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How effective is our ELL Program?

Listening and Learning:
Dr. Greg Baker’s Entry Plan Report to the Community

Dear Families, Community and Staff,

The purpose of my Entry Plan as the new superintendent of Bellingham Public Schools has been to listen and learn about our strengths, improvement opportunities and challenges through a process of building relationships, public trust and engagement in our schools.

During my first six months on the job, I have spent time in every classroom in our 22 schools to experience our system as a learner. In addition, I have had monthly an extensive data analysis and document review, trying to learn as much as possible about our school system’s history, past practices and current status.

This report does not mark the end of my listening and learning. I plan to continue meetings with stakeholders regularly with the belief that new learning, strong communication and adaptation to change are central to our future progress.

This juncture in the school year creates an opportunity for me to share with you
Snapshot of L1-L3 ELL Population in Bellingham 2010-2011

In the next several slides, “ELL” refers to students who have been identified by scoring Level 1, Level 2 or Level 3 on the Washington Language Proficiency Test. (WLPT)
ELLs as a Percentage of Total Students in Bellingham by School Year

- 1999-2000: 3.4%
- 2000-2001: 3.7%
- 2001-2002: 3.6%
- 2002-2003: 3.8%
- 2003-2004: 4.1%
- 2004-2005: 4.8%
- 2005-2006: 4.9%
- 2006-2007: 5.0%
- 2007-2008: 5.1%
- 2008-2009: 5.3%
- 2009-2010: 5.2%
- 2010-2011: 6.2%
Finding the percentage of ELLs in your district


Select your school district.

Select the school year.

Percentage of ELLs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage of L1-L3 ELLs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alderwood</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordata</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyland</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuksan</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Heights</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Cozier</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkview</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Valley</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squalicum</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larrabee</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade King</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Beach</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulshan</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whatcom</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sehome</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairhaven</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentage of L1-L3 ELLs By School**

- Elementary Schools
- Middle Schools
- High Schools
**Headcount of L1-L3 ELLs By School**

- **Alderwood**: 90
- **Cordata**: 83
- **Shuksan**: 71
- **Squalicum**: 69
- **Roosevelt**: 56
- **Northern Heights**: 45
- **Sunnyland**: 44
- **Carl Cozier**: 22
- **Happy Valley**: 19
- **Parkview**: 15
- **Sehome**: 14
- **Kulshan**: 13
- **Wade King**: 10
- **Bellingham**: 10
- **Silver Beach**: 9
- **Whatcom**: 8
- **Larrabee**: 6
- **Geneva**: 6
- **Lowell**: 5
- **Fairhaven**: 5
- **Columbia**: 4
- **Options**: 1

Colors:
- Blue: Elementary Schools
- Orange: Middle Schools
- Purple: High Schools
Percentage and Number of ELLs in a School


Select your district and the school.

Number & percentage of ELLs in school.
Over 80% of teachers in Bellingham are responsible for providing sheltered instruction for English language learners.
Languages Spoken by ELLs in Bellingham
Data that supported the need for a review...

**Increase in ELL Population, Decrease in ELL Support**

% ELL Students in Bellingham  
2001-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% ELL Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Certificated and Classified ELL FTE in Bellingham 2001-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data that supported the need for a review...

Inconsistent ELL Student Achievement

Our district goal for ELL student achievement is to consistently be above the state average in ELL test scores.
Data that supported the need for a review...

**Low ELL Graduation Rates**

- 2006-2007: 49% ELL, 73% All Students
- 2007-2008: 26% ELL, 67% All Students
- 2008-2009: 17% ELL, 65% All Students
- 2009-2010: 46% ELL, 72% All Students
- 2010-2011: 76% ELL, 76% All Students
Timeline Leading up to the Review

Aug.
- Met with new superintendent
- Asked to investigate the effectiveness of the current ELL program

Sept.
- Gathered data on effectiveness of the current ELL Program

Oct.
- Gathered data on effectiveness of the current ELL program

Nov.
- Researched and vetted consultants who could help facilitate an ELL program review
- Held informational meeting with potential consultants and key district leaders.
- Decided to do the Program Review

