

**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.**

This section reports the progress of Limited English Proficient students in developing and attaining English language proficiency and making adequate yearly progress. School systems are asked to provide information on Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs):

- AMAO I is used to demonstrate the percentages of Limited English Proficient students progressing toward English proficiency.
- AMAO II is used to demonstrate the percentages of Limited English Proficient students attaining English proficiency by end of each school year.
- 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 Assessments/High School Assessments, and in Title III, Part A, school systems not making AMAO III will be required to provide additional discussion of progress toward attaining reading and math proficiency here.

Table 4.1 System AMAO I, 2007-2008			
	Number Who Met Target	N	%; (Number Who Met Target)/N)
Total	29	47	61.0%

Worksheet 4.1.A Number of Students to be Included in the AMAO I Calculation	
Column 1*	Column 2
Number of students who were reported on the October 31, 2007 student data file.	Number of students from Column 1 who were still enrolled as of March 31, 2008 (first day of testing window) <b>AND</b> completed the summative LAS test. <b>Enter the result as "N" in Table 4.1.</b>
81	47

Worksheet 4.1.B Accounting for Untested Students	
Column 3	Column 4
Number of students from Column 1 who were still enrolled as of March 31, 2008 (first day of testing window) <b>AND did not</b> complete the summative LAS test.	Number of students from Column 1 who were not enrolled as on March 31, 2008 (first day of testing window).
0	0

**Worksheet 4.1.C: Number of Students Who Met the AMAO I Target**

Using the students identified in Worksheet #4.1.A in Column 2, list by Grade the number of these students who scored 15 scale score points higher on their overall test score in the Spring 2008 administration of the LAS compared to their scores on the October 31, 2007 pre test score file. **Enter the Total Number Who Met the Target in Table 4.1.**

Grade:	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total (Number who met target)
Number who met target	13	9	8	8	1	2	3	2	1	1	0	2	1	51

**Table 4.2 System AMAO II, 2007-2008**

	Number Who Met Target	N	%
<b>Total</b>	45	69	65.2%

**Worksheet 4.2.A: Number of Students to be Included in the AMAO II Calculation**

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Number of students who were reported on the October 31, 2007 student data file <b>AND</b> were tested on the summative LAS-Links in April 2008	Number of students from Column 1 who enrolled on or before October 31, 2005 (i.e. have received ESOL services for at least two years or more)	Number of students from Column 1 who enrolled between November 1, 2005 and October 31, 2007 and were placed at proficiency Level 3 or higher	Add the numbers reported in Column 2 and Column 3 to get the Total N. <b>Enter the result as "N" in Table 4.2.</b>
81	18	51	69

**Worksheet 4.2.B: Number of Students Who Met the AMAO II Target**

Using the students identified in Worksheet #4.2.A in Column 4, list by Grade the number of these students who scored greater than or equal to the **overall** target scale score by Grade provided below. Enter the Total Number who met the target in Table 4.2.

Grade:	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total (Number who met target)
Target Score:	463	485	505	513	516	521	525	528	531	533	539	539	539	
Number Who Met Target	3	9	9	10	4	3	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	45

**IDii**  
**LEP STUDENTS**

**I. EXAMINATION OF UNTESTED STUDENTS (Table 4.1)**

All Somerset County Public School LEP students who were enrolled as of March 31, 2008 completed the summative LAS test.

**II. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT STUDENT PROGRESS**

**A. FINDINGS**

**1. The percentage of Limited English Proficient students meeting the AMAO II target has increased in 2008.**

In 2008, 75.6% of the LEP subgroup met their target scale score for AMAO II. This represents an 8.6 percentage point increase over last year's performance. The Middle Level LEP students had the highest performance with 90% of the students in Grades 6 through 8 meeting the AMAO II target. At the Elementary Level, 78.3% of the LEP students met the target.

