Question 64:

**Describe the district’s program evaluation process of the implementation of district’s ELL Plan. Include whether the district has followed the established plan; *met the applicable procedural and service requirements* – including frequency, timeliness, and documentation; does the information sources and methods for gathering information:**

After spring break, a stakeholder group composed of the district special programs administrator and the secondary and elementary ELL specialists met to develop, collect, and analyze all pertinent evaluation information related to the ELL plan.

The small team has expertise and on-going experience with general and special education, specialized instruction for ELL students, Common Core, State and District assessments, and analyzing both group and individual student data. The group members are active participants on various building and district level decision making teams.

The group reviewed the District’s ELL plan, and procedural and service requirements, including frequency, timeliness, and relevant documentation. The team identified district and state data sources that provided information to respond to the evaluation questions.

After the assessment tool was developed, data and information were consolidated for the group to conduct the evaluation of the District’s ELL plan. During the development of the assessment and the evaluation, we were able to identify areas in which the District needs to create or improve our system for documentation of procedural practices.

Question 65:

**Include the evaluation of the district’s identification process.**

The District’s identification process includes: parent completion of the Home Language Survey (HLS), a secretary from the building will forward the HLS form to the building ELL program team and to the District ELL Coordinator, within two school days. Our data shows that we have some buildings that comply and others who are consistently outside of the timeline.

The District set and did not meet an ambitious goal to complete proficiency testing within 5 days of enrollment. We did meet the mandatory 10 day window with 95% of our students.

Question 66:

**Include the evaluation of the student initial identification assessment process.**

Our district plan calls for all students who are potentially ELL to be tested within 5 days of enrollment. While we were not able to meet this ambitious goal, we did however meet the mandatory 10 day window with 95% of our students. Our inability to test the remaining 5% of students was due to various issues including, but not limited to, timeliness in receiving Home Language Survey form, staff availability, and a lack of a clear understanding on the part of district and building administrators as to whose role it is to do the required testing.

Question 67:

**Include the evaluation of placement in ELL program services to all students with identified language needs.**

At the elementary levels, the district’s goal of placement testing all ELL students within the designated timelines was largely met. However, new students at the secondary level were not always tested for language level in a timely and efficient manner. This is due to various issues including, but not limited to, staff availability, and a lack of a clear understanding on the part of district and building administrators as to whose role it is to do the required testing.

While we did not have a system in place for notifying teachers of student placement, in many cases, it was the teachers themselves that did the placement testing and they should have been made aware of the student’s instructional level.

Question 68:

**Include the evaluation of adequate staff and materials that is consistent with the district’s ELL program of service.**

The district continues to struggle to find highly qualified bilingual teachers and instructional assistants to support our district’s bilingual program. Furthermore, the district has adopted instructional materials that do not fully address the needs of our current ELL program of instruction. See rubric below for additional information.

**Staff**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grades** | **Description** | 0No Evidence | 1Needs ImprovementAddresses Few/Some Needs | 2Needs ImprovementAddressesMost Needs | 3Adequate/MeetsAddressesAll Students’ Needs | 4Exceeds Needs |
| K-3 | Spanish speaking teachers for the Elementary Early Exit model |  |  |  | X |  |
| K-5 | Bi-lingual assistants to support Spanish speaking students in English classes |  |  | X |  |  |
| 6-8 | Bi-lingual assistants to support Spanish speaking students in English classes |  |  | X |  |  |
| 9-12 | Bi-lingual assistants to support Spanish speaking students in English classes |  | X |  |  |  |
| Post-high sped  | Bi-lingual assistants to support Spanish speaking students in English classes |  |  |  | X |  |
| DO | Main office – bilingual staff at least ½ day and access to Spanish speaking staff at all times |  |  |  |  | X |
| ElementarySchools | Main office – bilingual staff at least ½ day and access to Spanish speaking staff at all times |  |  | X |  |  |
| Middle School | Main office – bilingual staff at least ½ day and access to Spanish speaking staff at all times |  |  |  |  | X |
| High School | Main office – bilingual staff at least ½ day and access to Spanish speaking staff at all times |  |  |  |  | X |
| All buildings | Access to interpreters for non-English or Spanish speakers  |  |  |  | X |  |
| All buildings | Access to qualified translator |  |  |  | X |  |
| All buildings | Access to qualified and trained interpreter |  |  | X |  |  |

**Support Materials**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grades** | **Description** | 0No Evidence  | 1Purchased and on shelf with limited use | 2Used as support materials  | 3Used as instruction materials |
| K-5 | Treasure Chest  |  | **X** |  |  |
| K-5 | Bilingual English/Spanish – National Geographic  |  |  | **X** |  |
| 6-8 | Vision |  | **X** |  |  |
| 9-12 | High Point- |  | **X** |  |  |
| 9-12 | Spanish Language content area text for Levels 1 & 2 |  |  | **X** |  |

Question 69:

**Include the evaluation of the district’s exiting/reclassification process for students transitioning from the ELL program.**

Across the District, we are following the exiting/reclassification process for our students transitioning from the ELL program which includes the participants at meetings (parents, classroom teachers, building administrators, district ELL coordinator, and at times, the students themselves), and the review and discuss the body of evidence was used to conduct the evaluation.

