



Title III
Evaluation Report for
DOE Project Number 290-1027A-7C001

Grant Period:
August 14, 2006, through June 30, 2007
No cost extension:
July 1, 2007, through September 30, 2007

Prepared by:

Freda S. Watson, M.Ed., Coordinator
Department of Assessment and Accountability

December 2007

John A. Hilderbrand, Ph.D., Director
Grace L. Albritton, Ph.D., Supervisor
Department of Assessment and Accountability
Information and Technology
Hillsborough County Public Schools
Tampa, Florida

The School Board of Hillsborough County, Florida

Jennifer Faliero, Chair

Carol W. Kurdell, Vice Chair

Doretha W. Edgecomb

April Griffin

Jack R. Lamb, Ed.D.

Candy Olson

Susan L. Valdes

**MaryEllen Elia
Superintendent of Schools**

**Daniel J. Valdez
Deputy Superintendent**

**Kenneth R. Otero
Deputy Superintendent**

**Michael A. Grego, Ed.D.
Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction**

**Jack E. Davis
Chief Information and Technology Officer**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The English Language Learners (ELL) program of Hillsborough County Public Schools works toward the goal of assisting schools and students in ensuring that ELL students receive understandable instruction. This evaluation is based on the goals and objectives of Project 290-1027A-7C001. The report includes achievement data, summer school and after school attendance data, as well as descriptions of strategies that were employed to meet the grant goals.

Goal A: Supplemental Services for English Proficiency Strategies

1. Supplementary services focused on increasing the language proficiency of all ELLs were provided for elementary, middle, and high school students.
2. The targeted increase in percentage of students scoring at or above minimum proficiency on selected language acquisition assessments--the Comprehensive English Language Learners Assessment (CELLA) and the Stanford-9 Abbreviated)--was not met.
3. The percentage of ELL middle and high school students utilizing the after school program did increase.
4. The CELLA was successfully administered in the Fall of 2006 and in the Spring of 2007, and baseline data were obtained. Because cut scores have not been established, it could not be determined whether there was an increase across the designated proficiency levels. Based on mean scale score anchor points, that students were making progress towards English language proficiency is evident.

Goal B: Supplemental Instructional Services to Increase Academic Achievement of Current and Former ELLs/ELL Students

5. The designated achievement gains in reading and mathematics on the State's assessment were not met by ELL students. The designated gains seem particularly challenging. However, ELL staff, at the district as well as at the school level, did employ the strategies specified in the grant.
6. The designated increases in the graduation rate of ELL students and decrease in the dropout rate were not obtained. Again, these goals seem particularly challenging, and staff utilized the specified strategies.

Goal C. Increasing Professional Development for School Personnel

7. A broad array of professional development courses aimed at increasing English language proficiency was provided for school personnel who taught, supervised, or supported ELL students. District staff participated in over 146,000 hours of professional training concerning the needs of ELL students.
8. Personnel involved in administration of the CELLA received appropriate training.

Goal D. Increasing Parental and Community Participation in the Educational Experience of ELLS/LEP Students

9. Parents of ELL students as well as interested community members participated in family literacy training, although it is not possible to ascertain whether there was an increase over the participation rate of 2005-2006. District schools employed the strategies specified in the grant to notify parents and interested community members of training opportunities.

Accountability

10. The ELL Program Office staff utilized a variety of strategies to hold schools accountable for meeting grant goals and objectives.
11. ELL District Office staff and other district personnel involved in assisting ELL students utilized grant funding to help students and their families succeed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Continue to work toward increasing academic achievement, particularly reading.
2. Consider expending greater efforts to increase participation of ELL students in summer school programs.
3. Consider expanding existing efforts to increase graduation rates and to decrease dropout rates of ELL students.
4. High goals are commendable but goals should be set so that they are achievable with effort.
5. Maintain the commendable level of training provided for district personnel involved in teaching ELL students.
6. Continue providing support for parents and interested community members.
7. ELL District Office staff is well experienced and mechanisms are in place in the district to appropriately employ grant funds. Continue to pursue grant funding to support the ELL program.
8. An evaluation with goals focused on issues specific to Hillsborough County Public Schools would likely yield guidance that would benefit the ELL program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Purpose of Evaluation.....	1
Program Description.....	1
Data Sources	3
Progress Made During Grant Period.....	4
Goal A: Supplemental Services for English Proficiency Strategies.....	4
Goal B: Supplemental Instructional Services to Increase Academic Achievement of Current and Former ELLs/ELL Students	15
Goal C. Increasing Professional Development for School Personnel	26
Goal D. Increasing Parental and Community Participation in the Educational Experience of ELLS/LEP Students.....	29
Accountability	32
Findings and Recommendations	33