**B. PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, AND STRATEGIES THAT PROMOTED PROGRESS**

**1. Revised Elementary CORE Program**

The immediate concern of 2007 to be addressed was the size of teacher case load due to the steady increase in the LEP or ELL (English Language Learners) enrollment. Recognizing the challenges presented by an increase in Hispanic and LEP students, the system maintained the ELL Bilingual Assistant to assist with one elementary school and provided both an ELL Instructional Assistant and ELL Tutor in the larger elementary school. Previously, in an attempt to balance caseloads, more than one teacher had been serving the larger school. Having support staff members allowed one ELL teacher to carry a heavier caseload. A second ELL teacher was assigned to two elementary schools with one support staff person and a smaller caseload. Having the consistency of a single staff member in each school seemed to strengthen each school's ELL department. To assist with the monitoring and growth of the ELL subgroup, the system maintained the Coordinator of *Reading First* and increased responsibilities to include the supervision of ELL.

A second concern was the amount of instructional time provided to students. Instruction appeared to be taking a backseat to documentation and compliance checks. ELL teachers were asked for monthly submissions throughout 2007-2008 of their logs, student intervention attendance, and current measures of progress. This simple accountability requirement increased instructional opportunities for students and consequently increased student performance.

ELL teachers, at the elementary level, implemented the use of the intervention program, SIPPS, during the 30 minute block while embedding ESOL strategies to

enhance growth in students' proficiency in reading, writing and listening. The intervention blocks met daily. ELL teachers provided co-teaching plug in services during the 90 minute reading blocks and/or provided the initial instruction for a focused group based on the LEP population in the building by Grade.

Somerset County Public Schools has received a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Grant that provided an after school and extended year program, *The Voyager*. Students in Grades 3 through 7 who scored basic on the previous year's MSA or just managed to meet proficiency were invited to participate in the after school program for 2 hours, 4 days a week during the school year and 4 hour session 4 days per week for 20 instructional days in the summer.

Collaborative funding by *Reading First*, local funds and Special Education provided the resources necessary for an extended year program, *The Adventurers*. Elementary students (Kindergarten through Grade 2) who scored intensive or strategic on the previous year's final DIBELS benchmark were invited to participate in the summer program.

Both extended day and extended year programs utilized research based materials: *Moving with Math* for math and *Voyager* for reading. ELL students were an active part of this program.

## **2. Professional Development for ELL and Regular Education Teachers**

All ELL teachers are required to attend the same professional development as other classroom teachers in their schools. In 2007, they attended a series of sessions on Refresher Work with Systematic Instruction, Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words (SIPPS) to better enable them to deliver high quality reading intervention. ELL teachers also attended LETERS: Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling Modules 4-6 (vocabulary, fluency and comprehension).

Professional Development goes both ways in professional learning communities: ELL teachers are learning skills along with regular classroom teachers that are used with all students and regular classroom teachers are learning skills from and with ELL teachers to enhance their LEP students' progress. Regular classroom teachers needed assistance in making modifications and reinforcement for the ELL students in their classrooms. Sessions with specific techniques and strategies that teachers can use within the regular classroom to help ELL students be successful were conducted by ELL teachers and based upon the teachers' needs. In addition, ELL teachers provided information on the LAS Links assessments and how to analyze the LAS data to understand the needs of the students.

An effective implementation of *Reading First* requires teacher fluency with classroom differentiation strategies. Somerset County Public Schools provided on site professional development in three phases through two national consultants: Gabrielle Desotau at the beginning and end of the school year and Bobbi Plank in the spring of 2008. ELL teachers were active participants in these sessions.

The *Reading First* coaches led county wide training on differentiated instruction and higher order questioning in June 2007 and provided follow up with on-site trainings during collaborative planning sessions and faculty professional development opportunities.

