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During the 2024-2025 school year, Lynnfield 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 15, ELE 18 |
| **PARTIALLY****IMPLEMENTED** | ELE 3, ELE 5, ELE 7, ELE 8, ELE 10, ELE 13, 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, interviews with staff members, and a review of student records indicate that although the district has written procedures for identifying English Learners, those procedures are not thorough enough to ensure that all English Learners, Former English Learners, SLIFE, and Newcomers are identified in a timely manner. A review of district documentation indicates that the questions on the Home Language Survey do not conform to DESE guidance. Finally, conversations with staff members reveal that parents may not have access to the Home Language Survey in a language in which they understand. The Department concludes that the district does not properly identify students who need English language support and the current initial identification procedures, and practices are not in compliance with 603 CMR 14.02(1) that requires districts and charter schools to establish procedures in accordance with the Department guidelines. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **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 ELE staffing capacity and systems to effectively provide essential components of an effective ELE program, such as: * providing ESL instruction to all English Learners, including English Learners with disabilities,
* providing enough time for all English Learners in ESL courses to make rapid progress in English language development,
* providing scheduled 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 compliance requirements;
* reviewing student enrollment data and assessment data to allocate appropriate staffing at each building to ensure sufficient time of ELE instruction is provided;
* and ensuring district-wide systems and structures are established and implemented with fidelity including updating written procedures and providing staff training on the procedures to ensure full compliance with ELE programmatic requirements.

Documentation also indicated that the district has not adopted procedures to identify English learners who do not meet English proficiency benchmarks and has not established a process for the district to: (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.Finally, a review of district documents and interviews with staff members indicate that the district has two separate grading systems - one for English Learners at developing levels of English proficiency and one for non-English Learners and English Learners at higher levels of proficiency. The Department determines that ELs with low English proficiency levels have inequitable access to the district curriculum and grade level standards and they are not expected to show mastery of grade level standards as their English-speaking peers. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 7 - Parent Involvement |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Interviews indicated that although the district often provides translated documents and interpretation for families who need them, it does not have policies and procedures in place to ensure that all staff members are aware of which families have requested communications in languages other than English and that competent, appropriately trained staff or outside resources provide translation and interpretation in all necessary situations in which families may require them. The district needs to ensure that all of its translations sent to families are from competent, appropriately trained staff or outside resources 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 4** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 8 - Declining Entry to a Program |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Submitted documentation and student records indicate that the district does not have proper policies and procedures to require annual written confirmation of the parents' request to withdraw their children from an English learner education program as required by G.L. c. 71A§12.Furthermore, student records and conversations with staff members indicate that the district does not regularly monitor the progress of opt-out students which would indicate next steps if a student's academic and linguistic needs are not met. |

| **Improvement Area 5** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 10 - Parental Notification |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of the documentation indicated that the district does not have clear written procedures for parental notification, including timeline, ensuring compliance with state and federal forms, and responsibilities for various stakeholder roles. A review of documentation submitted indicates that progress reports concerning student progress in acquiring English Language proficiency are not being sent home on a regular basis to parents; furthermore, evidence does not support that report cards are translated and provided in a language the parent can understand. |

| **Improvement Area 6** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 13 - Follow-up Support |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** According to staff interviews and student records, the district monitors Former English Learners for four years after exiting the ELE program; however, the district lacks the staffing capacity and systems to provide reasonable and sufficient support for Former English Learners who may be struggling to adapt to the general curriculum. |

| **Improvement Area 7** |
| --- |
| **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. |