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# I.A. Introduction: School District Information

## Corvallis School District 509J Information

6 K-5 Elementary Schools

1 K-5 Charter School

2 K-8 Schools

2 Middle Schools

2 High Schools

Total Enrollment: 6791 students as of 10/20/09

## Ethnicity and Race of District Students

Ethnicity

Hispanic: 12%

Non-Hispanic: 88%

Race

9% Asian

5% Pacific Islander

5% Am. Indian/Alaskan Native

3% Black

78% White

Number of English Language Learners: 468

Number of ELL students receiving Special Education: 13%

Number of TAG identified ELL students: 1.2%

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | Number | Percent |
| Students progressing to next English Language Proficiency level(based on Oregon AMAO #1 data for 2007-08) | 223 | 52% |
| Students exited from a 5 year program (based on Oregon AMAO #2 data for 2007-08) | 101 | 33.5% |
| Students on Monitor Status Year 1 (10/2009 data) | 59  | 60% of Monitored  |
| Students on Monitor StatusYear 2 (Corvallis 10/2009 data) | 39 | 40% of Monitored |
| Students Re-entered into Program (Corvallis 10/2009 data) | 3 | .5% |
| Students whose parents Declined Services (Corvallis 10/2009 data) | 26 | 5.5% |

Oregon State Assessment Results for 2008-09 Using *Adjusted Status*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ELL Subgroup | Language Arts (adjusted status) | Increased Percentage from previous AYP Results | Participation |
| Elementary | MET | 71.5% | Yes | 99% |
| Middle Schools |  MET \* | 49.9% | Yes | 99% |
| High Schools | NOT MET | 38% | Yes | 94% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ELL Subgroup  | Mathematics (adjusted status) | Increased Percentage from Previous AYP Results | Participation |
| Elementary | Met | 65% | No | 99% |
| Middle School | Met \* | 50.8% | No | 97% |
| High School | Not Met | 42.8% | No | 96% |

\*Safe Harbor

**AMAO Criteria 1 and 2: Results using current local data from Corvallis Database**

**2008-09 \***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS | Number | Percent |
| Students progressing to next English Language Proficiency level | 128 | 41% |
| Students exited from a 5 year program | 48 | 34% |

\*Using data for 314 students who had 2 or more data points within the Corvallis School District ELL Database.

## Distribution of English Language Learners in Corvallis School District 509J

3 Major Languages

As of November 4, 2009

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School | Spanish | Korean | Arabic | OtherLanguage | # of ELLs | % of ELL Population |
| Adams | 6 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 3.5% |
| Franklin | 6 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 17 | 3.7% |
| Jefferson | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 2.2% |
| Mt. View | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0.7% |
| Wilson | 6 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 20 | 4.4% |
| Garfield | 123 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 129 | 28.4% |
| Hoover | 2 | 16 | 1 | 6 | 25 | 5.5% |
| Lincoln | 80 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 86 | 18.9% |
| Cheldelin | 7 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 4.4% |
| Linus Pauling | 44 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 47 | 10.3% |
| CHS | 41 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 60 | 13.2% |
| CV | 8 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 22 | 4.8% |
|  **ELL Totals** | **331 (73%)** | **44 (9%)** | **26 (6%)** | **54(12%)** | 455 | **100%** |

Schools in blue columns are current Magnet ELL schools. ELL families may chose to have their children attend an ELL magnet school and the school district provides transportation.

# I.B. Introduction: District Information on Program Goals and Philosophy

Corvallis School District has chosen educational approaches that are scientifically research based and are considered best practices for the education of English Language Learners. Dual Language Immersion (2 Way Bilingual) has been chosen as it supports core content acquisition and English language development (Collier and Thomas). Since 73% of our LEP students are Spanish speakers and we have many native English speaking families who would like their children to become bilingual Corvallis is able to provide Dual Language Immersion programs for a majority of our LEP students. Sheltered Instruction in core content courses and in elementary classrooms is an educational approach that is used in the DLI programs and in the regular classrooms throughout the district. Structured English Immersion is the third educational approach used to support core content acquisition and is implemented to support secondary students.

All LEP students received receive direct English Language Development each day either as a class period built into their daily schedule (DLI programs, middle schools and high schools) or as a pull-out program in 6 elementary programs. The Focused Approach to English Language Development with a focus on Forms and Functions of language is the instructional approach used for the ELD instruction with appropriate instructional materials provided.

## Program Goals and Philosophy

Mission Statement

To ensure that students gain the skills to be academically proficient in English in all language domains (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) and to ensure equal access to core content and access and understanding of the mainstream culture in an inclusive school community.

Goals

1. To provide English Language Learners high-quality instruction that leads to proficiency in reading, writing, speaking and understanding English through English Language Development Classes in order to achieve academic success in an all English curriculum.
2. To provide English Language Learners instruction that leads to the mastery of the Oregon Academic Standards in the areas of Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies through Sheltered Instruction, Dual Language Immersion, or Structured English Immersion.
3. To provide English Language Learners an educational environment that will enable students to maintain confidence and a positive identity with their cultural heritage and first language. This can be through one of the district’s Dual Language Immersion programs, multicultural education professional development, clubs and/or school events.
4. To provide parents of English Language Learners the opportunity to participate and support their child’s educational experience and the opportunity to shape the district’s English Language Learner program.
5. To analyze student achievement annually and determine needed resources to ensure that English Language Learners are effectively served in ELD and in their core content courses.

## ****English Language Proficiency and Subject Matter Mastery Goals****

* 65% of our LEP students will move up one or more language proficiency level as measured by the ELPA by June 2011.
* 70% of students who have been in an ELL program for 5 years or more will attain English proficiency by June 2011.
* 70% of our ELL students will reach their grade level Language Arts standards by June 2011 as measured by the Oregon State Assessment (based on adjusted status).
* 69% of our ELL students will reach their grade level Math standards by June 2011 as measured by the Oregon State Assessment (based on adjusted status).

## Case Law or Legislation

**ORS 336.074: Special English courses (1971)**: “Specific courses to teach speaking, reading and writing (English) shall be provided… to those children who are unable to profit from classes taught in English. Such courses shall be taught… until children are able to profit from classes conducted in English.”

**Equal Educational Opportunities Act (1974):** Makes educational institutions responsible for taking the necessary steps to overcome linguistic and/or cultural barriers that keep students from equal participation in instructional programs.

*The U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights in* **The Provision of an Equal Education Opportunity to Limited-English Proficient Students (2000)** *has provided non formal general guidelines for districts to ensure that they meet the needs of ELL’s. Under those guidelines, districts should:*

1. *1) Identify students as potential ELLs;*
2. *2) Assess students’ need for ELL services;*
3. *3) Develop a program which, in the view of experts in the field, has a reasonable chance for success;*
4. *4) Ensure that necessary staff, curricular materials, and facilities are in place and used properly;*
5. *5) Develop appropriate evaluation standards, including program exit criteria, for measuring the progress of students; and*
6. *6) Assess the success of the program and modify it where needed.*

# II. Identification of the Primary Language other than English and Eligibility

All students in grades kindergarten through 12th grade who have been identified as meeting the criteria in the following definition will be assessed for English Language proficiency levels.