Dec.
- Planned with consultants
- Recruited ELL Program Review Team members

Jan.
- Planned with consultants
- Recruited ELL Program Review team members

Feb.
- Planned with consultants
- Recruited ELL Program Review team members

Mar.
- Planned with consultants
- Gathered comprehensive schedule information
- Conducted the ELL Program Review

Apr.
- Met with district ELL Program Review team to translate data findings into specific recommendations

May
- Converted recommendations into a specific above baseline budget proposal
- Communicated Program Review results with stakeholders
ELL Program Review

- Three week process in three phases:

  - Two Days of Initial Professional Development
  - 8 Days of Data Collection at 7 Schools
  - Two Days of Concluding Professional Development
Phase One—Initial PD

Two Days of Professional Development with Consultants and District ELL Program Review Team

- Read research and summarized best practices
- Wrote questions for interviews, focus groups and on-line surveys
- Practiced using the observation protocol by watching teacher videos and engaging in inter-rater reliability activities
Example of Interview Questions

All data collection for the program review process was organized around 6 specific elements...

Element 1. Leadership
1. What is your understanding of your role in meeting the needs of ELL students?
2. What is the district’s vision for ELL students? What is your school’s vision?

Element 2. Identification, Assessment, Placement and Exit
3. Are you familiar with the policies/procedures for identifying and placing students in the ELL program? If so, tell me your understanding of those policies/procedures. What about the policies/procedures for exiting?
4. How does the district monitor the academic progress and language development of ELL students?

Element 3. Curriculum and Instruction
5. How many ELL students are there in each of your classes?
6. How do you use ongoing assessments to implement appropriate instruction for your ELL students?
7. What strategies, resources, and interventions do you use to facilitate ELL’s participation and learning in your classes?
8. How do you use English language development (ELD) standards to plan for instruction?
9. How does ELL fit into your understanding of RTI?

Element 4. Qualified Staff for ELL
10. What professional development have you had to prepare you to instruct and assess ELL students?
11. What, if any, ongoing professional development support is provided in this area?
OCR’s 6 Elements

1. Leadership
2. Identification, Assessment, Placement and Exit
3. Curriculum and Instruction
4. Qualified Staff for ELL
5. Program Collaboration and Support for ELL Students
6. Parent and Community Involvement in the ELL Program

http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/index.html
developing programs for english language learners: table of contents

resource materials for planning and self-assessments

• title page
• notices
• table of contents
• overview
• developing a program
• program evaluation
• glossary
• other resources
• charts

part i: an overview

about these resource materials

legal background

first principle

second principle

third principle

part ii: developing english language learner (ell) programs

introduction

goal development

ell plan development

ell plan outline

section one: selecting the educational approach and setting goals

section two: identification of potential ell students

section three: assessment of ell status

section four: program of services for ell students

section five: staffing and resources

section six: transition from ell services and monitoring performance

section seven: ell students and other district programs

section eight: program evaluation, review, and improvement

part iii: program evaluation

introduction

overview of key elements

program implementation information

student performance information

analyzing the information and identifying areas for improvement

part iv: glossary

part v: resources list

part vi: ell program flow charts
Phase Two—Data Collection

8 Days of Data Collection at the 7 Schools with the Highest ELL Population

- Led interviews and focus groups with students, parents, teachers, administrators, office staff etc.
- Conducted twenty-minute, unannounced classroom observations
- Asked district staff to complete an on-line survey
Example of Classroom Observation Protocol

Similar to the SIOP observation protocol, but with only the observable strategies.
Phase Three—Concluding PD

- Engaged in data analysis—learned how to quantify qualitative data
- Made generalizations in order to draw conclusions based on the data
- Transformed findings into specific recommendations for change*

*This required additional meetings of the ELL Program Review Team after the three-week program review period.

Two Days of Professional Development: District ELL Program Review Team and Professional Consultants
Excerpt from ELL Program Review Executive Summary

The full review document was 30 pages long, so our ELL Program Review Team wrote a 5 page executive summary to help communicate results with stakeholders.