### 3. Home Support for Families

Somerset County Public Schools continues to value all parent and community participation including families of ELL students. All schools send communications home in the first language of the student in order to keep parents and families informed. This strategy resulted in a high percentage of participation in school activities by LEP parents. For those parents who were unable to read letters in English or in their native language, home visits and/or phone calls provided by the native speaking (Spanish) ELL assistant and tutor were conducted. This assures that every possible attempt was made to notify and welcome parents to events or happenings in the schools.

## C. RELATED RESOURCES

<b>RELATED RESOURCES FOR ELL</b>	
<b>Staffing</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintained 3 ELL Teachers</li> </ul>	<b>Cost:</b> \$152,789 <b>Source:</b> Local/State <i>* Duplicated Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintained 2 ELL Instructional Assistants</li> </ul>	<b>Cost:</b> \$34,318 <b>Source:</b> \$16,002 – Title I \$18,316 – <i>Reading First</i> <i>* Duplicated Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintained 1 ELL Tutor</li> </ul>	<b>Cost:</b> \$7,900 <b>Source:</b> SS/HS <i>* Duplicated Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added .5 <i>Performance Matters</i> Coordinator</li> </ul>	<b>Cost:</b> \$40,774 <b>Source:</b> Local/State <i>* Duplicated Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintained Student Information Specialist</li> </ul>	<b>Cost:</b> \$58,918 <b>Source:</b> Local/State <i>* Duplicated Reference</i>
<b>Professional Development</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided <i>SIPPS</i> Training</li> </ul>	<b>Cost:</b> \$360 <b>Source:</b> <i>Reading First</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided <i>LETRS</i>: Modules 4 – 6 (Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling)</li> </ul>	<b>Cost:</b> \$360 <b>Source:</b> <i>Reading First</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implemented CORE Differentiated Strategies</li> </ul>	<b>Cost:</b> \$0 – Staff Time <b>Source:</b> Local/State

<b>Table 4.1 Proficiency Level by Grade Band</b>						
Proficiency Level	Grade Band	Overall	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing
5	Elem	30.2	38	44.4	27	17.5
	Middle	18.1	54.5	27.3	27.3	18.1
	High	16.7	0	16.7	50	33.3
4	Elem	31.7	34.9	25.4	25.4	22.2
	Middle	27.3	9	27.3	18.1	54.5
	High	16.7	0	16.7	16.7	0
3	Elem	19	19	20.6	12.7	22.2
	Middle	36.4	36.4	27.3	27.3	27.3
	High	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	33.3
2	Elem	12.7	3.2	4.8	17.5	12.7
	Middle	18.1	0	18.1	18.1	9
	High	33.3	66.7	50	0	33.3
1	Elem	6.3	4.8	4.8	17.5	25.4
	Middle	0	0	0	9	0
	High	0	0	0	16.7	0

<b>Table 4.2 Proficiency Levels by Percentages of Students</b>					
Proficiency Level	Overall	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing
5	27.5	37.5	40	28.6	18.7
4	30	28.6	25	23.8	23.8
3	22.5	22.6	21.2	15	23.8
2	15	7.5	10	16.3	13.2
1	5	3.8	3.8	16.3	20

<b>Table 4.3 Number of Students at each Proficiency Level by Years of Service</b>									
Proficiency Level	Years of Service								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5	2	5	2	6	5	1			1
4	3	6	3	6	3		1	1	
3	6	4	2	3	3				
2	4	3	3	2	1				
1	3							1	

### III. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY CHALLENGES

#### A. FINDINGS

1. The percentage of students proficient in Speaking is insufficient and is the weakest domain at the high school level.

Language Acquisition test results show that 33.9% of the LEP students were not proficient in speaking English. Breaking down the data by grade band reveals 72.9% of the elementary and 63.5% of middle level students are proficient in speaking English. However, none of the 6 high school LEP students are proficient in the domain of Speaking. The high school LEP students do not have sufficient English language skills or have experienced enough exposure to proficiently speak at grade level. For these students the speaking process must access their personal experiences and be chunked into small components to assure mastery and progress.