**A child is an English Language Learner:**

* who is aged 3 through 21; and who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school;

**and**

* whose native language is a language other than English; **or**
* who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; **and** who comes from an environment where **a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual's level of English language proficiency; or**
* who is migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who comes from **an environment where a language other than English is dominant;**

**and**

* **whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language** may be sufficient to deny the individual —
* the ability to meet the State's proficient level of achievement on State assessments;
* the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or
* the opportunity to participate fully in society

*From the* ***Elementary and Secondary Education Act 2001 (ESEA) - No Child Left Behind- Title IX – General Provisions – Part A*** *–* ***Definitions***

**Corvallis School District English Language Learner Program**

Identification and Eligibility Process

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROCESS** | **STAFF****RESPONSIBLE** | **TIME FRAME** | **OUTCOME** |
| ALL Registration packets include a Home Language Survey | School Secretary | During the time registration packets are being prepared | **All** families registering in a Corvallis school completes a Home Language Survey.  |
| Parents are provided ELL Magnet School Option Information sheet when registering at any school and information is verbally explained so families can make informed decision. | School SecretaryELL Teacher | During enrollment  | Parents can make an informed decision regarding services for their child in a timely manner. |
| Registration and Home Language Survey are completed by parents\*Home Language Survey will be provided in home language using TRANSACT form as needed.\*\*Parents unable to read – school secretary will contact ELL staff member or ELL Coordinator for assistance to register.\*\*\*Native American students need for services will be determined on a case by case basis.  | School Secretary | Immediately upon receiving enrollment packet, home language survey is completed by parent and submitted to school secretary | Home Language Survey Completed |
| Home Language Survey original is placed in cumulative file and NCR copy given to ELL teacher | School Secretary | Within two days of Home Language Survey Completion | ELL staff will determine if student will need English proficiency assessment. |
| Home Language Survey reviewed for “Yes” responses to key primary language questions.  | ELL Staff | Within 5 days of receiving Home Language Survey | ELL staff will set up time to assess student or will determine student does not have a primary language other than English. |
| Student is assessed using the IPT(IDEA Proficiency Test) to determine if eligible for ELL Services.* 2nd – 12th grade -One or more of the IPT-Oral/Reading and Writing subtests are scored as Non or Limited English Proficient
* K – 1st grade - IPT-Oral subtest is scored Non or Limited English Proficient

  | ELL Staff who have received training in IPT administration. | At the beginning of the school year must be completed in less than 30 days.After the first day of school the IPT assessment must be completed in first 2 weeks from enrollment. | Assessment completed on time so that services can begin.If student is eligible: Student’s name, grade, scores and whether parents can advocate in English is recorded in the District ELL Database.If student is not eligible, student’s name and scores are recorded in the ELL Database and assessment is filed in student’s Cumulative file. |
| ELL students attending ELL magnet schools out of their attendance area are eligible for transportation services to the nearest magnet school. ELL staff complete a transportation form and submit to Auxiliary Services. | ELL Staff | As soon as possible once need is determined | Students can access magnet program and do not miss any school days. |
| English Language Learners are placed in appropriate ELL services | PrincipalELL StaffDual Immersion TeachersCounselors | Within the first 30 days of school or within 2 weeks if enrolled after school year begins. | Students receive appropriate services to increase their English language proficiency and are able to access core academic content.ELL File is created and the Home Language Survey, assessment data and service plan are filed. |
| ELL File is created for each student | ELL Staff | ELL file following guidelines in ELL Teacher Handbook is created. | Each ELL student’s file is kept in the ELL classroom. This file is returned to the cumulative file for the summer. Purple form is placed in Cumulative file documenting that there is a ELL File. |
| Classroom and/or content teachers receive list of ELL students that are in their classes. Language proficiency levels are provided for each student. Corvallis Teacher may also use CARA (Corvallis Assessment and Reporting Application ) to determine which students in their classes are ELL and their most recent ELPA scores to assist them in instructional planning. | ELL Staff | Within the first 30 days of school or within 2 weeks if enrolled after school begins. | Teachers make modifications as needed. |
| List of ELL students is maintained on ELL Database and monitored by ELL Coordinator monthly. | ELL Staff | Weekly at school,Monthly by Coordinator | Accurate up-to-date list of all ELL students  |
| Parent Notification form is sent to parents, detailing their child’s English proficiency scores and offered services. Parents are notified of their service options such as attending a Dual Language program as appropriate. | ELL Staff | Within a week of when ELL services have begun. | Parents are aware that their child is receiving ELL services and can make an informed decision if they want their child to participate. |

# III.A Assessment of LEP

All students are assessed using the IPT (IDEA Proficiency Test) at the time of initial eli-gibility determination. The ADEPT or EXPRESS placement tests may be used to provide additional information for accurate placement for English Language Development classes and for their content/classroom teachers to know each of their ELL student’s current language proficiency level. Students are placed based on English language proficiency levels for ELD services rather than only grade placement. The current private school partners choose to use the EXPRESS as the eligibility assessment for ELL services.

ELD teachers and some ELL educational assistants are trained to conduct all 3 components of the IPT. Training is conducted through the use of a IPT training workshop provided by Ballard and Tighe and conducted by the ELL Coordinator or ELL Instructional Coach. Review sessions for the writing component of IPT are conducted as needed.

For kindergarten ELL determination when possible the Pre-IPT is conducted in the spring prior to kindergarten or in August before kindergarten begins so that parents can make informed decisions regarding the ELL service options they would like their child to participate in such as Dual Language classroom or ELD service with sheltered classroom option.

High school and middle school students when possible are assessed in August, so if they are eligible for ELL services their schedule can reflect these classes. This avoids students receiving one schedule and then having it changed in the first few days of school which causes students frustration and confusion.

ELL staff is reminded yearly regarding the need for initial evaluations to be conducted within the first 30 days of school or within 2 weeks of enrollment after the school year has begun. Corvallis ELL program expectations are that middle school and high school programs and Dual language Elementary ELD programs begin service on the first day of school. In elementary schools student services are expected to begin within the first 2 weeks of school.

Each parent of an eligible ELL student receives a Parent Notification form (English, Spanish, or other languages as available from TransAct) in the mail. This provides the IPT results (if this is initial eligibility) or ELPA results, a description of the services that the student will be receiving, and the information regarding their right to opt their child out of ELL services.

Teachers receive information regarding who the ELL students in their class or classes are and their current language proficiency level. Academic performance expectations based on language proficiency level will be provided to teachers. This is provided by the ELL staff and is a new addition to our program based on a request from classroom and content teachers.

Corvallis has created a very user friendly database for use by teachers and district staff that includes students’ program eligibility (TAG, ELL, IEP) and current and past assessment data/strand data for state and local assessments. The new system is referred to as CARA. CARA allows us to provide information to teachers more efficiently and allows teachers to be able to locate information on their own in a very timely manner.

# III.B Assessment Driven Decision Making

CARA also allows the ELL Coordinator and ELL Instructional Coach to analyze language proficiency data, academic progress and GPA of ELL and Exited ELL students in an efficient manner to make program changes more quickly than in the past.

Procedures to ensure that data from assessments including the IPT-Oral, IPT-Reading and IPT Writing, ELPA, OAKS Math and Reading, and district assessments (DIBELS, AIMSWEB, MAP Reading, MAP Mathematics, Aprenda) are reviewed by ELL Coordinator and ELL Instructional Coach to look for trends, needs of specific groups of ELL students and to determine if program or course changes need to be made to better serve the students. Data is graphed and reviewed for district trends and reviewed for each school. For ELL students at the middle school and high school level who have not made growth on the ELPA over a 3 year period their academic data is studied on an individual level to determine if additional courses need to be put into place or additional academic support is needed.

All ELL and exited ELL student transcripts at the high school level are reviewed to determine if students are on track for graduation.