Upon receipt of state ELPA scores, students were identified for potential exiting and reclassification. Although students were assessed within the allocated testing window, we have identified an issue when our students probable of exiting take ELPA later in the year. The time we have to complete our exiting /reclassification is limited and does not allow us to provide parents, students or staff with flexibility of meeting and evaluation times.

Decisions were documented on a district form with signatures from all participants. When parents were unable to attend, their input was gathered prior to the exiting meeting. In rare instances in which parents were not able to be reached due to incorrect contact information, notification was sent home with the students themselves.

Question 70:

**Include the evaluation of the district’s monitoring practices for students who have transitioned from the ELL program.**

Building teachers and administrators were informed of their monitoring students and review requirements at the beginning of the school year. At the elementary level, those students were reviewed at twice at all school staffing in conjunction with all building students. At the middle school level, no reviews took place this year. At the high school, three of the six required reviews were completed.

Question 71:

**Describe the district’s rate of ELs acquiring English language skills. Is the pace consistent the with district’s ELL program goals or expectations?**

Based on a review of existing English language skill acquisition data, the District projects that we will have the same percentage of students acquiring English language proficiency as the 2012-2013 school year which will not meet the district goal of 22% for AMAO 2A and 25% for AMAO 2B.

Question 72:

**Describe the district’s rate of language development progress compatible with the district’s objectives for academic (core content) progress.**

At the elementary level at grades 3 and 5, the ELL students are progressing at a higher rate than their non-ELL counterparts in Reading. At grades 1, 2, and 4, the non-ELL students are progressing at a higher rate than their ELL counterparts in reading. In math in grades 2, 3, 4, and 5, the ELL students are progressing at a higher rate than their non-ELL counterparts. The only grade in which the non-ELL students are progressing at a faster rate than the ELL students is at first grade.

At the secondary level, the ELL students underperform their non-ELL counterparts in both reading and math.

When compared to the OAKs performance, at the elementary level some grades are comparable to non-ELL students’ performance but in most instances including the secondary level, they are not progressing at the same rate as their non-ELL counterparts.

At this point, it appears that our ELL students are making greater gains in their acquisition of English than in their academic core content areas.

Question 73:

**Describe how the ELs are performing in English language skills compared to the district’s goals and standards?**

The district’s projected growth percentage for AMAO 1 is 51.7% which represents an increase over the previous year of 5%. However, this still does not meet the district’s stated goal of 66%.

Question 74:

**Describe how the district’s *English learners are progressing in English language skills s*o they will be able to successfully handle regular coursework?**

As of this date, our ADEPT progress monitoring is still in process. According to our ELPA data, 11% of our ELL students have reached the proficiency standard for English and are now able to fully access the curriculum without additional scaffolding for language.

Additionally, in the 2013-2014 school year 51.7% of our ELL students made at least one level of growth as measured by the ELPA test. This percentage of growth is an improvement over last year’s results.

Question 75:

**Describe how the former ELs (monitored) continue to demonstrate English language skills that enable them to successfully handle regular coursework.**

At the elementary level, all students are monitored for academic achievement. If a former ELL student is identified as a student who is struggling, the Elementary ELL specialist takes appropriate actions to ensure that their unique needs are addressed. There were no instances of this occurring this year.

At the secondary level, former ELL students who were struggling were staffed through the SST process actions to ensure that their unique needs are addressed. This year several of our former ELL students at the middle school level had their needs addressed through this process.

The majority of our female secondary ELLs are making good academic progress in their content area instruction. The average GPA for our female former ELL students is 3.0 or higher. For our male former ELL students, their GPA on average is lower ranging between 1.5 and 2.0.

Question 76:

**Describe how the EL students, who are currently receiving English language development services are progressing academically relative to program goals or expectations for core content knowledge.**

At the elementary level at grades 3 and 5, the ELL students are progressing at a higher rate than their non-ELL counterparts in Reading. At grades 1, 2, and 4, the non-ELL students are progressing at a higher rate than their ELL counterparts in reading.

In math in grades 2, 3, 4, and 5, the ELL students are progressing at a higher rate than their non-ELL counterparts. The only grade in which the non-ELL students are progressing at a faster rate than the ELL students is at first grade.

At the secondary level, the ELL students underperform their non-ELL counterparts in both reading and math.