**2. The percentage of students proficient in Listening is insufficient and particularly weak at the high school level.**

2008 Language Acquisition scores show that 35% of all LEP students tested are not proficient in Listening. Listening is the second highest domain for the elementary LEP students, with 69.8% testing proficient. However at the upper levels where listening is even more critical to academic success, only 33.4% of the students tested at the high school level scored proficient in Listening. It is one of the weakest domains at this level.

**3. The percentage of students proficient in Reading remains insufficient and is the weakest domains at the middle level.**

Reading is the strongest domain at the high school level, with 66.7% of the students scoring proficient. At the elementary level, 52.4% of the students were proficient. The area of greatest concern is the middle level students. Reading proficiency levels on the Language Acquisition Scales test is the lowest domain for the middle level. Only 45.4% of the middle level students tested were proficient in Reading. The middle level LEP students do not have sufficient reading skills and need concentrated instruction in linguistic, cognitive and academic variables that continue to compound the process of reading.

**4. The percentage of students proficient in Writing is insufficient and is the weakest domain at the elementary level.**

The weakest domain at the elementary level is Writing. Only 39.7% of the elementary LEP students scored at the proficient level. Writing was also the second lowest domain for the high school LEP student. Only 33.3% were proficient. These compare with 42.5% of all LEP students testing proficient in Writing. Knowing that reading skills are also insufficient for the LEP students, deliberate and varied exposure to the English language is needed. For these students, the writing process must be broken down and built up with the use of the same personal experiences as with the spoken language skills. Students learn to write the way they speak and connecting the two through planned activities will yield progress.

**B. PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, AND STRATEGIES DESIGNED TO ADDRESS CONCERNS AND OVERCOME CHALLENGES**

We are challenged in all four domains to increase ELL students' growth and development in acquiring the critical language skills necessary to support their learning. Somerset strives to support, not replace, the Maryland Voluntary State

Curricula with effective ELL strategies for use in the regular classrooms and in pull out small group or individualized flex groups.

**1. We are challenged to avoid confusing social *Speaking* proficiency with Reading, Listening, and Writing skills.**

Teachers can be misled by an ELL student's ability to speak English among his or her friends and in class by assuming that since the student can speak English, he or she has adequate *Listening* skills and should be able to pick up *Reading* and *Writing* skills shortly. Such an assumption creates additional difficulties and ultimately shortchanges ELL students of the necessary explicit instruction they need for academic success. ELL students have been said to need a "third" language: academic English. Academic English is very different from the words of the hallways, cafeteria, and community. Academic English is "...full of new words, figurative expressions, grammar structures, verb tenses, and communication strategies." [Zweirs, Jeff. "The Third Language or Academic English," *Educational Leadership*, December 2004-January 2005.] Somerset County must guide both the regular classroom teachers and the teachers of ELL students at all levels in the development of academic English. ELL students need to develop "habits of language" that they can use to acquire speaking, listening, reading, and writing academic skills in that sequence. These habits are good practice for all learners, not merely ELL students and would be especially beneficial to those at risk or struggling. The strategies, which apply to all four domains include:

1. Using context to interpret meaning
2. Recognizing words that describe thinking skills
3. Reading or hearing read-aloud challenging but understandable materials
4. Taking risks in the new language (academic language) in small group, classroom discussion and hearing teacher modeling , and
5. Converse with Native English Speakers about "academic" topics.

Somerset County does provide high quality professional development to assist regular classroom teachers in making modifications and reinforcing the English Language Learner. Ongoing training sessions facilitated by the ELL teachers demonstrate specific techniques and strategies that teachers can use within the regular classroom to help ELL students be comfortable and successful in the spoken language. Speaking strategies that the ELL teachers have worked with teachers to develop within their regular classroom repertoire are:

6. "Giving " ELL students specific questions to ask in class
7. Engaging students in casual talk as often as possible
8. Avoiding forcing ELL students to speak before they are ready
9. Providing staged opportunities for ELL students to give the right answer
10. Promoting oral interaction and extended academic talk moving away from asking questions that require only with one- or two-word responses,

11. Modeling academic English by repeating ELL students' answers using correct grammar

ELL teachers also provide individualized strategies to help teachers and students to find ways to share their ideas and better communicate with their peers and instructors during class activities.