After the ELL data has been reviewed and summarized it is presented to all principals, ELL teachers, the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and the Instructional Services team so that School Improvement Plans and District CIP can take this data into consideration when programs, budgeting and goals are being established.

The district ELL program plan includes a detailed Action Plan that is developed based on the data review. The Action plan sets Standards (referred to as Goals in the action plan) and objectives to be accomplished. The action plan is developed through the use of data, ELL/DL Superintendent’s Advisory Committee meetings and planning with the Instructional Services department to address English Language Learner needs across the district and specifically in core content classes so that they receive the strongest program possible and will meet the AMAO targets.

# IV. Instructional Program and Educational Approaches for LEP Students

## Programs to ensure that ELLs can meaningfully access and participate in the academic and special programs offered by Corvallis School District 509J

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Description** | **Instruction and Staffing** | **Student Access** | **Program Evaluation** |
| **Dual Language Immersion (Two-Way Bilingual)** | * Goal is for students to access core content subject matter and develop strong skills and proficiency in students’ first and second language
* About half the students are native speakers of English and half are English language learners from the same language group
* Instruction in both languages: 50% Spanish, 50% English for all students
 | * Curriculum is based on Oregon State Standards for all content areas in conjunction with English language proficiency standards and focused on district content and language power standards.
* Instructional practices used are research-based best practices for dual language programs, bilingualism and bi-literacy
* All classroom teachers hold ESOL endorsement and Spanish classroom teachers hold a Spanish endorsement
 | * All native Spanish ELLs in kindergarten through fifth grade
* Middle School and High School native Spanish ELLs who have sufficient Spanish literacy skills to benefit from the program
 | Program will be evaluated for effective implementation by school administrator or ELL coordinator using *Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education* (Howard & et.al., 2007) |
| **Sheltered Instruction** | * Goal is for students to access core content subject matter and gain fluency in English
* Content instruction in English with adjustment by teacher to proficiency level so subject matter is comprehensible (e.g. SIOP, GLAD, SDAIE methods)
* L1 support as needed.
 | * Curriculum is based on Oregon State Standards for all content areas in conjunction with English language proficiency standards and focused on district content and language power standards.
* Instructional materials are adapted based on students’ reading levels and academic needs.
* Instructional practices are research-based best practices for sheltered instruction.
* All classroom teachers hold an endorsement in the content area that they teach and are trained in SIOP or hold an ESOL endorsement.
 | * All ELLs
 | Program will be evaluated for effective implementation by school administrator or ELL coordinator using ODE Self-Assessment for Sheltered English Instruction Classrooms and SIOP (Echevarria, Short, &Vogt, 2004) |
| **Structured English Immersion** | * Goal is for students to access core content subject matter and gain fluency in English
* All students in program are English Language Learners
* Content instruction in English with adjustment by teacher to proficiency level so subject matter is comprehensible (eg. SIOP, GLAD, SDAIE methods)
* L1 support as needed.
 | * Curriculum is based on Oregon State Standards for all content areas in conjunction with English language proficiency standards and focused on district content and language power standards.
* Instructional materials are chosen and adapted based on students’ reading levels and academic need.
* Instructional practices are research-based best practices for sheltered instruction.
* All classroom teachers hold an endorsement in the content area that they teach and hold an ESOL endorsement.
 | * High School ELLs who attend magnet high school.
 | Program will be evaluated for effective implementation by school administrator or ELL coordinator using ODE Self-Assessment for Sheltered English Instruction Classrooms and SIOP (Echevarria, Short, &Vogt, 2004) |

## Programs to teach English language skills used within the Corvallis School District 509J

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Description** | **Instruction** | **Student Access** | **Program Evaluation** |
| **Dual Language Immersion (Two-Way Bilingual)** | * Goal is for students to access core content subject matter and develop strong skills and proficiency in students’ first and second language
* About half the students are native speakers of English and half are English language learners from the same language group
* Instruction in both languages: 50% Spanish, 50% English for all students from the beginning
* 30 minute period of ELD is embedded into daily schedule
* Student grouping for ELD is based on Language Proficiency level.
 | * Curriculum is based on Oregon State Standards for all content areas in conjunction with English language proficiency standards and focused on district language power standards.
* Instructional practices used are research-based best practices for dual language programs, bilingualism and bi-literacy
* All classroom teachers hold ESOL endorsement and Spanish classroom teachers hold a Spanish endorsement
 | All ELL students who participate in DLI at the elementary level have access to this program. | Program will be evaluated for effective implementation by school administrator or ELL coordinator using District ELD Program Evaluation Tool. |
| **ELD Push-in or Pull-out** | * Goal is fluency in English
* Program is targeted to English language learners
* Students in sheltered instruction for content subjects
* Students pulled-out **or** participate in specific group instruction aimed at developing English grammar, vocabulary, and communication skills.
* Student grouping is based on Language Proficiency Level.
 | * Curriculum is based on Oregon State Language Arts and Language Proficiency Standards and focused on district language power standards.
* Instructional practices used are research-based best practices for English Language Development.
* ESOL endorsed teachers with training in Standards-based ELD Instruction
 | All ELL students who do not participate in DLI at the elementary level have access to this program. | Program will be evaluated for effective implementation by school administrator or ELL coordinator using District ELD Program Evaluation Tool. |
| **ELD Class** | * Goal is fluency in English
* Program is targeted to English language learners
* Students in sheltered instruction, dual immersion, or structured English immersion classrooms for other subjects
* Students participate in class period of instruction aimed at developing English grammar, vocabulary, and communication skills, not academic content.
* Student grouping is based on Language Proficiency Level.
 | * Curriculum is based on Oregon State Language Arts and Language Proficiency Standards and focused on district language power standards.
* Instructional practices used are research-based best practices for English Language Development.
* ESOL endorsed teachers with training in Focused Approach to ELD.
 | All middle school and high school students have access to this program. | Program will be evaluated for effective implementation by school administrator or ELL coordinator using District ELD Program Evaluation Tool |
| **Content based ELD** | * Goal is fluency in English
* Program targeted to English language learners
* Students are integrated in sheltered classes in other subjects
* Augmented to include academic content, vocabulary and foundational concepts.
 | * Curriculum is based on Oregon State Standards for content areas in conjunction with English language proficiency standards and focused on district content and language power standards.
* Instructional practices used are research-based best practices for English Language Development
* ESOL endorsed teachers with training in Focused Approach to ELD.
 | Newcomer ELLs at high school magnet schools will have access. | Program will be evaluated for effective implementation by school administrator or ELL coordinator using District ELD Program Evaluation Tool. |
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## Elementary School English Language Learner Program Options

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Language level** | **Identification** | **Curriculum** | **Services** |
| **Beginning** | * IPT-Oral score of A
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Non-English
* ELPA Composite Score of 1
 | 1. Language acquisition is highest priority in schedule.
2. Core subjects in L1, or Sheltered instructional strategies used in L2
3. One on One and/or small literacy group instruction when available is a priority.
4. Literacy instruction in L1 if possible.
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class 30+ minutes every day
2. Sheltered Instruction classroom with native language support when possible
3. Newcomer group – for the first 6 months of instruction

**Option B**1. Dual Language Immersion
2. ELD built into daily schedule
 |
| **Early Intermediate** | * IPT-Oral score of B
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Limited English
* ELPA Composite Score of 2
 | 1. Language acquisition is highest priority in schedule.
2. Core subjects in L1, or Sheltered instructional strategies used in L2
3. One on One and/or small literacy group instruction when available is a priority.
4. Literacy instruction in L1 if possible.
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class 30+ minutes every day
2. Sheltered Instruction classroom with native language support when possible