**Element 1—Leadership**
- Implement a research-based, district-wide program of ELL service that (1) uses Sheltered Instruction as the primary approach and (2) is clearly communicated to all district staff.
- Provide sufficient funding, staffing, and training to implement the Sheltered Instruction ELL Program effectively
  - Hire highly-qualified, certified ELL Specialists who will support teachers in providing effective core instruction for ELLs and who will provide appropriate instructional interventions to accelerate the academic progress of ELLs.
  - Create an administrative ELL Program Coordinator position to oversee the ELL program.
- Ensure that the ELL program is in compliance with district, state and federal laws, policies and procedures.
- Establish an ELL Advisory Committee.

**Element 2—Identification, Assessment, Placement and Exit**
- Make ELL identification, placement, and exit procedures known to all staff.
- Use the framework of Response to Intervention (RTI) to address the language development needs of ELLs.
- Develop a plan for how the district will track the academic progress of exited (L4) ELL students.
- Make ELL program placement, assessment and exit information available in the district database.

**Element 3—Curriculum and Instruction**
- Require professional development for teachers and administrators regarding key concepts of second language acquisition, the English Language Development (ELD) Standards and sheltered instructional practices that reduce linguistic barriers for ELL students.
- Provide academic support by (1) purchasing leveled texts for content areas in English as well as other languages, (2) providing academic support in advanced level courses for advanced (L3) and exited (L4) ELL students, and (3) offering instruction on how to successfully navigate the education system through college (including funding sources).

**Element 4—Qualified Staff for ELL**
- Allocate and maintain appropriate ELL student to staff ratios to sustain the Sheltered Instruction ELL program model.
- Based on best practice models, put a system in place for on-going ELL professional development and coaching on sheltered instruction strategies and cultural sensitivity.
- Recruit culturally and linguistically diverse staff with expertise in ELL and who are native speakers of the
Results:

Background Regarding ELL Program Models

- Bilingual Programs
  - Dual Language
  - Developmental Bilingual
  - Transitional Bilingual

- ELL Instructional Program Alternatives in Washington State
  - Sheltered Instruction/Content-Based ELL

- Newcomer Programs

Lau v. Nichols

Castañeda v. Pickard
Results:

Most Important Finding

- We say we have a Sheltered Instruction ELL Program, but we do not.
  - ELL program model has not been effectively communicated.
  - Teachers don’t always know who their ELL students are.
  - Teachers have received limited training in Sheltered Instruction.
  - Observation data showed that teachers were not using SI strategies even though they thought they were.

Sink or Swim...
Results:  

*The Good News*

- 97% of teachers interviewed said that they need additional professional development in the area of ELL.
Recommendations for Change: Transforming the ELL Program

- Bellingham School District Develops a Highly Effective Sheltered Instruction ELL Program
- ELLs achieve at high levels in content knowledge and language proficiency
- Quality of core instruction improves for all students
- Sheltered Instruction PD for teachers and Administrators
- Enough highly qualified ELL staff to sustain PD and provide interventions
Enough Highly Qualified Staff:

Certificated ELL Specialist

- Supports Classroom Teachers’ Core Instruction
- Provides Instructional Interventions for ELL Students
- Serves as Point Person for ELL Family Engagement
Enough Highly Qualified Staff:

*Increase in ELL Staffing*

- 2010-2011: 3.4 Certificated ELL Staff
- 2011-2012: 11 Certificated ELL Staff
Recommendations for Change: 
Transforming the ELL Program

Bellingham School District Develops a Highly Effective Sheltered Instruction ELL Program

- Sheltered Instruction PD for teachers and Administrators
- Enough highly qualified ELL staff to sustain PD and provide interventions
- ELLs achieve at high levels in content knowledge and language proficiency
- Quality of core instruction improves for all students
## Sustained Professional Development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIOP Professional Development Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kind of Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIOP 3-Day Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Based SIOP PD—Whole Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building-Based SIOP Coaching—Small Group/Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trainer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Specialist/Peer Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required/Optional</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly at Staff Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a month for 6 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ELL Support Plan for Proficiency Level 1**

