

SECTION I.D.ii. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS

No Child Left Behind Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 2.2: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the state's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

No Child Left Behind Indicator 2.3: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the state's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

This section reports the progress of Limited English Proficient students in developing and attaining English proficiency and making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). School systems are asked to analyze information on Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs):

- **AMAO I is issued to demonstrate the percentages of Limited English Proficient students progressing toward English proficiency.** For making AMAO I progress, Maryland uses a composite score obtained from the LAS Links assessment. The composite score is derived from equally weighted sub scores from each of the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Students are considered to have made progress if their overall test score on the LAS links composite is 15 scale score points higher than the composite score from the previous test administration. IN order to meet the target for AMAO I for the school year 2008-2009, 56% of ELLS will make progress in learning English.
- **AMAO II is issued to demonstrate the percentages of Limited English Proficient students attaining English proficiency by the end of each school year.** For calculating AMAO II, Maryland uses a composite score obtained from LAS Links assessment. The composite score is derived from equally weighted sub scores from each of the four domains of listening, speaking, reading and writing. For the purpose of AMAO II (accountability), a composite score of 5 on the ELP assessment with a minimum cut score of 4 in each domain is used to determine proficiency level for each grade. The AMAO II target for school year 2008-2009 is 15% of ELL's will attain proficiency in English.
- **AMAO III represents Adequate Yearly Progress of LSSs for the Limited English Proficient student subgroup.** Although progress of Limited English Proficient students in attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics is included in Section I.D.i., Maryland School Assessment/High School Assessments and in Attachment 10 (Title III,

Part A), school systems not making AMAO III are required to provide additional discussion of progress toward attaining reading and math proficiency here.

Somerset County provides data in this Annual Update to indicate the progress of ELL students toward attaining English proficiency, reading/language arts proficiency, and mathematics proficiency.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENTS

A. Based upon the examination of AMAO I, AMAO II, and AMAO III Data (Tables 4.1 – 4.3), Somerset County reports as follows:

| Table 4.1 System AMAO I, 2008-2009 | | | |
|---|----|-----------------------|---|
| | N | Number Who Met Target | % (% = $\frac{\text{Number Who Met Target}}{\text{N}}$) |
| Total | 81 | 60 | 74.07% |

| Table 4.2 System AMAO II, 2008-2009 | | | |
|--|-----|-----------------------|--------|
| | N | Number Who Met Target | % |
| Total | 103 | 28 | 27.18% |

| Table 4.3: System AMAO III, 2009 | | | | | | |
|--|------------|--------|------|------------|--------|------|
| AYP Status for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students* | | | | | | |
| | Reading | | | Math | | |
| | Elementary | Middle | High | Elementary | Middle | High |
| 2007 | 52.60% | 16.70% | NA | 57.10% | 50% | NA |
| 2008 | 75% | 58.30% | NA | 88.20% | 33.30% | NA |
| 2009 | 86.5% | 33.3% | NA | 89.2% | 62.5% | NA |

1. Evidence of ELL Progress

a. The LEP measure of AMAO I improved from 2008 to 2009.

The percentage of students progressing towards English proficiency, or AMAO I, in 2008 was 46%. This increased to 74.07% in 2009. Students are considered progressing when they achieve a 15 scale point difference in the end of year LAS assessment compared with the previous year's score or the diagnostic testing. Somerset County exceeded the Maryland State target of 56% for AMAO I for 2009 by 18 percentage points.

b. Somerset County's LEP measure of AMAO II exceeded the Maryland State target.

The percentage of students attaining English Language proficiency by scoring an overall composite score of 5 with a minimum of 4 on all the LAS Domains is 27.18% for 2009. The Maryland State target for 2009 is 15%.

c. Local trend data over the last 3 years indicates improvements in LAS data in several areas.

- A three year upward trend is apparent in Reading and Writing at the elementary band.
- At the high school band, two of the four domains, Listening and Writing, show a continuing upward trend.
- At the middle band Speaking has experienced a continuing upward trend.

2. The Practices, Programs, or Strategies and Professional Development to which the Progress of Limited English Proficient Students' Progress toward Attaining English Proficiency Is Attributed

a. STRATEGY: LEP teachers work increased regular classroom teachers' knowledge of and skills in effectively working with LEP students in the regular classroom.