LIST OF TABLES

Table A: ELL Student Results on SAT-9 Abbreviated from Fall 2006 and Fall 2007.....	4
Table B: Scale Score Anchor Points for CELLA.....	6
Table C: CELLA Test Results – Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 – Listening and Speaking.....	7
Table D: CELLA Test Results – Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 – Reading.....	8
Table E.: CELLA Test Results – Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 - Writing.....	9
Table F: Mean Scale Scores for Listening and Speaking, Reading, and Writing.....	10
Table G: Percent of ELL and Non-ELL Students Attending After School Programs.....	12
Table H: Percent of ELL Students Scoring 3 or Higher in Reading on the <i>FCAT</i>	16
Table I: Percent of ELL Students Scoring 3 or Higher in Mathematics on the <i>FCAT</i>	17
Table J: 2006 and 2007 FCAT Percentages at or Above Grade Level Based on AYP.....	17
Table K: Percent of LEP and Non-LEP Students Attending Summer School by Year.....	19
Table L: Percent of LEP and Non-LEP Students Attending After School Programs.....	21
Table M: Percent of Graduates and Dropouts 2005/206 and 2006/2007.....	24
Table N: ESOL Training Completed 2006-2007.....	26
Table O: Comparison of ESOL Training - 2005/2006 to 2006/2007.....	27

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Utilization of Grant Funds

Appendix B: District's Progress as a Whole Regarding Adequate Yearly Progress

Appendix C. ESOL Inservice Training Completed in 2006-2007

Appendix D: ESOL Strategies Checklist

Purpose of Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide information regarding DOE Project Number 290-1027A-7C001. A grant of \$2,791,713.60 was awarded for the period August 14, 2006, through June 30, 2007 to the English Language Learning (ELL) Office of Hillsborough County Public Schools. A no-cost extension through September 30, 2007, was subsequently obtained.

Program Description

Currently 25,000 ELL students are serviced in Hillsborough County. Over 102 different languages are spoken by these individual students. Spanish, Vietnamese, Haitian Creole, and Korean represent the majority of students in the ELL program.

The primary focus of the ELL program is to assist schools and students in ensuring that English Language Learners (ELL) receive understandable instruction. Services are provided by ESOL endorsed teachers, classroom teachers working toward endorsement, Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals, ESOL Resource Teachers and ESOL Specialists.

The Title III grant enhances the efforts of ELL program and district staff in assisting ELLs to meet challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards. Schools use Title III sub-grants to carry out activities that use approaches and methodologies that are based on scientifically based research on teaching children learning English and immigrant children for the following purposes:

(1) Developing and implementing new language instruction educational programs and academic content instructional programs for English Language Learners in elementary and secondary programs.

(2) Expanding or enhancing existing language instruction educational programs and academic content instruction programs.

(3) Implementing school-wide programs within individual schools to restructure, reform, and upgrade all programs, activities, and operations related to language instruction educational programs and academic content instruction for English Language Learners.

(4) Implementing, in a local educational agency, system-wide programs designed to restructure, reform, and upgrade all programs, activities, and operations related to the education of English Language Learners.

(Source: <http://esol.mysdhc.org/home%20page>)

Supplemental Assistance Provided by ELL Staff

A portion of grant funds was utilized to provide salaries, as detailed in Appendix A. The funds expended in salaries supplemented district funds and allowed the ELL personnel to more effectively meet the needs of ELL students.

Many of the strategies described in the remainder of this report require that school personnel have direct or indirect contact with ELL district level staff or ELL school-based staff. In 2005-2006, the ELL district staff consisted of the positions listed below:

- 8 District Resource Teachers (DRTs)
- 8 ESOL resource specialists

- 2 guidance counselors
- 3 bilingual school psychologists
- 2 bilingual social workers

In general, when schools had more than 75 ELL students, ELL staff were assigned to that school. The assigned staff could be paraprofessionals or ESOL resource teachers, depending on the needs of the individual school. Some middle and high schools had ESOL resource specialists, who functioned as non-classroom support for students and teachers.

All resource personnel had the responsibility to give training, guidance, and other support to school personnel on matters related to English language learners. They also provided assistance with programmatic procedures, such as identification, assessment and placement of eligible students in the program, academic support, parent involvement, etc.

Some services were provided by the schools, with ELL providing supportive services, so that equal access was provided for ELL students. However, ELL staff did not provide services that replaced those provided by District and school staff. When teachers saw a need for an ELL student, the first step was to use the resources already at the school. Then, if the need was not met, the ELL office was contacted. Some schools had their own ELL staff paid for by school funds.

If schools had ELL personnel, then the ELL district level staff gave guidance and support through DRT visits. If a school did not have its own ELL personnel, the district level DRTs helped with more individualized needs, like scheduling, training for teachers on ELL needs, etc. The level of help provided depended on whether the school had its own ELL personnel. If it did, district ELL staff helped the school's ELL personnel; if not, district ELL staff gave supportive help directly to the administration and faculty.