**Option B**1. Dual Language Immersion
2. ELD built into daily schedule
 |
| **Intermediate** | * IPT-Oral score of C (B at Kinder)
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Limited English
* ELPA Composite Score of 3
 | * 1. Language acquisition with emphasis on more advanced language forms.
	2. Core subjects in L1, or Sheltered instructional strategies used in L2
	3. Small literacy group instruction may still be a priority.
	4. Literacy instruction in L1 if appropriate.
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class 30+ minutes every day
2. Sheltered Instruction classroom with native language support when possible

**Option B**1. Dual Language Immersion
2. ELD built into daily schedule
 |
| **Early Advanced & Advanced** | * IPT-Oral score of D or E
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Limited or Fluent English
* ELPA Composite Score of 4
 | 1. Transitional English with emphasis on advanced lang. forms and academic vocabulary.
2. Core subjects in L1 in Dual Language Immersion, or Sheltered instructional strategies used in L2
3. Small literacy group instruction may still be a priority.
4. Literacy instruction in L1 if appropriate.
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class 30+ minutes every day
2. Sheltered Instruction classroom with native language support when possible

**Option B**1. Dual Language Immersion
2. ELD built into daily schedule
 |
| **Exited and Monitored****(2 year monitoring period)** | * ELPA Composite Score of 4 or 5
* Refer to page 27 for complete Exit Criteria.
 | 1. Mainstream classes
2. Progress monitored at each grading period.
3. State assessments reviewed by ELL team.
 | **ELL Team may determine to:**a) maintain exited status with reviews,b) Place student back into ELL services or identify additional needed services. |

## Middle School English Language Learner Program Options

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Language level** | **Identification** | **Curriculum** | **Services** |
| **Beginning** | * IPT-Oral score of A
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Non-English
* ELPA Composite Score of 1
 | 1. Language acquisition is highest priority in schedule.
2. Core subjects in L1, or Sheltered Instruction
3. Literacy instruction in L1 if appropriate
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class every day
2. Sheltered Instruction core classes with native language support when appropriate
3. Newcomer class – for the first semester of instruction

**Option B**1. Dual Language Immersion
2. ELD Class every day
 |
| **Early Intermediate** | * IPT-Oral score of B
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Limited English
* ELPA Composite Score of 2
 | 1. Language acquisition is highest priority in schedule.
2. Core subjects in L1 or bilingual, or Sheltered Instruction
3. Supported L2 literacy
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class every day
2. Sheltered Instruction core classes with native language support when appropriate

**Option B**1. Dual Language Immersion
2. ELD Class every day
 |
| **Intermediate** | * IPT-Oral score of C
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Limited English
* ELPA Composite Score of 3
 | 1. Language acquisition with emphasis on more advanced language forms.
2. Core subjects taught in bilingual or Sheltered Instruction.
3. Supported L2 literacy.
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class every day
2. Sheltered Instruction core classes with native language support when appropriate

**Option B**1. Dual Language Immersion
2. ELD Class every day
 |
| **Early Advanced & Advanced** | * IPT-Oral score of D or E
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Limited or Fluent English
* ELPA Composite Score of 4
 | 1. Transitional English with emphasis on advanced lang. forms and academic vocabulary.
2. Core subjects in Dual Language Immersion or Sheltered Instruction
3. Mainstream electives
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class every day
2. Sheltered Instruction core classes.

**Option B**1. Dual Language Immersion
2. ELD Class every day
 |
| **Exited and Monitored****(2 year monitoring period)** | * ELPA Composite Score of 4 or 5
* Refer to page 27 for complete Exit Criteria.
 | 1. Mainstream classes
2. Progress monitored at each grading period.
3. State assessments reviewed by ELL team.
 | **ELL Team may determine to:**a) maintain exited status with reviews,b) Place student back into ELL services or identify additional needed services. |

## High School English Language Learner Program Options

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Language level** | **Identification** | **Curriculum** | **Services** |
| **Beginning** | * IPT-Oral score of A
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Non-English
* ELPA Composite Score of 1
 | 1. Language acquisition is highest priority in schedule.
2. Core subjects - Sheltered Instruction
3. Supported L2 Language Arts
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class
2. Sheltered Instruction core classes with native language support when appropriate
3. Structured English Immersion – Language Arts
4. Newcomer Content Based ELD – for the first semester of instruction

**Option B**1. Option A
2. Dual Language Immersion – Spanish Language/Literature class
 |
| **Early Intermediate** | * IPT-Oral score of B
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Limited English
* ELPA Composite Score of 2
 | 1. Language acquisition is highest priority in schedule.
2. Core subjects - Sheltered Instruction
3. Supported L2 Language Arts.
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class
2. Sheltered Instruction core classes with native language support when appropriate
3. Structured English Immersion – Language Arts

**Option B**1. Option A
2. Dual Language Immersion – Spanish Language/Literature class
 |
| **Intermediate** | * IPT-Oral score of C
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Limited English
* ELPA Composite Score of 3
 | 1. Language acquisition with emphasis on more advanced language forms.
2. Core subjects - Sheltered Instruction
3. Supported L2 Language Arts.
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class
2. Sheltered Instruction core classes with native language support when appropriate
3. Structured English Immersion – Language Arts

**Option B**1. Option A
2. Dual Language Immersion – Spanish Language/Literature class
 |
| **Early Advanced & Advanced** | * IPT-Oral score of D or E
* IPT Reading and Writing Score of Limited or Fluent English
* ELPA Composite Score of 4
 | 1. Transitional English with emphasis on advanced lang. forms and academic vocabulary.
2. Core subjects - Sheltered Instruction
3. Mainstream electives
 | **Option A**1. ELD Class
2. Sheltered Instruction core classes
3. Structured English Immersion – Language Arts

**Option B**1. Option A
2. Dual Language Immersion – Spanish Language/Literature class
 |
| **Exited and Monitored****(2 year monitoring period)** | * ELPA Composite Score of 4 or 5

Refer to page 27 for complete Exit Criteria. | 1. Mainstream classes
2. Progress monitored at each grading period.
3. State assessments reviewed by ELL team.
 | **ELL Team may determine to:**a) maintain exited status with reviews,b) Place student back into ELL services or identify additional needed services. |

## Parent Notification of Services and Options

Parents are notified of the types of services their child will receive during the current school year to meet their child’s language needs. This notification also provides the most recent language proficiency assessment information (ELPA or IPT). Parents are also provided information regarding the magnet school option and the dual language immersion programs that are available if their home school is not a magnet ELL program school. Every effort is made to send this letter and other information regarding other school activities in the family’s native language. Phone calls in the family’s native language may also be used to provide additional information or clarification so that parents can make informed decisions regarding services for their child.

District Student Handbook, progress notices, and district calendars are provided to parents in Spanish and English. School rules are posted in English, Spanish, and/or Korean when appropriate. Conferences and IEP meetings are conducted with translators to ensure that meetings are accessible to parents. PTA meetings at the Elementary DLI Schools are conducted bilingually or in Spanish.

# V. Staffing and Professional Development

The Corvallis School District 509J Human Resources Department closely reviews appropriate licensures, endorsements and training as part of the hiring process.

## Recruitment

The Corvallis School District 509J Human Resources Department actively recruits highly qualified staff within the state as well as across the country. A major focus is to increase the number of teachers with ESOL, Bilingual or Spanish endorsements and increase the diversity of our teaching staff.

