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During the 2023-2024 school year, Woburn 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).

Woburn

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** 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 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 with lower proficiency levels are not held to the same learning standards as their peers;
* ELs at the middle and high school levels do not have equitable access to grade appropriate content courses such as ELA and history;
* ELs at the elementary level do not have equitable access to tier 1 and tier 2 interventions;
* Dually identified students at the elementary level do not have access to ESL instruction as their special education and related services are scheduled during the same block that ESL instruction is scheduled;
* ELs at the middle and high school levels do not have equitable access to higher level courses;
* ELs at the middle school do not have access to world language courses.

The Department determines that ELs with low English proficiency levels have inequitable access to the district curriculum, district supports such as tiered interventions, and grade level standards and they are not expected to show the same level of mastery of grade level standards as their English-speaking peers. Interviews also indicated that for ELs of lower proficiency levels, content instruction was often delivered by unlicensed paraprofessionals who provide direct translation of the content instruction. As a result, SEI strategies are not always used to make content comprehensible for English learners at low proficiency levels, SEI teachers rely on the direct translation provided in SEI classes and students focus on the paraprofessional rather than the teacher and other instructional activities in the classroom. While leveraging native language and supporting translanguaging in moderation are important strategies, relying on direct translation too much at the expense of incorporating sheltering strategies does not promote the rapid learning of English nor grade level understanding of the content areas in SEI classes. 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 providing coaching and instructional support to content teachers, placing students in ESL courses with peers at appropriate levels, providing time for ESL collaboration with content teachers to identify language objectives, student needs and to provide appropriate supports and scaffolds for students with low levels of proficiency in content courses, providing effective oversight and monitoring of the ELE program, and advocating for English Learners at the administrative level. The district has procedures in place 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; however, 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. Finally, interviews and a review of documentation indicate that the district does not have an ESL curriculum that is integral to an effective ELE program in which ELs of all grades and proficiency levels become English proficient at a rapid pace. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 7 - Parent Involvement |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Interviews indicated that although the district has policies in place to provide 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. Appropriate and competent translators or interpreters have proficiency in target languages, ease of written and oral expression, knowledge of specialized terms or concepts, expertise in the content being interpreted and as they are trained in their role they are knowledgeable on the ethics of interpreting and translating, and the need for confidentiality. The district needs to ensure that its interpreters are qualified to provide services that meet its legal obligations. Therefore, the Department has determined that the district does not always provide effective language assistance to parents whose preferred language is not English and therefore, does not always meet the obligation to communicate effectively with parents to include them in matters pertaining to their children's education. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **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 teachers assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to English learners hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement, but some do not. |