade-level teams have regular common planning time and meet as a cluster three to four times each week, and by content area once or twice a week.

Mill Pond Intermediate School in Westborough uses a grade-level team structure that involves three or four instructional teams at each grade level, led by a team leader. The instructional teams share common students and each team is designated as either an ELL team or a special education team. Mill Pond intentionally clusters ELL and special education students on separate teams so that they can provide appropriate instruction and ensure that ESL teachers and tutors are able to concentrate their efforts on only four classes per grade.

Collaboration: How do collaborative relationships between and among school- and district-level teachers and leaders contribute to an effective ELL program?

Gap closing schools are making efforts to ensure that regular education teachers and ESL teachers work together to meet the needs of ELL students. Through their actions, leaders in gap closing schools demonstrate that they are aware that conscious attention to collaboration is necessary to ensure that all teachers have ownership of all students, across grades, content areas, and programs (e.g., special education, ELL, Title I). Gap-closing schools in 8 of the 11 districts have systems in place to support effective collaboration between regular teachers and ESL teachers.

In gap closing schools, leaders have constructed team structures, meetings, and/or a school schedule that allow ESL teachers, tutors, and other support staff to fully participate in common planning around instruction and long-term planning. School leaders have nurtured an environment described by staff as collegial and inclusive. District and school leaders were found in some reviews to have developed inclusive leadership teams and model collaboration in part by including ELL leaders (at the district level) or ESL teachers (at the school level) in leadership team meetings.

Strong relationships and collaboration among staff, including administrators, provide a basis for effective co-teaching and inclusion classrooms and the development of shared expectations for all students.

Focus on Literacy: How are gap closers focusing on literacy in inclusion classes?

Gap closing schools focus on literacy and provide extensive in-class student support (e.g., multiple teachers in the classroom) in their inclusion classes. Gap closing schools in at least 9 of the 11 districts are using an ELL program consisting of: (1) extensive English Language Development (ELD) supports to students beginning to learn English and (2) inclusion of ELL students in mainstream classes taught by a trained content area teacher and supported by ELL staff and tutors and pull-out support for ELL students, based on MEPA levels and student need.

Evidence from the reviews suggests that gap closing schools have been able to move beyond the routine implementation of a traditional ELL program by focusing on literacy during inclusion classes and providing extensive supports to ELL students.

The Welch School in Peabody has leveraged the district’s Balanced Literacy program to create an inclusionary model for the delivery of reading instruction, described as a “triangular model,” through which students receive daily classroom support from the classroom teacher, the reading specialist, and tutors.

Collaborative relationships among professional staff support ELL programs and instruction through:

- Effective co-teaching and inclusion classrooms.
- The development of shared expectations for all students and a sense of ownership among all teachers for all students.

In gap closing schools, the ELL programs are characterized by:

- **A focus on inclusion and mainstreaming ELL students coupled with extensive supports** (e.g., ESL teachers, Sheltered Instruction, Title I tutors), **co-teaching**, and an **explicit focus on literacy**, that is in turn supported by teaming structures and high expectations for all students.

District Support: How are districts supporting schools in providing effective literacy practices, a culture of inclusiveness, and high expectations?

The success of gap closing schools was accompanied by effective support from the district or at least limited interference from the district in their development of team and meeting structures that allow teachers—regular content area teachers and ESL teachers—to build strong, collaborative relationships. Complementing the effective structures, relationships, and programs being used in gap closing schools is a pervasive culture of high expectations for all students and inclusivity among professional staff and among students; in some schools this message originated from district leaders; in others, the message originated from school leaders. As a result, teachers and leaders from gap closing schools in 8 of the 11 districts espouse a culture in which ELL students are integrated into the mainstream, included in all school activities, and seen as full members of the school community. The clearest examples of effective provision of district support were identified in districts that had integrated their English Language Arts and English Language Learner departments. The ELL district reviews suggest that effective district and school approaches to supporting ELL students arise from efforts to integrate general education and ELL programs, services, and ways of thinking about instruction, while retaining the specific features of ELL instruction necessary to move students to full proficiency.

Integrating ELA and ELL Functions: Two Cases

Lowell Public Schools and Malden Public Schools have both made significant changes in how the district office operates in order to provide more coordinated support to schools and to remove obstacles to district- and school-level collaboration, while maintaining among leadership the necessary experience and expertise in English language learner education.

Malden Public Schools combined the ELA and ELL programs in 2009 into a single program led by a director of literacy and language acquisition, a long-time ESL practitioner. All schools provide tiered instruction to struggling students, without reference to program or subgroup (e.g., ELL, special education). By reorganizing the district and reconceptualizing how the district supports all students, Malden created an expectation that content area teachers have a responsibility for students’ English language acquisition. District expectations trickle down to schools, to the extent that principals and teachers feel that “ELL students get what everyone else is getting in the curriculum” and that “nothing changes because the students are ELL students.” When hiring elementary teachers, Malden implements a preference for teachers with dual certification in elementary education and ESL.