## Criteria to Ensure Staff is Qualified to Meet the Needs of LEP Students

The Human Resources Department monitors the qualifications of the staff working with LEP students based on the following criteria:

* ELD Teacher – must hold an ESOL endorsement
* Sheltered Instruction Teacher – must hold an ESOL endorsement or documented sheltered instruction training (SIOP, GLAD, SDAIE, SEI) and a credential in the course area.
* DLI English Teacher – must hold an ESOL endorsement and a credential in course area.
* DLI Spanish Teacher – ESOL plus Bilingual endorsement or Spanish endorsement and a credential in course area.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Position | Duties | Qualifications |
| ELD Teacher | * Instructs students in English Language Development
* Assesses students on English language proficiency, reading and writing skills
* Supports students in classroom settings
* Communicates with ELL families about student progress and school information
* Supports ELL assistants
* Participate in Professional Learning Comm-unity work and PBIS system at school level.
* Supports classroom teachers with ELA standards expectations for ELLs, models strategies and plans for student success
* Teams with other district ELL teachers to support English Language Development district-wide and evaluate district ELL program
* Participate in on-going professional development to strengthen instructional strategies and sheltered instruction techniques
* Maintains school database of ELL students (SIS and ESD)
 | * ESOL Endorsement
* Current teaching certificate
 |
| ELL Assistant | * Instructs students in English Language Development under supervision of ELD teacher.
* Conduct assessments
* Supports students in content or ELD classroom settings
* Participates in on-going professional development to strengthen instructional strategies and sheltered instruction techniques
* Database maintenance
 | * Receive training in Focused Approach to ELD (3 day training).
* Trained in Sheltered Instruction.
 |
| ELL Instructional Coach | * Supports teachers with model lessons, co-planning, co-teaching and classroom observations
* Analyzes data to inform instructional design and planning
* Provides training for classroom teachers in English Language Development
* Conducts Best Practices Professional Conversations
* Coordinates with ELL Coor. and principals
* Supports principals with design and development of ELL services at buildings
* Provides training for teachers in SIOP
* Participates in district level instructional planning and program development
* Trains leaders in ELL instruction observation
* Supports Title I schools with training in best practices for serving ELLs
 | * ESOL endorsement
* Current teaching license
* Sheltered Instruction trainer
* ELD trainer
 |
| ELL High School Student/FamilyAdvocate | * Advocate for ELL students and families to receive educational services for which they are eligible.
* Works closely with families to address attend-ance issues and barriers to student success.
* Ensure that families are informed of educational and related opportunities
* Assist students and families with school placement/summer programs
	+ Provide families with referrals to health and dental services.
 | * Background and training in social services/child and family development
* Bilingual -Spanish/English
 |
| ELL Coordinator | * Oversees and implements District ELL (LAU) Program Plan
* Develops and implements ELL action plan
* Oversees ELL staffing needs
* Develops and oversees ELL program budget and Title III budget
* Works with leadership to implement and improve the ELL Program Plan
* Tracks testing and student databases
* Provides professional development and on-going support to ELL staff
 | * ESOL endorsement
* Understanding of NCLB and Title III
 |
| Sheltered InstructionTeacher | * Uses sheltered instruction to ensure content instruction is understandable
* Teams with ELL staff to support English Language learners in content and English language development
 | * Oregon teaching license
* Trained in Sheltered Instruction

And/or* ESOL endorsed
 |
| DLI Classroom Teacher | * Teams with ELD teacher to support ELL students in English language development
* Uses sheltered instruction to support content understanding
 | * Oregon teaching license
* ESOL endorsement if teaching in English
* ESOL plus Bilingual endorsement or Spanish endorsement if teaching in Spanish.
* Trained in ELD instruction
 |

## Professional Development

Corvallis School District 509J provides on-going training and support in the areas of English Language Development and Sheltered Instruction for all ELL staff (both certified and classified) and classroom teachers. Dual Language Immersion teachers and staff receive training in best practices and program design.

ELD three day training will take place each year. The 30 hour Sheltered Instruction workshop will be conducted for ELL and classroom teachers one or more times per year. All teachers in their second year of teaching in Corvallis will participate in the Sheltered Instruction Training. Each fall staff new to the Dual Language program will participate in a half day Dual Language training.

These professional development opportunities were designed in response to staff requests, classroom observations and program review.

## Identification of Needs and Evaluation of Professional Development

Each training has a daily evaluation component. Participants are asked to rate the usefulness of the training, what was effective, and what they would like in future trainings. This data is compiled and used to refine the ELL Professional Development Plan. Once a year ELL staff is surveyed regarding their professional development needs and effectiveness of current professional development plan. This is conducted through an on-line survey which provides privacy.

At the end of ELD and SIOP training, participants are asked to set goals for the implementation of the research based best instructional practices that they have been learning. Participants articulate an area of focus, 3 concrete steps that they will take towards implementation, and resources and/or support needed. This information is used to refine the ELL Professional Development Plan and define the ELL Instructional Coach’s work.

## Two Year Professional Development Plan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Professional Development Opportunity** | **Duration** | **When** | **Participants** |
| Focused Approach to English Language Development - Elementary | 21 hours | Once a year to train new teachers who are teaching ELD. | Elementary ELD TeachersElementary ELL AssistantsDLI Teachers who teach ELD |
| Focused Approach to English Language Development – Secondary | 21 hours | 2009-2010 – One training to train all secondary ELD teachers | Secondary ELD Teachers |
| SIOP for Elementary Teachers | 30 hours | One to two times a year (as needed) to train classroom teachers who will be teaching Sheltered Classes. | Elementary Classroom TeachersElementary ELD Teachers |
| SIOP for Secondary Teachers  | 30 hours | One time a year to train content teachers who will be teaching Sheltered Content Courses. | Secondary Content TeachersSecondary ELD Teachers |
| ELL and DLI Superintendent Advisory Committee | 2 days a year | Fall and Spring each year | DLI School TeamsBuilding AdministratorsDistrict Leadership |
| Dual Language Instruction Workshop – Best Practices and Corvallis School District Program Design | ½ day | New Teacher Institute – August | DLI Teachers new to Corvallis  |
| Monthly ELL Staff Meetings (using PLC model) with integrated professional development component. | 1 hour each month by level | On-going | ELD TeachersELL AssistantsELL CoordinatorELL Coach |
| Best Practices for ELL’s – What Administrators Need to Know | 2 - ½ day sessions | Fall 2009 Yearly as needed for new administrators | Leadership Team |
| New ELL Staff Orientation | ½ day | Fall each year | Newly hired ELL staff |

# VI. Reassessment, Reclassification and Exiting

**Yearly Assessment Process**

All active ELL students and students whose parents have chosen to refuse ELL services (ELD or specifically designed courses for ELL students) are assessed annually using the Oregon English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA). Students take this computer administered assessment between January and March if they have been attending Corvallis schools. If ELL students arrive later they take the ELPA up through the ELPA end date usually in mid May.

**Moving from Active to Monitor Status**

Active status refers to students currently enrolled in ELL services. Students move to

Monitor Status when their English proficiency is considered fluent and they meet the Exit criteria established by the ELL program. Students are on monitor status for two years after they exit from active status. The ELL teacher is responsible for collecting progress data when considering students who will be exited from active status in the ELL program and reclassified to monitor status.