1. LEP teachers led professional development sessions for regular classroom teachers and worked with regular education teachers on some of the strategies within the classrooms. Strategies included specific techniques to increase verbal interaction of LEP students with their teachers and peers.
2. Teachers worked to maximize opportunities within Flex Time for students to increase their English Proficiency.
3. LEP teachers also increased teacher success in working with LEP students through shared experiences, ideas, and collaborative data analysis.
4. Accuracy of local assessment results for LEP students was an additional professional development topic within and outside of the classrooms. Accurate assessment information is critical to guide instructional planning.

| <i>CATEGORY</i> | <i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i> | <i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i> |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Professional Development | LEP Classroom Strategies through team, staff, multidisciplinary, cross grade and band level meetings | Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 |
| Staffing | Quarterly Assessment Scoring: Coordinator of Student Assessment | Source: Local Cost: \$37,885 |

b. STRATEGY: Increased LEP teachers' repertoire of interactive strategies to improve students' language proficiency by utilizing the LAS Links Curriculum

- LAS Links training on curriculum and instruction was provided to all LEP teachers.
- LEP teachers used LAS Links with LEP pull out intervention groups.
- LAS Links was fully implemented at the Intermediate School (Grades 6 and 7) and at one of the elementary schools.

| <i>CATEGORY</i> | <i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i> | <i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i> |
|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Professional Development | LAS Links Curriculum Training | Source: Title III Cost: \$1,190 |
| Materials | LAS Links | Source: Title III Cost: \$1,520 |

c. PRACTICE: Provided targeted intervention to LEP students in identified areas of language weakness.

- LEP small group instruction and LEP flex groups in reading and math were accomplished through non-traditional scheduling.
- One school was able to provide a full, daily 90 minute "plug in" with an ESOL teacher, an assistant and a bilingual paraprofessional.

| <i>CATEGORY</i> | <i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i> | <i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i> |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Materials | <i>LAS Links Curriculum</i> | Source: Title III Cost: \$1,520 |
| Staffing | Schedule Adjustments for Pull Out and Plug In Classroom Intervention | Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 |
| Staffing | Math Facilitators | Source: Local Cost: \$284,244 |
| Staffing | Reading Coaches- 4.5 staff plus LEP paraprofessional | Source: Reading First Cost: \$25,691 Source: Title 1 Cost: 197,993 |

d. STRATEGY: Increased LEP students' opportunities to learn increased through the provision of take home highly engaging practice tools.

- LEP students utilized Leap Frog software which engages students in fun activities while building their reading fluency, accuracy, and phonetic skills.
- LEP students utilize *Rosseta Stone*.

| <i>CATEGORY</i> | <i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i> | <i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i> |
|-------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Equipment and Materials | Maintaining <i>Leap Frog</i> Program | Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 |
| Materials | Rosetta Stone | Source: Title III Cost: \$8,164 |

e. STRATEGY: Maintained staffing to support LEP learners in spite of severe budget cuts was maintained.

The following positions were maintained for 113 LEP students:

- ELL Bilingual Assistant to assist in one elementary school.
- ELL Instructional Assistant and ELL Tutor in the largest school.
- An ELL teacher serving two elementary schools with the support of the ELL Bilingual Assistant.
- An ELL teacher for the secondary schools.
- A Coordinator of the ELL and Migrant Programs with Special Education reading responsibilities.
- Additional Bilingual Tutoring services have been added to support the middle school and the Alternative Learning Center.

| <i>CATEGORY</i> | <i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i> | <i>FUNDING SOURCE, AND COST</i> |
|------------------------------|---|--|
| Staffing Intervention | ELL Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional (3) • Paraprofessional (3) • Supervisory | Cost: \$202,470 Source: Local \$163,530; Title I \$17,078; Reading First \$19,462 |

f. PROGRAM: Extended day and extended year learning opportunities for LEP students were provided.

- Instructional support such as daily tutoring to enhance LEP students' learning was provided.
- A Home Visitation Program led by a bilingual paraprofessional from an elementary school was established in order to aide parents in helping their children with their homework and to further meet translation/ interpretation needs.
- Extended day and year settings.

| <i>CATEGORY</i> | <i>STRATEGY, PROGRAM, OR PRACTICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</i> | <i>FUNDING SOURCE AND COST</i> |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Staffing | Bilingual After School Homework/Tutoring Program | Source: Title III Cost: \$895 |
| Materials and Supplies | Bilingual One-on-One Reading and Math Tutoring | Source: Migrant Education Cost: \$600 |
| Staffing | Summer Intervention Programs in Reading, Writing and Mathematics | Source Migrant Education Cost: \$240 Migrant Summer 2008 |
| Staffing | Home Visitation | Source: Title III Cost: \$720 |

3. Evidence of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students' Challenges in Attaining English Proficiency in the Four Domains: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing.