Question 77:

**Describe how the EL and former EL students are doing, over time, as compared to the academic performance of all other students.**

Our current ELLs are not progressing academically as well as our non-ELL students. Our female former ELLs are performing at a higher level academically than their non-ELL counterparts, while the male former ELL students are performing with a lower level of success than their non-ELL counterparts.

The majority of both the male and female former ELL students are graduating with regular diplomas. We have a decreasing number of current and former ELL students drop out prior to graduation, with the majority of those being male. This is comparable to our non-ELL population.

Question 78:

**Describe what measures are being used to assess the overall performance of EL students in meeting the goals the district has established for its ELL program.**

We are currently unable to complete the analysis of progress monitoring on ADEPT because this testing is currently taking place and the RIT growth analysis is also unavailable through the data warehouse at this time. However, the comparison has been made between students overall performance on OAKs, ELPA, and universal screening tools as per our district plan.

Questions 79 and 80

**#79: Describe any identified concern(s) based on this evaluation, and**

**#80 Describe how the district will address the concern(s).**

|  |
| --- |
| **Concerns and Actions to Address Issues** |
| Questions 65, 66, 67 |  |
| *Concern*: Lacking a visual reference with tracking steps to initiate the identification process | *Action for improvement*:1. Update visual for schools to reference when needing information about the EL identification process and timelines
 |
| *Concern*: Not enough time with current staffing levels to consistently monitor enrollment and processing of the Home Language Survey (HLS) | *Action for improvement*:1. Adjust staffing to assign specific person to monitor enrollment and HLSs
2. Identify staff person to contact schools when HLS not received by person who will review and identify potential ELL students in the building &/or District Office within identified timeframe
3. Provide positive reinforcement to staff who follow the process
 |
| *Concern*: Need personnel to consistently monitor enrollment and processing of the Home Language Survey (HLS) | *Action for improvement*:1. Adjust staffing to assign specific person to monitor enrollment and HLSs
2. Staff person to contact schools when HLS not received at District Office within identified timeframe
3. Provide positive reinforcement to staff who follow the process
 |
| Question 66: |  |
| *Concern*: Lack of time to conduct initial identification assessment process | *Action for improvement*:1. Identify staff testing options (substitutes, assessment staff, extra duty) and include in the ELL handbook
 |
| *Concern*: District and building administrators and staff disconnect as to whose role it is to do the required testing | *Action for improvement*:1. Review and update ELL initial identification protocol with timelines to go into the /ELL handbook
 |
| Questions 68, 71, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77 |  |
| *Concern*: Use and appropriateness of instructional materials | *Action for improvement*:1. Conduct a thorough ELL Audit of Practice at the elementary, middle and high school levels
2. Conduct a Gap Analysis to determine areas of instructional, materials/curricular, and intervention needs based on research and /or evidence based practice
3. Develop an action plan with stakeholders to incorporate research and /or evidence based practice across all buildings and levels
4. Continue partnership with Western Oregon University, and training and coaching of Contextual ELD
5. Collaborate with district literacy specialists, classroom and special education teachers, and administrators to develop training modules that address evidence based practices in the area of literacy
 |
| *Concern*: Need additional information to assess if students have adequate access to Spanish speaking staff  | *Action for improvement*:1. Include questions in the ELL Audit of Practice referring to availability of Spanish speaking staff to support students
2. Conduct a Gap Analysis on the availability of Spanish speaking staff to support students to determine needs based on research and /or evidence based practice
3. Include identified needs in the action plan
 |
| Question 69: |  |
| *Concern*: Short window of time to conduct the exit/reclassification evaluation when the ELPA is taken at the end of the testing window | *Action for improvement*:1. Identify, and communicate with buildings and district office, a testing deadline that allows staff to have an adequate amount of time to complete the exit/reclassification evaluation process
 |
| Questions 70, 75, 78 |  |
| *Concern*: Monitoring teams did not meet at the required intervals to review student progress and needs | *Action for improvement*:1. Review with buildings and district administrators the written guidelines and requirements for monitoring students
2. Identify and share dates of time for monitoring teams to review student data at the beginning of each school year
3. Review, update and share our monitoring report for buildings to complete after team meetings, and submit to the building administrator or district office for evidence of meeting
 |
| Question 76: |  |
| *Concern*: Support and instruction provided to newcomers, and/or our Level 1 and Level 2 students | *Action for improvement*:1. Include the areas of support and instruction for our Level 1 and Level 2 students in the ELL Audit of Practice at the middle and high school levels
2. Conduct a Gap Analysis to determine areas of instructional, materials/curricular, and intervention needs based on research and /or evidence based practice specific to Level 1 and Level 2 students
3. Develop an action plan with stakeholders to incorporate research and /or evidence based practice across all buildings and levels
 |