The ELL teachers have been trained in the implementation of LAS Links Curriculum. This curriculum is used in conjunction with the LAS Links individual assessment results. It provides the ELL teacher with strategies to address the specific speaking, listening, reading and writing needs of the student through either core classroom instruction or through intervention classes. Strategies from this curriculum are shared with classroom teachers by the ELL teacher as needed.

**2. We are challenged to increase classroom teachers' awareness, sensitivity, and skill in responding effectively to ELL students' learning barriers from *Listening* deficiencies.**

The vast majority of classroom instruction depends upon verbal interaction, both speaking and listening. *Listening* skills become more sophisticated with each grade level. All three levels of *Listening* training for teachers: awareness, sensitivity, and skill, are critical to successful instructional delivery. No level is simple; each must become habit.

Classroom teachers' development of instructional habits to reinforce ELL students' success begins with professional development sessions on best ELL instructional practices and continues through conferences between the regular teacher and the ELL teacher, monitoring by coaches, and observations by administrators. ELL teachers demonstrate strategies during staff workshops as well as collaborative meetings and present guidelines for ways to select the best strategies to meet each student's needs. Simple listening strategies supervisors, principals, and ELL teachers will expect to see in practice in regular classrooms for the benefit of ELL students are:

- a. Providing abundant opportunities for active listening,
- b. Using props, visuals, and real objects in lectures, discussions, and instructions,
- c. Pairing or grouping students with proficient learners and native English speakers who can rephrase for the ELL student's better understanding
- d. Pairing students with a "buddy" with the same first language,
- e. Structuring group discussion,
- f. Simplifying the language, not the content,
- g. Creating listening stations so ELL students may listen and read at the same time
- h. Recognizing that ELL students will make language mistakes – modeling and correcting grammatical form in a supportive, friendly, respectful environment

**3. We are challenged to motivate ELL students to read independently in order to increase their proficiency.**

SCPS recognizes that *Reading* is a powerful way to push students beyond social language and into academic language. Reading exposes students to words and expressions they will not encounter in conversation. Reading in English may be further complicated by reading difficulties that the student has in his or her first language; it might be necessary to build a bridge to independent reading through reading aloud. Reading aloud at all levels is a valuable and worthwhile investment of instructional time. Applying Directed Reading-Thinking as well as Guided Reading activities such as Anticipation guides to the read aloud text not only benefits ELL students, but the full class as well. Maintaining literature rich classrooms with all types of books, short stories, song lyrics, periodicals, and news items can tempt ELL readers to take the next step. At all levels, ELL students need time to read independently.

Teachers can further ELL students' motivation and confidence in developing reading skills by directing them to written resources to find answers to their questions. Reading and discussing cultural memoirs send a message of respect to ELL students while providing reading practice and building skills.

Taking reading home and outside of the classroom is an important step for SCPS ELL students. To encourage this, *Leap Frog* materials have been provided to all elementary schools with identified ELL students to use during independent and intervention times. The students have been provided a checkout system to take home the materials and share with their family. This promotes reading both in school and at home.

School year reading alone is not adequate for ELL students. Summer reading programs are necessary that ELL students can access through SCPS summer programs, the local libraries, and in home visitation programs. The home visitation program was begun on a pilot basis this past summer with low performing regular education students. In this program a regular classroom teacher sought permission from the parent to visit the child four times over the summer, bringing with her several books each time that the teacher and student read together and then were left to become a part of the child's home library. This could be a powerful intervention for ELL students to stimulate independent reading.