A review of the LAS testing scores from 2008 compared to 2009 reveal the following:

a. **The 2009 Middle School Band of LEP students’ performance revealed a decrease in proficiency in three of the four domains when compared with the 2008 Middle School Band LEP students’ performance.**

- Listening proficiency scores decreased by 4.6 percentage points.
- Reading proficiency decreased 2.5 percentage points.
- Writing proficiency decreased 22.6 percentage points.

b. **The 2009 Elementary Band of LEP students’ performance revealed a decrease in proficiency in two of the four domains when compared with the 2008 Elementary LEP students’ performance.**

- Listening proficiency scores decreased by 4.6 percentage points.
- Speaking proficiency scores decreased by 21.6 percentage points.

c. **The 2009 High School Band of LEP students’ performance revealed a decrease in proficiency in one of the four domains when compared with the 2008 High School LEP students’ performance.**

Reading proficiency decreased by 6.1 percentage points.

4. Changes or Adjustments That Are Being Made to Ensure Sufficient Progress of Limited English Proficient Students in Attaining English Proficiency

a. **ADJUSTMENT: Increase classroom teachers’ skills in working with LEP students in the regular classroom.**

| ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE | RESOURCE | CATEGORY AND FUNDING |
|--|---|--|
| Provide training for classroom teachers on in class strategies to maximize proficiency of LEP students. through led by Dr. Katy Arnett from St. Mary’s College of Maryland and ongoing ESOL Teacher led workshops Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | Consultant: Dr. Katy Arnett from St. Mary’s College of Maryland | Professional Development Source: Title III Cost: \$5,000 |
| Increase collaborative opportunities for ESOL staff and regular classroom teachers through multidisciplinary, cross grand and band level meetings Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | Staff Time | Professional Development Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 |

b. **CHANGE: Develop and implement school based language instruction through educational programs that are coordinated with other relevant programs and services.**

This change seeks to provide more continuity for the LEP student as well as increase language proficiency.

| CHANGE and TIMELINE | RESOURCE | CATEGORY AND FUNDING |
|---|--|---|
| Provide formal, scheduled Co-Planning/Co-teaching at the elementary level for the 90 minute reading block Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | Staff time | Core Program Source: Staff Time Cost: \$0 |
| Link classroom teachers and LEP teachers with the After School Program instructors and community services and agencies interacting with the families Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voyager Staff • Department of Social Services • Local Management Board | Extended Day Program Source: 21 st Century Grant Cost: \$347,898 |

c. ADJUSTMENT: Increase High Quality Instructional Support to enhance student learning.

| ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE | RESOURCE | CATEGORY AND FUNDING |
|--|---|--|
| Hire a Bilingual Translator/Tutor for Princess Anne Elementary School to work with LEP students and with migrant parents enrolling their children Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | Staffing | Core Program Source: Migrant Cost: \$3,220 |
| Provide additional instruction and intervention beyond the regular school day through after school tutoring support Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | Staffing Extended Day Programs | Extended Day Program Source: Title III Cost: \$6,000 |
| Upgrade supplemental materials and educational software for LEP students Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bilingual Dictionaries • Educational Software: Rosetta Stone Network | Supplies/Materials Source: Title III Cost: \$8,164 |

d. ADJUSTMENT: Increase ESOL teachers' repertoire and command of interactive strategies to increase students' language proficiency through social and academic interaction.

| ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE | RESOURCE | CATEGORY AND FUNDING |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Increase targeted intervention in identified areas of individual LEP students' language | Professional Development | Professional Development |

| ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE | RESOURCE | CATEGORY AND FUNDING |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| weakness Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | LAS Links Training | Source: Title III Cost:: \$1,100 |
| Train principals in recognizing and assessing effective LEP teaching strategies Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | Professional Development | Professional Development Source: Staff Time Cost:: \$0 |

- e. **ADJUSTMENT: Increase programs and access to programs developed to assist parents in becoming active participants in the education of their children and improving their children’s academic achievement.**

| ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE | RESOURCE | CATEGORY AND FUNDING |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| Contract services for bilingual interpreters for parent conferences, school enrollment, meetings, translations, etc. Timeline August 2009 – June 2010 | Bilingual Interpreters | Contracted Service Source: Title III Cost:: \$1,920 |
| Utilize Transact Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | Transact Web Based Service | Other Charge Source: Title III Cost:: \$6,969 |

B. Describe the corrective action plan specifying action to be taken for not meeting AMAO I (Table 4.1)

Note: In order for a local school system to meet the System AMAO I, 2008-2009, at least 56% of students must make a 15 scale score point increase on the 2009 LAS administration as compared to last year's administration.