## Corvallis English Language Learner Exit Criteria (Move to Monitor Status)

1. Student scores a Composite score of 5 (Fluent English Proficient) on the ELPA. There are a few exceptions where based on a team decision Composite score of 4 (Early Advanced) will be accepted but this is rare and #2-4 must be compelling.
2. Student successfully participates in English only and non-sheltered classes. Through the use of ELD specific rubrics scored by classroom and/or ELD teachers, student demonstrates scores of Early Advanced or Advanced on the state ELD Writing Rubric, and Speaking Rubric. All supporting documentation is recorded on the Move to Monitor Form and placed in the student’s ELL folder.
3. Teacher recommendations, both classroom and ELD, will be considered.
4. Other scored items that will attest to the student’s linguistic performance such as

oral competence and writing samples in core content courses.

**Move to Monitor Process**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Process | Staff | Timeframe | Outcome |
| Review all ELPA results for students who have scored a 5 Composite on the ELPA | ELL Teacher | As soon as scores are available beginning in mid-February. | List of possible student’s who may be ready to exit. |
| Speaking and Writing Rubrics completed by classroom/content teachers. Distributed and collected by ELL Teacher | ELL Teacher | Review completed rubrics within 3 weeks of ELPA scores | Students who have scores in the Advanced level in one or more of the components (Speaking or Writing) (the other component may be at the Early Advanced level) will continue in the Move to Monitor Process. |
| Team comprised of ELL teacher, administrator, classroom/content teacher, ELL Coordinator or ELL Instructional Coach meets to review all data for students who may move to monitor status.  | Exit Team | By the last day of the instructional school year. | Each student’s academic data and language proficiency is reviewed and recommendations are made.  |
| If student is moving to monitor status, classroom teachers are notified by ELL teacher. Parents are notified via Move to Monitor form that their student is exiting from services.**OR** | ELL Teacher | Within 2 weeks of determination for Parent Notification.If during the school year, teachers are notified within two weeks. If at the end of the school year teachers receive the list of active and exited ELL students in their class in the fall of the following school year. | Parents and teachers instructing students have accurate information regarding what services student is currently receiving. |
| If student is remaining in ELL services based on team decision and data review, information is recorded on Move to Monitor form clearly stating why student will not be exiting at this time. | ELL Teacher | Within 2 weeks of determination for Parent Notification.If during the school year, teachers are notified within two weeks. If at the end of the school year teachers receive the list of active and exited ELL students in their class in the fall of the following school year. | Parents and teachers instructing students have accurate information regarding what services student is currently receiving. |
| Student’s ELL File is updated. | ELL Teacher | Before the end of the school year. | Documentation including the Move to Monitor form is placed in ELL file. |
| ELL Database is updated. | ELL Teacher | Before the end of the month in which the meeting took place or before the last day of school in June. | Student’s exit date is added and status code is changed from 1B to 1C. |

## Early Exit

In rare cases there is the option to move a student to monitor status before the student has achieved a composite score of 5 on the ELPA. The student must have at least a composite score of 4 on the ELPA, meet the rubric standards as described in the previous chart and be performing satisfactorily in his or her current classes. The decision to recommend a student exit early must be based on a collection of data. The school team must consider multiple factors indicating the student has already demonstrated that he/she can benefit fully from instruction in the regular educational program without assistance from the ELL program. Students who are recommended for Early Exit will follow the same Move to Monitor status process as described on the previous page.

## Continuation or Return to ELL Services (Retention)

Students who have met the Move to Monitor Criteria are generally considered to be proficient and able to benefit fully from general education instruction. In some cases, through ELPA and the local evidence indicates that a student may need additional instruction in the ELL program in spite of having achieved a level of “Proficient”.

|  |
| --- |
| Return to ELL Services Process |
| ELL Teacher, classroom/content teacher, parent or student | * Requests consideration for Retention in the ELL program based on teacher or parent concern that student is not able to access content in their classes because of English language proficiency in one or more of the areas: reading, writing , speaking or listening.
 |
| ELL Teacher | * Reviews student transcript/report card. SIS assessment report, diagnostic assessments that focus on linguistic abilities rather than core content knowledge and anecdotal records.
* Compile information for Team meeting
 |
| Team | * A team comprised of ELL teacher, classroom/content teacher, administrator and parent (and student when appropriate) will discuss and review student performance to determine if student can benefit fully from instruction in the regular educational program.
 |
| Team | * Complete ELL Return to ELL Program Planning Form.
* Determination will be made by the team as to whether the student will participate in the ELL program or will remain exited
* Team review determines what other general education support should be implemented for student success.
 |
| ELL Teacher | * Written documentation of the decision will be provided to parent.
* Written documentation will be provided to teachers of the student.
* Written documentation will be placed in ELL file.
* ELL database will be updated.
 |

## Monitoring Process

All exited English Language Learners are monitored for two years following their exit. It is the ELD teacher’s responsibility to monitor exited ELL students to determine that they are able to meaningfully participate in the classes or classroom they are currently in. Classroom teachers and principals will be notified which students in their classroom or school are on monitor status so that they may remain aware of these students’ academic progress.

**EXITED STUDENTS**

**Monitor for 2 Years**

**Unable to Participate Successfully**

Criteria: Failing one or more classes. Pattern of missing many classes or missing many assignments. Elementary level: not making growth in reading/writing skill development

**Meaningful Participation**

Criteria: Student making adequate progress. Elementary student making growth in reading and writing skills and participating in all content subjects adequately

**Further Assessment**

* IPT-Oral, Reading, Writing
* Express/ADEPT
* Review current academic assessments (MAP, DRA,TORF, DIBELS, OSAT)
* Oregon State Language Rubrics in Reading/Writing/Speaking/Listening

**Mainstream Classroom**

Student remains in regular classroom experiences. May access Title I reading or extended learning opportunities if needed.

**Factors Other Than Language Proficiency**

Factors that may impact academic progress other than language may include frequent family moves, homelessness, learning disabilities, health issues/substance abuse.

**Assessment Criteria**

Evaluate IPT and Language Rubric data to determine if language proficiency is a factor in the student’s performance.

**Re-Establish ELL Services**

IPT – F Rubric EA or A

IPT below F

Rubrics below EA

# VII. Equal Access to Other School District Programs

The district’s on-going goal is to provide academic and language services to our English Language Learner population and to provide materials that equalize their educational opportunities. District staff will work to ensure that English Language Learners have equal access to extra curricular and non-academic activities.

* Talented and Gifted (TAG) Program
	+ ELL students participate in TAG screening process using the RAVEN non-verbal intellectual assessment if English language proficiency will impact performance on the OLSAT.
	+ An additional TAG screening takes place for all LEP students at the middle school level using a non-verbal assessment to determine if any students have been overlooked. This process has identified an additional 3 to 4 LEP TAG students each year.
* Special Education Program
	+ Implementation of Response to Intervention Model. ELL Teacher is a team member for intervention decisions as well as special education referral process. See process on following page for Sp.Ed./ELL services.
* Title 1 Supplemental Services
	+ ELL students are eligible for all supplemental and intervention programs offered based on their academic needs.
* ELL students are eligible for reading intervention support through the RTI model implemented in Corvallis School District 509J.
* Information regarding extra curricular activities is provided through bilingual newsletters at the elementary level and Spanish parent phone trees and information provided by our Corvallis High School ELL Family Advocate.
* Homeless Services – Homeless Family Advocate supports ELL families as needed.
* The District Diversity Committee lead by Terryl Ross, OSU Community and Diversity Department Chair, and Jeanne Holmes, Assistant Superintendent is in the process of developing the Diversity Action Plan. Several of the identified needs are regarding equal opportunity and access for all courses and extracurricular opportunities. ELL parents and community members were involved in identifying the needs and possible solutions.
* The ELL program uses Title III funds and works with the Corvallis Education Foundation to support parents and students to participate in supplemental learning opportunities and extracurricular events.