**4. We are challenged to prioritize *Writing* proficiency as a means toward the development of proficiency in the other three domains.**

Research conducted by the Center for Research on Education Diversity and Excellence (CREDE), a national research center funded by the U.S. Department of Education found the ELL students whose teachers were trained in implementing the *Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol* (SIOP) performed significantly better on academic writing assessments than comparison groups of ELL students whose teachers were not trained in SIOP or using it. SIOP is a lesson-planning and delivery approach of 30 instructional strategies grouped into eight components.

SIOP begins with having teachers identify the language issues and demands in their lessons and then write and explain language objectives for each lesson for the ELL students as well as content objectives. The explicit awareness of the language issues begins the journey toward resolution. SCPS intends to study SIOP and apply its concepts and practices where appropriate to the benefit of increasing writing fluency as well as reading, speaking, and listening skills.

SCPS now employs the *LAS Links Instructional Guidance* which offers teachers' practical skill-based lesson plans to scaffold learners through contextualized tasks using the language of content-area classrooms. The instructional guidance materials are theme based containing content from academic subjects such as Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies, each appropriately leveled according to language proficiency. English Language Learners are also exposed to both test-oriented and content-oriented tasks.

Both the *LAS Curriculum* and the SIOP model are prompting learning and thinking through written expression. There is also a need to address the mechanics of written expression. In this area, students from all grade levels are tested on three standards associated with writing conventions: using appropriate grammar, using appropriate capitalization and punctuation, and using standard sentence structure. Students in Grades 2 through 12 are asked to write in detail responding to a prompt.

Two strategies to enhance writing development in ELL students are being reviewed. The first involves incorporating ELL family funds of knowledge into the classroom learning. Often ELL students and their families possess specific information about their culture, their former land and history, specialty foods, arts, or crafts. Writing up interviews with family members is a simple but powerful assignment. Taking these pieces one step further and creating cultural memoirs further validates to students the power they acquire in having a command of written language.

The second strategy is group writing. There is security and support in group tasks; and, for many cultures people working together is the way in which they are accustomed to getting things done. Creating finished writing products as a group rather than an individual becomes a multifaceted teaching tool and a powerful learning structure that reinforces reading, speaking, listening and writing.

### C. RELATED RESOURCES

<b>PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, &amp; STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES</b>
<b>Staffing</b>

<b>PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, &amp; STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain 3 ELL Teachers</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$163,592 <b>Source:</b> Local/State <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain 2 ELL Instructional Assistants</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$37,540 <b>Source:</b> \$19,962 <i>Reading First</i> \$17,578 Title I <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain 1 ELL Tutor</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$7,900 <b>Source:</b> SS/HS <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009
<b>Intervention</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement LAS Links Curriculum</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$1,200 <b>Source:</b> Title III, Part A <b>Timeline:</b> September 2008
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain Implementation of Leap Frog Program</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$0- Staff Time <b>Source:</b> Local/State <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009
<b>Professional Development</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide Best Strategies Training by ELL Teachers</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$5,050 <b>Source:</b> Title III, Part A <b>Timeline:</b> September 2008

**D. CORRELATION OF PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, AND STRATEGIES WITH MASTER PLAN EXTENSION 2008-2010**

# of Action Step	Action Step Description
<b>1.11.5 ELL Teacher Case Load</b>	1.11.5.1. Monitor Case Load Assignment based on identified ELL student enrollment
<b>1.11.6 ELL Subgroup:</b> All ELL students meet or exceed the Maryland State Standards of proficiency in Reading	1.11.6.1. Target intervention to meet specific instructional deficits through monitoring progress and analyzing benchmarks.
<b>8.4.1 Testing:</b> All English Language Learners from K–12 who are active ESOL students will take the English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT) LAS Links annually.	8.4.1.3. Analyze data to target intervention to meet the specific instructional deficits of individual students.
<b>8.4.2 Standards:</b> ELL Teachers will utilize the ELP Standards as a guide to collaborate with content area teachers.	8.4.2.2. Develop and provide classroom teachers with training/handbook on best practices when working with ELL students in order to optimize instruction in meeting the ELP Standards.