Somerset County met AMAO I at 74.07%

C. Describe the corrective action plan specifying action to be taken for not meeting AMAO II (Table 4.2)

Note: In order for a local school system to meet the System AMAO II, 2008-2009, at least 15% of students must meet grade-specific targets for English Language Proficiency.

Somerset County met AMAO II at 27.18%

D. Based on the examination of AMAO III Data (Table 4.3)

Indicate YES If the School System made AYP for LEP Students, or NO of the School.

System did not make AYP for LEP Students at the Middle Level in Reading.

Challenges to making AYP at the Middle Level in Reading

- Somerset Intermediate remained in School Improvement moving to Corrective Action as a result of the LEP subgroup failing to meet AYP in Reading.
- The middle level LEP subgroup is small with only 10 members for 2010. This includes students at three sites.
- Current skills of these students are extremely weak.
 - ✓ Only one student passed a previous MSA Reading Assessment by a safe margin.
 - ✓ Only one student passed his last MSA Reading Assessment by 1 point.
 - ✓ Six students scored basic on the most recent MSA Reading Assessment.
 - ✓ Two students transferred in from out of country with no previous MSA data.

Changes or adjustments that will be made so that the system will achieve Adequate Yearly Progress

- Each grade level team will identify the LEP students on their team. In their planning, teachers are attempting to incorporate best practices for working with LEP students in their instruction.
- Language Arts teachers will track and reporting the progress of each LEP student in critical reading skills (the *Big 8*) through common assessment and benchmark data.
- Students not meeting proficiency in a particular reading skill will receive re-teaching/remediation in the skill and be re-assessed.
- Students will be divided into "flex groups" for intervention and/or enrichment activities. Based on data, LEP students will move among the teachers/groups as needed.
- SIS has requested the purchase of MP3 players to record or play audio files player to use in completing differentiated enrichment activities, including instruction.
- LEP students are being actively recruited for participation in the *Voyager* after school program to supplement their core instruction and increase their exposure to predominantly English oriented instructional/social environments.
- A matrix for each LEP child has been developed which includes achievement data, and differentiated strategies based on his/her language strengths and weaknesses.
- Professional development is scheduled for faculty on understanding LAS scores and incorporating research-based best practices into instruction.

| ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE | RESOURCE | CATEGORY AND FUNDING |
|---|----------|---|
| A full time teacher at Somerset Intermediate has be reassigned to teach Reading Intervention Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | Staffing | Staffing Source: Local Cost: \$47,088 |

| | | |
|---|----------|---------------------------|
| 2 Full time reading intervention Teachers at high schools | Staffing | Professional Development\ |
|---|----------|---------------------------|

| ADJUSTMENT and TIMELINE | RESOURCE | CATEGORY AND FUNDING |
|---|---|---|
| Timeline: August 2009-June 2010 | | Staffing Cost: \$66,338 Source: ARRA (Stimulus funding) |
| Reading Advantage used at all three secondary schools Timeline: April 2009-June 2010 | Materials | Supplies/Materials: Cost: \$3,500 Source: ARRA (Stimulus funding) |
| Content Area Reading Enrichment (CARE) will be implemented at the intermediate school this year. CARE is professional development provided to content area teachers by language arts teachers to promote reading literacy. Timeline: August 2009-June 2010 | Professional Development for Content area teachers | Professional Development\ Staffing Cost: \$17,320 Source: ARRA (Stimulus funding) |
| Reading Coach has moved to a 12 month position and will also work with high school teachers (position is secondary literary coach) Timeline: August 2009-June 2010 | Staffing/Embedded Professional Development | Staffing Cost: \$59,801 Source: Local |
| High School After School Professional Development (APD) will move to a different day so secondary literary coach can work with both groups Timeline: August 2009-June 2010 | Explicit and Embedded Professional Development | Professional Development Cost: \$265,574 for APD Source: Local |
| Professional Development on the LAS Curriculum and incorporating research-based best LEP practices into instruction Timeline: August 2009-June 2010 | Professional Development | Professional Development Cost: \$265,574 for APD Source: Local |
| Job embedded professional development will be provided by elementary reading coaches Timeline: August 2009 – June 2010 | Staffing: Reading Coaches, Staffing is .5 less than last year | Professional Development Cost:\$196,638 Source: Title 1 |
| MP3 players to record or play audio files player to use in completing differentiated enrichment activities, including instruction Timeline: November 2009-June 2010 | Materials: Individual players for each student | Materials Cost: \$1454 Source: Title III |