**Student Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>Teacher/Team</th>
<th>Proficiency Level at Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Proficiency Level 1:** Student may demonstrate some or all of these skills; proficiency in each area may be different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening/Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Very little or no English</td>
<td>• Uses words, drawings, gestures</td>
<td>• Draws, labels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses words, gestures, and actions</td>
<td>• Sequence simple text</td>
<td>• Writes familiar words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practices repetitive social greetings</td>
<td>• Answers literal questions</td>
<td>• Begins to invent spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Imitates</td>
<td>• Highly contextualized vocabulary</td>
<td>• Uses graphic organizers to convey ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reads short phrases</td>
<td>• Participates in group writing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses word meaning strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classroom Implications:**

**Recommended Instructional Strategies**

- Read-aloud and picture support
- Extensive oral language practice
- Longer wait time
- Gestures and demonstrations
- Thinking Maps
- Sentence frames for speaking and writing
- Clarify concepts in first language

**Recommended Accommodations**

- Use assistive technology
- Give a test orally or read test
- Provide peer tutoring
- Preferential seating
- Pair with a language partner
- Opportunity to show understanding in multiple modes

**Recommended Modifications**

- Simplify directions, repeat, rephrase, show, model
- Provide picture support (always!)
- Reduce number of correct responses required
- Slow the pace of instruction
- Give an outline for an assignment (in first language if possible)
- Adapted texts

**Level of Concern (Annual Progress + Years in Program)**

- New
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

**Additional Services**

- Special Education
- Speech/Language Therapy
- Migrant
- 504 Plan
- 504 Plan
- Other:

**Assessment Accommodations** — review prior to assessment to ensure these are still appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read-Aloud: Human Readers and Read-Aloud CDs **</td>
<td>Spell Check/Word Prediction Software ***</td>
<td>Student has IEP or 504 — see plan for more accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read Aloud: Text to Speech **</td>
<td>Grammar Devices *****</td>
<td>MSP Math or Math/Science only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read-Aloud: Translated Presentations ***</td>
<td>Voice Recognition Software: Speech-to-Text ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scribes ***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Glossaries *****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Content-specific restrictions apply**


**Teacher Comments:**
Recommendations for Change: 
Transforming the ELL Program

Bellingham School District Develops a Highly Effective Sheltered Instruction ELL Program

- Sheltered Instruction PD for teachers and Administrators
- Enough highly qualified ELL staff to sustain PD and provide interventions

- ELLs achieve at high levels in content knowledge and language proficiency
- Quality of core instruction improves for all students
Instructional Interventions for ELL

**TIER 3**
- Intensive Interventions for Long Term English Learners

**TIER 2**
- Students identified for interventions based on:
  1. ELL Peer Data Analysis
  2. Individual AMAO data

**TIER 1**
- 1. Supporting differentiated core instruction through SIOP PD and Coaching
- 2. Establishing appropriate expectations for English learners’ academic progress—ELL Student Support Plans
The RTI For ELL Challenge—Defining Expected Progress

- Tier 2, and Tier 3
  - How do we define “expected progress” in the four language domains—listening, speaking, reading and writing?
  - How do we gather baseline and formative data on ELL student progress in the four domains?
  - What supplemental and intensive interventions are most effective specifically for English Learners?
On-Going Development and Improvement

Bellingham ELL Program

Training and Development for Teachers: *Sheltered Instruction*

Support for ELL Students: *RTI for ELL*

Family Engagement: *One Schoolhouse Approach*

**TIER 1**
1. Supporting differentiated core instruction through SIOP PD and Coaching
2. Establishing appropriate expectations for English learners academic progress—ELL Student Support Plans

**TIER 2**
Students identified for interventions based on:
1. ELL Peer Data Analysis
2. Individual AMAO data
Contact and Resources

http://bellinghamschools.org/
Amy.Carder@bellinghamschools.org