## **IV. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY AYP CHALLENGES**

### **A. FINDINGS**

**1. Middle Level Reading for the LEP subgroup has not exceeded the AMO target for the past 4 years.**

Although Middle Level LEP Reading proficiency increased by 41.6 percentage points to 58.3% in 2008, it still fell 12.8 points below the AMO target. The middle level group has not met the AMO target for Reading in the past four years. The gap between the AMO and the percent proficient has decreased since 2007; however the rate of improvement is not sufficient to reach 100% by 2014.

**2. Middle Level Mathematics for the LEP subgroup has not exceeded the AMO target for the past 4 years.**

The number of LEP students tested was only 12, but their proficiency rate is still required to be 100% by 2014. The Middle Level math proficiency rate for the LEP subgroup was 33.3% in 2008. This represents a decrease of 16.7 points since last year and is 23.9 points below the AMO target. The Middle Level LEP subgroup has not met the AMO target in four years.

### **B. PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, AND STRATEGIES DESIGNED TO ADDRESS CONCERNS AND OVERCOME CHALLENGES**

**1. We are challenged to identify and respond to the specific barriers to reading skill motivation, development, and appreciation among LEP students.**

The main strategy for intervention can be divided into two categories, within class and supplemental. Efforts to improve in class intervention include the following: continuation of benchmarks and common exams; professional development on actively engaging students and management of small groups for differentiation. New for 2008-09 is the Focused Improvement Process (FIP). This is a structured process in which teachers must document the particular students who need intervention and identify the strategies to be followed.

Significant time was spent in the week long content area workshops during the summer with teacher consultants who shared teaching methods that require student engagement, involve higher cognitive level thinking, and small group management strategies that can provide for direct and targeted teacher/student interaction. The secondary division has also adopted a new course syllabus, unit plan, and lesson plan templates which explicitly include planning for diverse learners. Time will be allotted during the Afternoon Professional Development (APD) time period to continue work on these.

To attack the reduced achievement of LEP students, ELL teachers will meet with classroom teachers to identify the root cause of each student's weaknesses. The Focused Improvement Process will document individual student weaknesses and identify strategies for intervention. Common lesson plans will include re-teaching activities. The development of these lessons and their implementation will be monitored by the instructional supervisors and building principals.

The ELL teachers will implement the new LAS Links Curriculum during designated time blocks as assigned by the school administrator. The facilitator in each secondary school will collaborate with the ELL teachers on progress made and strategies to share with classroom teachers. Classroom teachers and the ELL teacher will collaborate on identifying effective strategies and next step strategies on an on going basis.

**2. We are challenged to identify and respond to the specific barriers to mathematics mastery among LEP students.**

Similar to reading ELL intervention, math intervention can be divided into two categories, within class and supplemental. Efforts to improve in class intervention include the following: continuation of benchmarks and common exams; professional development on actively engaging students and management of small groups for differentiation. New to this year's efforts is the Focused Improvement Process (FIP), which is equally appropriate for math as for reading and other core areas of instruction. The FIP is a structured process in which teachers must document the particular students who need intervention and identify the strategies to be followed. Significant time was spent in the week long content area workshops during the summer with teacher consultants who shared teaching methods that require student engagement, involve higher cognitive level thinking, and small group management strategies that can provide for direct and targeted teacher/student interaction. The secondary division has also adopted a new course syllabus, unit plan, and lesson plan templates which explicitly include planning for diverse learners. Time will be allotted during the Afternoon Professional Development (APD) time period to continue work on these.

In the supplemental category, the Intermediate School will use the *Math Navigator* to provide targeted intervention during specials. SCPS will continue with the *Voyager* Program in the afternoons.

To attack the reduced math achievement of LEP students, ELL teachers will meet with regular math teachers to identify the root cause of each student's weaknesses. The Focused Improvement Process will document individual student weaknesses and identify strategies for intervention. Common lesson plans will include re-teaching activities.

### C. RELATED RESOURCES

<b>PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, &amp; STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES FOR ELL</b>	
<b>Staffing</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain .5 <i>Performance Matters</i> Coordinator</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$42,303 <b>Source:</b> Local/State <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009 <i>* Duplicated Reference</i>
<b>Core Program</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement the Focused Improvement Process</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$0 <b>Source:</b> Staff Time <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilize the Common Lesson Plan and Unit Plan Templates</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$0 <b>Source:</b> Staff Time <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009
<b>Intervention Programs</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Begin Implementation of <i>Math Navigator</i></li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$13,311 <b>Source:</b> MHEC Grant (UMES) <b>Timeline:</b> September 2008 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Duplicated Reference</i></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide <i>Voyager</i> Afterschool Program</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$300,000 <b>Source:</b> 21 <sup>st</sup> Century Grant <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009 <i>* Duplicated Reference</i>
<b>Professional Development</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide Best Strategies Training by ELL Teachers</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$5,050 <b>Source:</b> Title III, Part A <b>Timeline:</b> September 2008 <i>* Duplicated Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hire Consultants to Provide Focused Math</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$16,200 <b>Source:</b> GEAR-UP <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide Weekly Afternoon Professional Development (APD)</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$312,680 <b>Source:</b> Local/Local <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009 <i>* Duplicated Reference</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partner with <i>Coalition of Essential Schools</i> (CES)</li> </ul>	<b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$36,000

**PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, & STRATEGIES TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES FOR ELL**

	<p><b>Source:</b> School Improvement Grant  <b>Timeline:</b> 2008-2009  <i>* Duplicated Reference</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Week Long Summer Math Workshop</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amount Budgeted:</b> \$9,000  <b>Source:</b> Local/State  <b>Timeline:</b> Summer 2008</p>

**D. CORRELATION OF PROGRAMS, PRACTICES, AND STRATEGIES WITH MASTER PLAN EXTENSION 2008-2010**

	# of Action Step	Action Step Description
1.3.2	<p><b>Intermediate Math:</b> All intermediate students meet or exceed the minimum State Standards of Proficiency in Mathematics.</p>	<p>1.3.2.1 Monitor alignment of instruction with Maryland state standards at or above the assessment limit.</p> <p>1.3.2.2 Monitor and assess individual student progress and sub-group progress.</p> <p>1.3.2.3 Implement structured intervention program for students not meeting proficiency.</p> <p>1.3.2.4 Implement and monitor training in technology integration, student engagement, critical skills, and high quality daily assessments.(PD 4.2.2)</p> <p>1.3.2.5 Increase student engagement and achievement through rich lessons filled with problem solving, authentic assessments, and real life applications.</p>
1.11.5	<p><b>ELL Teacher Case Load</b></p>	<p>1.11.5.1. Monitor Case Load Assignment based on identified ELL student enrollment</p>
1.11.6	<p><b>ELL Subgroup:</b> All ELL students meet or exceed the Maryland State Standards of proficiency in Reading</p>	<p>1.11.6.1. Target intervention to meet specific instructional deficits through monitoring progress and analyzing benchmarks.</p>
8.4.1	<p><b>Testing:</b> All English Language Learners from K–12 who are active ESOL students will take the English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT) LAS Links annually.</p>	<p>8.4.1.3. Analyze data to target intervention to meet the specific instructional deficits of individual students.</p>
8.4.2	<p><b>Standards:</b> ELL Teachers will utilize the ELP Standards as a guide to collaborate with content area teachers.</p>	<p>8.4.2.2. Develop and provide classroom teachers with training/handbook on best practices when working with EL</p>