## Requirements for Teams Who Serve English Language Learners/Special Education Students

**ELL Expectations**

* Students receive English Language Development (ELD) aligned with the Oregon English Language Development Standards.
* Students receive access to core content instruction through specially designed academic instruction
* English Language Learner (ELL) funding must be used to provide **every** ELL student with learning opportunities to acquire English skills and learn core content knowledge.
* Parents will be informed of ELL program placement yearly
* Teachers teaching English Language Development must hold the appropriate endorsement and provide instruction through a direct service model.
* Instruction must be targeted to the student’s language proficiency level.
* English language development in reading, writing and speaking must be monitored regularly.

**IDEA Expectations**

* Planning and eligibility includes a discussion regarding second language acquisition
* Evidence Decision Making using an IEP Team
* Free and Appropriate Education
* Educational Instruction that is specially designed to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability and is supported by such services as are necessary to permit the child to benefit from instruction in the least restrictive environment.

**Collaborative Model when ELL and IDEA Services Come Together**

* ELL students must receive their ELD services from an ESOL endorsed teacher and instructional modifications can take place in the ELD class.
* ELD can be provided by a SPED teacher who holds an ESOL endorsement if ELD is delivered in a direct service model.
* Options to provide least restrictive environment for ELD Services
	+ ELD
	+ ELD with modification to general curriculum
	+ ELD taught in SPED setting by endorsed teacher
	+ ELD taught in Life Skills program by SPED teacher with general ELD training and on-going communication with ELL teacher. ELL teacher remains case manager for ELL Services.

**Minimum Requirements of ELL Teachers regarding IEP Planning**

* The ELL teacher or classroom teacher who holds an ESOL endorsement (who has reviewed this document) must participate in the student’s annual IEP at a minimum during the time ELL services, supports and the impact of language on learning are being discussed.
* ELL Service recommendations can be made by the IEP team but the final decision is made by the ELL Department based on recommendations and legal ramifications.
* The student’s ELL status including their English language proficiency level must be documented on the IEP as an amendment to the Present Level of Performance.
* Modifications for ELPA administration will be document on the State Assessment page of the IEP.

**Frequently Asked Questions Regarding ELL/SPED Students**

1. **When conflicts arise in schedules is ELD or SPED the priority?**

Things to Consider:

* What are the students needs?
* If a student needs both a model of collaboration will be needed.
* “A student must receive ELL services even though the scheduling may be inconvenient.” Office of Civil Rights (Seattle)
* See Collaborative Model on page 1.
1. **Is there a point at which a student with a severe learning disability who is not making progress in ELD due to the disability can be redesignated as no longer ELL.**

Things to consider when discussing this issue:

* How was the original disability determined with or with out language considerations?
* How severe is the disability?
* What supports are currently in place to assist this student’s language development? How has the ELD instruction been specially designed to meet the needs of this particular student?
* Is the continued lack of English proficiency due only to the disability?
* Can the student with the support of their IEP benefit from English only or Dual Language general programs?
* How was it determined that the student is not making progress in ELD?
* NOTE: Students can not be reclassified solely on the basis of:
	+ low academic skills in English
	+ low test scores in English or Spanish
	+ lack of resources
	+ longevity in program or district.

These are the questions to be discussed when making the decision of whether the student should be reclassified as an exited English Language Learner. Each decision should be based on the student’s language and learning needs and be made in consultation with individuals knowledgeable about the student’s IEP and English Language Development. This discussion could take place during an RTI meeting or an Intensive Intervention Team (CARE, SST, staffing} meeting. The determination then must be discussed at an IEP team meeting and/or parents must be consulted before a student is reclassified.

1. **If SPED Identified students still need to be counted as ELL but the school schedule may not allow the student to receive ELD services are they to be left as un-exited students?**

No. If they are not receiving ELD services they may not be counted as an un-exited student. Based on the question #1 a student may be exited if it is deemed appropriate. If it is not deemed appropriate, the student must be receiving ELD services. Students cannot be reclassified solely on the basis of lack of resources. If scheduling is causing a conflict, it is the school’s responsibility to address this.

1. **What if a student’s disability is so severe that ELL services would be ineffective, do we have to assess, qualify, and serve?**

Things to consider:

* School districts must determine the language(s) spoken at home by each student in order to provide all students meaningful instruction
* If any language(s) other than English are spoken at home, then the student must be assessed with a language proficiency instrument
* Clear documentation from parents of the language that is spoken in the home may be used for qualification
* The Alternative Language Proficiency Instrument for Students with Significant Disabilities (ALPI, 1989) can be used.
	+ <http://sped.ocde.us/>
1. **What about a non-verbal student from a non-English-speaking home? Are they LEP if they don’t speak at all?**

Things to consider:

* Will the content be comprehensible and meaningful without support for their limited English status?
* Would sequential and systematic instruction in English help the student to achieve content goals?
* Information from question #3

The student’s ELL status must be documented on the IEP as an amendment to the Present Level of Performance. Using the criteria from question #1 this student may eventually be re-classified if they meet the criteria.

1. **For parents with limited English is a translator needed for IEP meetings?**

The district must take what ever action is necessary to ensure that the parent understand the proceedings of the IEP meeting. This will include arranging an interpreter for parents whose native language is other than English.

# VIII. Parent and Community Involvement

Communication concerning NCLB related information is provided to parents in the school report card on Statewide testing showing the school’s academic performance. This report is available in English and Spanish. Parents are notified in a timely manner regarding if the district did not make AMAO and AYP targets.

Parents are informed of their child’s placement in the district’s ELL program within 30 days of registering at the beginning of the year and within two weeks of registering once the school year has begun in a language that they can understand by the Parent Notification letter. In spring parents are informed of their child’s English language acquisition progress in a language they can understand. The ELPA result documents is mailed to parents either in English or Spanish with the end of the year report card.

We provide translators for registration, conferences, IEP meetings, parent meetings and as needed to make contact by phone, in person or in writing to keep parents updated on opportunities for their children. The Corvallis High School ELL Family/Student Advocate communicate regularly with parents to facilitate family participation in decisions concerning their student’s program participation, ELD progress, academic progress, and participation in district programs. (Refer to ELL Family/Student Advocate position description.) Magnet schools provide specific parent and family information opportunities that address specific issues regarding school culture and rules, understanding state assessments including ELPA, and transitioning from one school level to the next (i.e. elementary to middle and middle to high school). Meetings are conducted bilingually or in Spanish.

Parents of LEP students are on the Site Councils for Garfield Elementary and Lincoln K-8 schools, and on the ELL/DLI Superintendent’s Advisory Committee.

# IX. Program Evaluation Review and Improvement

## Evaluation Process

Annually, ELPA results and ELL OAKS data are analyzed to evaluate program effectiveness with regards to English Language proficiency growth and core content achievement to work toward meeting AMAO targets. ELPA results are reviewed by levels (elementary, middle school and high school), and by school as well as by the district as a whole. Student ELPA progress is reviewed by composite growth and then reviewed by strand growth (reading, writing, speaking and listening).

Three times a year district assessment data is reviewed to determine the academic progress of ELL students.

