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During the 2024-2025 school year, New Bedford 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).

New Bedford

**SUMMARY OF COMPLIANCE CRITERIA RATINGS**

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

| **Improvement Area** **1** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 5 - Program Placement and Structure |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:**  Curriculum:  A review of submitted documentation and staff interviews indicated that while the district does have ESL curricula for all grades and proficiency levels, the district does not ensure these curricula are implemented consistently by ESL educators during ESL instructional time across programmatic models, buildings, and ESL service delivery models. A consistently implemented ESL curriculum is integral to an effective ELE program in which ELs of all grades and proficiency levels become English proficient at a rapid pace    Benchmarking:  A review of submitted documentation and staff interviews also indicated that the district has not adopted procedures aligned with the requirements of M.G.L. c. 71A, § 11 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. While the district does implement a process to review ACCESS data to create personalized goal(s) based on this data, it does not review whether students met their ACCESS target scores (made progress) to determine if the student needs a personalized goal(s) to be established, and instead reviews the difficulty index data and selects certain student populations, such as Students With Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE) and Long Term English Learners (LTEL) students, to create a comprehensive "Whole Child Plan". This does not meet the district's legal requirements in accordance with M.G.L. c. 71A,§11.  Equitable access:  Staff interviews indicated 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:   * In certain elementary buildings, staff interviews indicated that English Learners in the newcomer programs do not get equitable access to the district's "Whole Child Plan" process based solely on their placement and designation as newcomer students. Therefore, elementary newcomer students do not always have equal access to the district's multi-tiered systems of support or special education services because students who are referred to the "Whole Child" team are often found ineligible for consideration due to the lack of training and expertise to distinguish potential disability from language learning for English Learners of lower proficiency levels. * At the middle schools, observations and staff interviews indicated that newcomer and SLIFE do not have equitable access to rigorous, grade-level appropriate instruction that focuses on meaningful and engaging activities designed to build content knowledge with strategic scaffolding of the instruction to meet the unique language needs of newcomer and SLIFE , while ensuring there is academic rigor that challenges students cognitively regardless of their English language proficiency. * Across the district, observations and staff interviews indicated while the district does have a requirement for language objectives to be included in instructional planning, staff are not consistently delving into specifics about the language of the content by developing language objectives aligned to WIDA Standards 2020 and designing instructional tasks and scaffolds to support English Learners of all proficiency levels to master these language objectives.     Staffing:  Dual language:  A review of submitted documents and interviews indicated that the district does not have enough staff with elementary education license and bilingual endorsement to implement its DLE program model with fidelity.  SEI :  Additionally, staff interviews indicated that in the SEI program model, including newcomer and SLIFE programs, the district lacks the ESL staffing capacity to effectively provide essential components of an effective ELE program, such as providing ESL instruction to students based on their English language proficiency and linguistic needs, providing structured collaboration time for instructional planning between co-teachers (for the co-taught ESL service delivery models implemented) as well as between ESL and content staff (for the push-in ESL service delivery models implemented) to identify language objectives, student needs, and to provide appropriate supports and scaffolds for students with all levels of proficiency in content courses.  ELE Services  The district places some students in out-of-district placements to meet their unique needs. The district does not ensure that ELs in such out-of-district placements receive ELE services. |

| **Improvement Area 2** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 6 - Program Exit and Readiness |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of submitted student records indicated that the district has prematurely exited students before they met exit criteria, including students who transfer from other districts with prior ACCESS scores. |

| **Improvement Area 3** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 7 - Parent Involvement |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Although the district stated that there is an active ELPAC, it does not meet the legal requirements of 603 CMR 14.09 and M.G.L. c. 71A,§6A which includes:   * Ensuring the council is composed of volunteer parents or legal guardians of students who are or have been identified as English learners and, to the extent feasible, the members of the council representing the native languages most commonly spoken by the students of the district or charter school * Ensuring the ELPAC is able to perform its duties of: * advising the school district, school committee and board of trustees on matters that pertain to English learners * meeting regularly with school officials to participate in the planning and development of programs designed to improve educational opportunities for English learners * participating in the review of school improvement plans under section 59C of chapter 71 and district improvement plans under section 1I of chapter 69 as the plans relate to English learners. |

| **Improvement Area 4** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 8 - Declining Entry to a Program |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of student records and staff interviews indicated that the written confirmation of the withdrawal (opt-out request) is not provided annually to the school by the parent or legal guardian and such confirmation is not retained in the student's cumulative folder as required by G.L. c. G.L. c. 71A §12.  Also, review of student records indicated 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 14 - Licensure Requirements |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** Licensure:  Documentation, interviews, and a review of ELAR data indicated that not all staff responsible for ESL instruction hold an ESL license or current waiver appropriate for the grade level(s) they teach issued by the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.  Endorsement:  SEI program:  A review of the relevant SEI Endorsement data from ELAR, district submitted documentation, and staff interviews indicated that most core academic teachers assigned to provide sheltered English instruction to English learners hold the SEI Teacher Endorsement, but some do not.  Dual language program:  A review of the relevant BEE and SEI Endorsement data from ELAR, district submitted documentation, and staff interviews indicated that not all staff providing instruction in the dual language education program hold the BEE endorsement or SEI endorsement as required. A core academic teacher in a dual program responsible for the instructional component provided in a language other than English should hold the Bilingual Education Endorsement or a valid waiver issued by the Commissioner. Similarly, a core academic teacher responsible for the instructional component provided in English must either hold the Bilingual Education Endorsement or the SEI Endorsement. |

| **Improvement Area 6** |
| --- |
| **Criterion:** ELE 18 - Records of ELs |
| **Rating:** Partially Implemented |
|  |
| **Description of Current Issue:** A review of the documents requested from the district indicated that the district does not consistently keep all the required documents in students' EL records, particularly at the secondary levels. |