Lowell Public Schools combined the ELA and ELL departments in 2008, reflecting the district’s move toward integrating language and literacy supports for all students. As a result, district ELA and ELL staff work together and school leaders and teachers think about students’ needs holistically, rather than by subgroup. For students, the integration of ELA and ELL means that ELL students may be grouped with other, non-ELL students who are reading at the same level and that ELL students receive support from literacy specialists as well as ESL teachers. Lowell has successfully removed artificial barriers to providing comprehensive support to all students while maintaining leadership for ELL and ELA with the requisite knowledge of ELL education: the district coordinator for reading and ELA reports directly to the deputy superintendent, a former bilingual teacher.

Some districts with greater concentrations of ELL students, such as Lowell, Malden, and Worcester, had altered district systems and shifted the roles of district leaders to reinforce a culture of inclusiveness and high expectations. Other districts appeared to have targeted resources and staffing to schools with high concentrations of ELL

students, the result being effective programs guided in many gap closers by strong leadership and passionate, high-quality staff.⁸ These gap closing schools attributed much of their success to a culture in which ELL students are integrated, socially and academically, into the school and in which teachers are collectively responsible for ELL students.

Other Emerging Practices

The central importance of core professional development in sheltering content

In every district and gap closing school included in the ELL district reviews the importance of sheltering content instruction (mostly through category training) was noted as a key factor in developing an effective ELL program. Districts with higher percentages of ELL students were making a concerted effort to provide at least Category 1 and 2 training to their teachers. In some gap closing schools, nearly all teachers had gone through Category 3 training, and many had also received Category 4 training.⁹

Parent information centers as a hub for services and intake

Some districts are finding that a parent information center can play a crucial role in supporting ELL students and families. Districts are using parent information centers as the central hub for student intake, initial language assessment, and placement. In these districts, parent information centers provide language services, such as translation and English language classes for parents and community members, and serve as central and known locations where parents of ELL students can ask questions and obtain access to services. In districts with an influx of families and students from non-English-speaking countries, a full-service parent information center appears to play an important role in easing the transition of students into the school system and ensuring appropriate placement of students for the school year.

Effective and valued before- and after-school programs

Gap closing schools in 5 of the 11 districts were providing extensive before- and after-school programs for ELLs. Before- and after-school programs provide an opportunity for ELLs to receive additional academic support and a way to connect with community organizations. Examples of after-school programs included a homework club for ELL students, a program in which elementary school Spanish-speaking ELL students are paired with high school students taking AP Spanish, and academic enrichment programs targeting ELLs.

⁸ The district reviews provide evidence that teacher efficacy and a culture of inclusiveness in gap closing schools in these districts is just as powerful as approaches observed in the first group, despite the lack sometimes of district structures and systems (such as assessments, data teams, or an aligned curriculum) to support ELL programs and district-wide inclusion.

⁹ For information about category training, please see Attachment 1 to ESE's June 15, 2004, memorandum on qualifications for teachers in sheltered English immersion classrooms, available at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/sei/qualifications.pdf>.

Challenges

Developing an ESL curriculum that is aligned with the English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes (ELPBO) for English Language Learners¹⁰

Some districts have made a significant effort to develop an ESL curriculum that is aligned with ELPBO, and this effort is seen as a contributing factor in the success of gap closing schools in these districts. However, other schools (and districts) have not yet developed a formal ESL curriculum that is aligned with ELPBO.

Questions Raised:

- What is the added value of developing an ESL curriculum that is aligned with ELPBO?
- What are the key factors contributing to effective instruction?

Using ELL assessment data to make decisions and inform instruction¹¹

There is strong evidence of some districts and schools using ELL assessment data to measure ELLs' growth and progress in English and to make determinations regarding if and when students are ready to be exited from their ESL program. In such districts, the use of student data in data teams and among teachers is an effective practice and is cited as crucial to the success of the ELL program. However, some of the districts included in the ELL reviews do not have a strong district assessment system. In such districts, there is evidence that gap closing schools have developed their own school-based practices around data use that go beyond what the district offers. However,

Questions Raised:

- How could districts and schools learn to better incorporate ELL assessment data into their practice of using other assessment data, student work, and a deep understanding of students as individual learners?

there are also examples of gap closing schools that do not use ELL assessment data on a regular basis; rather, they consider their work to be “people-driven, not data-driven.”

Developing cultural competency among district and school staff¹²

A challenge mentioned in at least two of the district reviews was dealing with cultural issues. Some districts offer courses in cultural competency. Lowell, for instance, among other courses in cultural diversity, offered a district-wide course to help teachers work more effectively with students who had traumatic experiences such as living in a war zone or refugee camp. In other districts, however, parents told review team members that staff needed to develop more understanding of their cultures.

Questions Raised:

- How can districts ensure that all teachers receive the training they need to acquire cultural competency?
- What are the topics that should be covered in this training?

¹⁰ Please see Essential Condition for School Effectiveness #3 on **Aligned curriculum**, at <http://www.doe.mass.edu/sda/review/school/process.html?section=essential>.

¹¹ Please see Essential Condition for School Effectiveness #5 on **Student assessment** (see link in footnote 10 above).

¹² Please see Essential Condition for School Effectiveness #7 on **Professional development and structures for collaboration** (see link in footnote 10 above).