**Student Goals: District**

* 65% of our LEP students will move up one or more language proficiency level as measured by the ELPA by June 2011.
* 70% of students who have been in an ELL program for 5 years or more will attain English proficiency by June 2011.
* 70% of our ELL students will reach their grade level Language Arts standards by June 2011 as measured by the Oregon State Assessment (based on adjusted status).
* 69% of our ELL students will reach their grade level Math standards by June 2011 as measured by the Oregon State Assessment (based on adjusted status).

## ****Student Goals by Grade Span for AMAO #3****

***Based in 2009-12 Corvallis CIP Closing the Achievement Gap Goals***

**READING**

**By June 2011 77.61% of Elementary LEP students will meet/exceed benchmark status in OAKS Reading. (Currently at 72% meeting/exceeding 08-09 based on 2008-2009 % met column)**

**By June 2011, 53.8% of Middle School LEP students will meet/exceed benchmark status in OAKS Reading (Currently at 43% meeting/exceeding 08-09 based on 2008-2009 % met column)**

**By June 2011, 25.7% of High School LEP students will meet/exceed benchmark status in OAKS Reading (Currently at 8.3% meeting/exceeding 08-09 based on 2008-2009 % met column)**

## Collection and Review of Results

See current Data Analysis in Appendix A. The data was reviewed to determine overall program effectiveness and by specific program model (based on Instructional Programs described in Section IV) and individual schools when population is statistically significant. Evaluation also included growth of students in each proficiency level and at each grade span level.

Additional data is collected from program observations in all ELD classes, some sheltered classes as well as regular classrooms. Staff input is gathered through PLC work and ELL/DLI Superintendent’s Advisory Committee.

AMAO #1

* 61% of Early Intermediate Students did not progress 1 proficiency level or more.
* 64% of Early Intermediate Student at the Elementary level did not progress 1 proficiency level or more.
* 73% of Early Advanced Students did not progress 1 proficiency level.
* 86% of Early Advanced Students at the high school level did not progress to Proficient.

AMAO #2

* 73% of Early Advanced students did not progress to Proficient.
* 10% of students who have been identified as LEP for 5 years or more are performing at the Early Intermediate level.
* 29% of students who have been identified as LEP for 5 years or more are performing at the Intermediate level.

AMAO #3

* Reading
	+ LEP students at the high school did not meet AYP for participation or academic status.
* Mathematics
	+ LEP students at the high school level did not meet AYP for academic status.

## Factors that Prevented District from Achieving AMAO Targets

Based on the above summary of data the factors that prevented the district from achieving AMAO targets are listed below:

AMAO #1

* At the Elementary level ELD instruction was not sufficiently targeted for the Early Intermediate Language Learners. The focus of most teachers has been on the Intermediate and Early Advanced students.
* At the High School level the pace and rigor of ELD III courses were not sufficient to meet the needs of Early Advanced Students.
* At the High School level Early Advanced Students could not fully access the instruction provided in their core Language Arts courses.

AMAO #2

* A proportion of long-term LEP students do not have adequate foundational reading and writing skills and this had not been identified.
* At the High School level there was limited literacy support for all students to learn reading skills.

AMAO #3

* High School Schedule impacted ability to ensure all students had taken state assessments.
* A proportion of long-term LEP students do not have adequate foundational reading and writing skills and this had not been identified.
* At the High School level there was limited literacy support for all students to learn reading skills.
* The use of leveled math courses limited LEP students access to grade level math instruction.
* Math curriculum in the past was not aligned to state standards at the elementary level.

These factors are currently and will continue to be addressed through ELL program revision, Corvallis CIP development process and individual School Improvement plans. Specific factors are brought to the Curriculum and Instruction Department for further study.

Currently the ELL Program has clear processes for the identification of potential ELLs, the assessment of English Language Proficiency, providing appropriate resource for program design and student need and implementing transition criteria. These processes support language learning and academic growth. The ELL program has articulated a process to serve all eligible ELL students with ELD and access to core content. At the Secondary level implementation of this process has not been completed. This is currently being addressed as noted below (see Plan for Modification).

## Plan for Modification

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Modification | Timeline | Person Responsible |
| All elementary schools design ELD schedule based on language proficiency level of students not grade level. | 2009-10 Partial Implementation2010-11 Full Implementation | ELL Coordinator |
| Create and implement use of Power Language Functions for each ELD level (Beginning, Intermediate and Advanced)to strengthen targeted language instruction. | Create – 2009-10Implement Fully 2010-11 | ELL Instructional CoachELL Coordinator |
| Pace and rigor of high school ELD 3 courses is increased, pacing guide developed and new curriculum is introduced | 2009-2011 | ELL CoordinatorAssistant Principal |
| Three Structured English Immersion Language Arts courses are in place at the magnet High School. | 2009-10 | ELL Coordinator |
| Strategically select content classes in the High School (Science, Social Studies, Mathematics) to be sheltered and/or supported in crease LEP student success in meeting standards. | 2010-11 Mathematics2011-12 Science and Social Studies | High School Admin.ELL Coordinator |
| Implement a Read/Write ELD course at the magnet Middle School to address reading and writing fundamental for targeted students. | 2009-2010 | ELL Instructional Coach |
| Implement Read 180 at the High School and Language! At the Middle School with access for LEP students. | 2009-10 Middle School2010-11 High School | Middle School Admin.High School Admin.ELL CoordinatorELL Instructional Coach |
| High School schedule is being reviewed by a district committee during 09-10 school year. | 2010-11 New Schedule in use | High School Scheduling Committee |
| Proficiency Based Math course being established at high schools | 2009-10 Initial Implementation2010-12 Implementation and ELL support | High School Admin.ELL Coordinator |
| Remedial math course removed from middle school program and Supported Grade level math implemented. | 2009-10 Implemented and on-going | Middle School Admin. |
| K-5 math curriculum will be adopted during the 09-10 school year that is aligned to Oregon state standards. | 2010-11 new curriculum implemented across the district and ELL supplemental materials identified | Curriculum CoordinatorELL Coordinator |
| Dual Language District Plan developed to address the need for clear processes and procedures as DL program spans all 3 grade levels (K-12) | October 2009 ELL/DL Superintendent’s Advisory Committee January 2010 -DL District Plan written  | ELL CoordinatorELL Instructional Coach |

**Activities and Practices that have been dismissed because of lack of effectiveness and Reasons these Activities and Practices were not found to be effective:**

* **For Pull-Out ELD - grouping by grade level rather than language proficiency levels at the elementary level** **non-magnet schools.** This was not effective since the lessons were not designed with enough specificity to meet the needs of the various language proficiency levels of the students and students were not able to make as much growth as desired.
* **ELL students not being recommended for RTI because of language level.** This was not effective as it was depriving students who could benefit from reading and math interventions access to these additional services.
* **ELL students being placed in a remedial level math class at 6th grade.** This was not effective since the students did not “catch up” so that they could be placed into grade level math. Expectations were low. If a student started at this level math in 6th grade they would not have enough math credits for college entrance at the end of 4 years of high school.
* **ELL students being placed in un-sheltered language arts classes at the high school level.** This was not effective as many students did not pass their language arts classes.
* **Newcomers at the high school level were placed in to regular high school courses too soon after they arrived.** Students did not have enough English to be successful. They did not have enough support to understand the general culture or high school culture. There were not enough specially designed classes for Newcomers to increase their language skills quickly and core content teachers did not have the skills to work with Newcomers in their regular classes.

To address these factors the ELL team developed the Corvallis ELL Program Action Plan. The team included the ELL Coordinator, ELL Coach, and District leadership including Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent.