Coordinator Name	Mary Lee Burlemann	*Planning Team*	Cathy Dutcher, Krista Sherman, Walter Garrett

Program Description

Purpose or Mandate
The purpose of the English Language Learner (ELL) program is to teach and advocate for beginning English learners so they can become successful within our community both socially and academically.

Summary Description of Program
All SSD students are screened to identify those who need ELL services. Those classified as "ELL students" are provided services appropriate to their instructional needs. They are assessed for progress annually. Once identified as proficient in speaking, reading, and writing English, ELL services are suspended and students are placed on a 2-year monitoring list. If they fall behind, their need for ELL services will again be accessed and ELL services will resume, if needed.

Which specific CSIP goals and PCF processes does this Program support?
CSIP 1   Student Success
CSIP 1.1   Ensure achievement for all students
CSIP 1.2   Ensure that all students are ready to participate in college, career, or community programs
CSIP 1.3   Ensure student satisfaction and engagement)
PCF 2.2.6   Provide differentiated instruction based on individual student needs

Who are the Customers/Stakeholders?

☒ Students ☒ Parents ☒ Staff ☐ Administrators
☒ Board of Education ☒ Taxpayers ☒ Other: Public Schools

What are the Customer/Stakeholder requirements?
Students are expected to be proficient in speaking, reading, and writing English. This program is required to identify eligible students and to provide appropriate services that will assist them in attaining proficiency, thereby positioning them to become socially and academically successful within our community.

What is this program expected to accomplish?
Upon identification through the Home Language Survey and the screener, students will be evaluated for possible ELL services. If eligible, an annual evaluation will take place, appropriate ELL services will be delivered, and students' progress in their mastery of speaking, reading and writing of English will be measured until such a time that they no longer require ELL services.

Briefly describe how this Program works
At the time of each student's enrollment (all SSD students), staff give parents a Home Language Survey. The survey asks three questions: (1) Is the student's native tongue a language other than English? (2) Is a language other than English spoken in the student's home? (3) If so, what language? If either of the answers to the first two questions is "yes", the student is screened for English proficiency using the WIDA W-APT[1] screening assessment. Students who fail W-APT screening are classified as "ELL students" and are provided appropriate instructional support.

Students receiving ELL services are assessed for progress annually using the ACCESS for ELLs instrument[2]. Once identified as proficient in speaking, reading, and writing English, ELL services are suspended and students are placed on a 2-year monitoring list. If they fall behind during that period, services can again be accessed and resumed as appropriate. This process repeats until such time as they no longer require ELL services.

What resources (type and quantity) are required to execute this plan?
3 trained school psychologists, 1 ELL-certified teacher as-needed (of a total of 9 currently certified), the W-APT screening instrument, and the ACCESS for ELLs annual assessment instrument.

Action Plan Summary

Previous Cycle Goals and Measurable Objectives

2013-2014 Overall Goals
Goal 1: The program will meet Federal Compliance guidelines.

Goal 2: SSD will systematically identify students who speak languages other than English at home and provide effective programs to meet assessed needs.

2013-2014 Objectives
The program will annually meet 100% of all Federal Compliance requirements as measured by DESE self-monitoring checklist.
100% of SSD students will be screened in order to identify ELL students and provide them with appropriate services.

Current Cycle (2014-2015) Goals and Measurable Objectives

2014-2015 Overall Goals
Goal 1: The program will meet Federal Compliance guidelines.

Goal 2: SSD will systematically identify students who speak languages other than English at home and provide effective programs to meet assessed needs.
Goal 3: SSD will monitor English language proficiency of any identified student using Access for ELLs.

Expected Measurable Objectives
The program will annually meet 100% of all Federal Compliance requirements as measured by DESE self-monitoring checklist.
100% of SSD students will be screened in order to identify ELL students and provide them with appropriate services.
100% of identified students will show positive progression in ACCESS for ELLs test scores, year to year.

Current Cycle (2014-2015) Action Plans

Short-term (within the next school year)

Action Plan 1: Work with Communications Department to find a process for making SSD site accessible in other languages.

Action Plan 2: SSD staff will participate in all available and appropriate DESE trainings on Missouri English Language Development Standards training.

Action Plan 3: Work with Evaluation & Research Department to perform a diagnosis of the screening process to discover the root cause of the process failure and design a fail-safe improvement to that process. (See Goal 2.)

Action Plan 4: Identify and train at least two staff members to administer ACCESS for ELLs instrument.

Medium-term (1-2 years)
   N/A

Long-term (3 years and more)
   N/A

Evaluation Plan Summary

Program Evaluation Authority
- *Castaneda v. Pickard 1981* (US Supreme Court) requires districts to have "a system established to evaluate the (ELL) program."
- Board Policy IM requires a biennial evaluation of the ELL program.

The last program evaluation was conducted in the Spring of 2015. This program is being evaluated again after only one year so as to put it on the same cycle with the Homeless and Migratory program evaluations.

Qualitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used
- What are the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?
- How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?
- What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?
- How well-aligned are the program's processes with the goals of the program?
- What is the level of deployment of this program's services?
- How should resources be changed to improve this program?
- How should goals be changed, added, or removed?

Quantitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used
- What is the status of the program's progress toward achieving its goals?
- What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to planned costs?
- What is the estimated actual benefit-cost or cost-effectiveness of this program?

Quantitative Measures – Criteria for Evaluation

Measure to be used	2014-2015 Target
1: Self-monitoring % of compliance requirements met. 2: % of SSD students screened. 3: % of identified students showing positive yearly progress.	1: 100% compliant. 2: 100% identification. 3: 100% progress.

_____

[1] WIDA (originally "Wisconsin, Delaware, and Arkansas," later "World-class Instructional Design and Assessment," now just WIDA) is a consortium that promotes language development and academic achievement for linguistically diverse students. WIDA-APT (or W-APT) is the WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test, a screening instrument to assist with initial placement decisions and assign ELL classification.

[2] ACCESS for ELLs is an annual summative WIDA instrument for students already classified as ELL, designed to monitor students' progress in acquiring academic English.

English Language Learner (ELL)
2015-2016 Program Evaluation Report

Special School District

Coordinator
Name   Mary Lee Burlemann

Planning
Team   Lowell Schneiderman, Walter Garrett

Evaluation Summary

Purpose or Mandate
The ELL program is mandated under both Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In addition, the 1974 *Lau v. Nichols* ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court and the Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974 require school districts to take affirmative steps to ensure that ELL students can meaningfully participate in their educational programs and services. DESE regulations support this mandate for all districts in Missouri. SSD Board Policy IGBH recognizes the need to identify ELL students and ensure them equal access to appropriate programs.

SSD Board Policy IM requires a biennial evaluation of this program. The last evaluation report was approved by the Board on April 14, 2015 (less than one year ago). The present evaluation has been accelerated by one year to align this program report with two other small "Title" programs (Homeless and Migratory). Accordingly, the present report covers only the 2014-2015 school year.

Program Description
The English Language Learner program (ELL) is intended to identify and serve students who need English language support services. The program screens all students upon their initial entry into Special School District to determine if the student's home environment includes languages other than English and if the student has limited English proficiency (LEP). Students identified as LEP are given ELL services as needed, and monitored for an additional two-year period after services have ended.

What were the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?
This program has negligible impact on student performance in SSD. That conclusion does not indicate a shortcoming of the program or its implementation but, rather, is based on the negligible number of students served. During the latest evaluation period, only one student (a senior at North Technical High School) met the screening criteria for eligible services, and that student returned to her home school in 2015. The program continues to screen all other students for ELL eligibility.

How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?
☐ Inadequate   ☐ Approaching Satisfactory   ☒ Satisfactory   ☐ Excellent

What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?
This program is in a perpetual "stand-by" mode, ready to serve ELL students as needed, and performs that role at a satisfactory level. Absent any students who require instructional ELL assistance, the ability of the program to deliver instructional assistance cannot be evaluated.

What is the general level of customer or stakeholder satisfaction with this program?
☐ Not at all Satisfied   ☐ Somewhat Satisfied   ☒ Very Satisfied   ☐ Completely Satisfied

Board Approved: 2/23/2016

What factors made essential contributions (+/-) to this rating?
This year, our previously identified student did not return to North Tech but two new students enrolled who were identified as ELL in their home school districts. They are full-time NCT students, so we will be administering their ACCESS for ELLs tests[1] in the spring of 2016.

Evaluation Results

What is the status of the program's progress toward achieving its goals?

Goal 1: The program will meet Federal Compliance guidelines.

Measurable Objective 1:	The program will annually meet 100% of all Federal Compliance requirements as measured by DESE self-monitoring checklist.

Results: MET.

Previous Results			Targets	
2012-13	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Goal 2: SSD will systematically identify students who speak languages other than English at home and provide effective programs to meet assessed needs.

Measurable Objective 1:	100% of SSD students will be screened in order to identify ELL students and provide them with appropriate services.

Results: MET WITH MINOR DEVIATION. 100% of enrolling students were screened, and the screening identified no eligible students. Two weeks after school started (Fall 2014), a student was discovered to be in the monitoring phase of a partner-district ELL plan, which the screening process had not revealed. Monitoring of that student resumed and continued until that student exited the program.

Previous Results			Targets	
2012-13	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Board Approved: 2/23/2016

Goal 3: SSD will monitor English language proficiency in any identified student using ACCESS for ELLs.

Measurable Objective 1:	100% of identified students will show positive progression in ACCESS test scores, year to year.

Results: Met. The one eligible student was enrolled for less than one year, but her ACCESS scores were measured from her home school. She increased from a 3.5 proficiency score to a 4.0 proficiency score (6-point nominal scale).

Previous Results			Targets	
2012-13	**2013-14**	**2014-15**	**2015-16**	**2016-17**
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?

Strengths
- Necessary staff and processes are in place to accomplish the purpose of this program:
  - a Board-appointed ELL coordinator, as required by DESE and federal mandates;
  - evaluation staff trained to administer the W-APT screening instrument;
  - staff to provide translated materials for parents, as needed.
- The student who was initially "lost" in our process was, in fact, quickly identified by back-up processes, was tested within the testing window, and received appropriate services.

Opportunities/Weaknesses
- The process for screening enrolling students failed to properly identify all eligible students, and requires a thorough review (see Action Plans).
- Two of the four staff members trained to administer the ACCESS for ELLs test have recently retired; replacement staff and training are required.

How well aligned are the program's processes with the goals of the program?
The program processes we have in place support the goals we have for the program.

Deployment Level of Program Services
- ☐ Little or no deployment of program services.
- ☐ The program services are in the early stages of deployment in most areas or schools.
- ☐ Services are deployed, although some areas or schools are in early stages of deployment.
- ☐ Services are well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or schools.
- ☒ Services are well deployed, with no significant gaps.
- ☐ Services are fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or schools.

Should resources be changed to improve this program? ☐ *Yes* ☒ *No*

Should goals be changed, added or removed? ☒ *Yes* ☐ *No*
Goal 3 needs to be changed in future cycles, to include the caveat that some students do not continue with SSD for a full year or more; thus, year-to-year comparisons may not be possible for some students.

Board Approved: 2/23/2016

Evaluation Implications

What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to budget?

       Actual Total Annual Costs: Less than $1,000

       Staff: School psychologist: 3 hours
                             ELL teacher: 5 hours

What are the major sources and amounts of funds?
The costs are included in the SSD budget.

How many customers (students) are served by this program?   1 student

What is this program's annual cost per customer (student)?   less than $ 1,000.00

Estimated Cost Effectiveness
- ☒ Mandated program; costs cannot be significantly reduced.
- ☐ Mandated program; costs could be reduced (include in Action Plan, below).
- ☐ Benefits greatly outweigh costs.
- ☐ Benefits outweigh cost, but improvement appears possible (include in Action Plan, below).
- ☐ Costs outweigh benefits (include in Action Plan, below).

General Recommendation Resulting from this Evaluation
- ☒ Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
- ☐ Continue the program as is with specific action plans for improvement.
- ☐ Expand the program, replicating effective components.
- ☐ Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
- ☐ Redesign the program.
- ☐ Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
- ☐ Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
- ☐ Discontinue the program.
- ☐ Other (Specify.)

Action Plans

Review of Action Plan progress since last report.

Action Plan 1: Work with Communications Department to find a process for making SSD site accessible in other languages.
Progress on Action Plan: Completed. Communications Department has posted resources in English plus five other languages. The DESE web site has posted Procedural Safeguards and the Parent Bill of Rights in English plus 23 other languages.

Action Plan 2: SSD staff will participate in all available and appropriate DESE trainings on Missouri English Language Development Standards training.
Progress on Action Plan: Completed.

Board Approved: 2/23/2016

What specific actions are needed in the next evaluation cycle?

Short-term (within the next school year)
- Continue working with Communications Department to make SSD web site accessible in other languages.
- Work with Evaluation & Research Department to perform a diagnosis of the screening process to discover the root cause of the process failure and design a fail-safe improvement to that process. (*See Goal 2.*)
- Identify and train at least two staff members to administer ACCESS for ELLs instrument.

Medium-term (1-2 years)
N/A

Long-term (3 years and more)
N/A

NOTE

[1] "ACCESS for ELLs" is a summative assessment given to K-12 students who have been identified as English language learners (ELLs). It is given annually, in the spring, to ELLs.

Board Approved: 2/23/2016