Utilization of Grant Funds

Details of how grant funds were utilized are provided in Appendix A. As Appendix A indicates, the majority of funds was spent for salaries, equipment and supplies. Grant funds for equipment and supplies were distributed to each school site in two different ways, i.e., through special initiatives submitted by each school site and by an allocation of discretionary funds. Upon receipt of grant funding, ELL District staff determined that \$10,000.00 was available for each school site in the district for support materials for academic purposes. Schools obtained funding through completing a Special Initiative Application that had to include goals, objectives, and results. The ELL District office sent Special Initiative applications to school administrators and ELL resource teachers, who consulted with teachers. The completed application was then submitted to ELL district staff for approval. Most schools received the full amount of funding requested, and every school received at least partial funding during the current grant period. No school was denied Special Initiative funding.

Four restrictions applied to the \$10,000 available for each school. The funds had to be used for ELL students only, and had to be tied to academic goals. The products requested had to be from a district-approved vendor and appropriate for the student's academic level.

The second way funds were distributed to individual schools was based on the number of immigrant students in the school. An immigrant student was defined as a student from a foreign country (outside the United States and its territories) who had been in the United States less than three years. Schools were

allocated \$10.00 per immigrant student. That money was put in the school's account, and schools could use those funds without submitting documentation to the ELL district office. Most schools used their discretionary funds for supplies. All schools in the district, K-12, had the opportunity to receive the \$10,000 possible in Special Initiative funds, and all schools received the appropriate amount of discretionary funds based on the number of immigrant students in that school.

Data Sources

In accordance with the project award notification, a wide variety of data was utilized to ascertain whether grant objectives were met. Data included results of the State's assessment (Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test) as well as the initial administration of the CELLA. Other data were obtained from district personnel who maintain documentation of, for example, hours of professional development courses in which staff in the district participate. Qualitative data was gathered via interviews.

PROGRESS MADE DURING GRANT PERIOD

This section of the report presents progress that was made toward the goals of the grant during the grant period. For each of the five sections, findings regarding the goals are presented first. Following the goals, each strategy is listed and then followed by a description of what activities were undertaken to address that strategy. Where applicable, two or more strategies are addressed together.

GOAL A. SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES FOR ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL LEVELS

Goal 1: Improve language acquisition for elementary LEP students.

Objective 1.1: The percentage of elementary school LEP students who score at or above minimum proficiency on selected language acquisition assessments will increase by 5% by May 30, 2007. This objective was not met.

PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 1

At present, ELL students earning a score of 33 or higher on the Stanford-9 Abbreviated are eligible to leave the ELL program. The Stanford-9 Abbreviated is a norm-referenced test administered each fall to students in grades 4 through 12. In an effort to comply with the requirements of NCLB that school districts use an English language proficiency test, Florida schools administered the CELLA in the fall of 2006 and the spring of 2007. Because cut scores have not been established for the CELLA, results of the Stanford-9 Abbreviated will be used in this report to determine whether the goals listed above were met, i.e., a five percent increase in scores. CELLA results are presented following the Stanford-9 Abbreviated results.

The change in percentage of elementary, middle, and high school students scoring at or above minimum proficiency (33+) on the Stanford-9 Abbreviated Progress made in 2005 and 2006 is presented below in Table A. As can be seen, across all levels--except Total Language for high school--the percentages of ELL students attaining a proficiency rating on the SAT-9 abbreviated either remained the same or dropped slightly from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007.

Table A. ELL Student Results on SAT-9 Abbreviated from Fall 2006 and Fall 2007

	Fall 2006				Fall 2007			
	Total Reading		Total Language		Total Reading		Total Language	
Level	n	% NP* 33+	n	% NP 33+	n	% NP 33+	n	% NP 33+
Elementary	3458	34	3638	37	3204	33	3470	35
Middle	3667	22	3645	25	3043	21	3519	25
High	2786	19	2783	28	2880	19	2877	29

NP = National percentile

Showing gains in the SAT-9 is difficult for ELL students because of student turnover. When an ELL student attains the designated proficiency level (greater than the 32nd national percentile), that student exits the ELL

program and is no longer classified as an ELL student. New transfer students enter the ELL program throughout the year, so that essentially each year there is a pool of ELL students at levels of proficiency very similar to the previous year's pool of ELL students.

In an effort to comply with the requirements of NCLB that school districts use an English language proficiency test, Florida schools administered the CELLA in the fall of 2006 and the spring of 2007. The FLDOE website (<http://www.flboe.org/aala/cella.asp>) describes the CELLA as follows:

Florida uses the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) to measure the growth of students classified as English Language Learners (ELLs) in mastering the skills in English they will need to succeed in school.

CELLA is a four-skill language proficiency assessment developed under contract by Educational Testing Service (ETS) that is designed to provide:

- *Evidence of program accountability in accordance with Title III of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), which calls for schools and districts to meet state accountability objectives for increasing the English-language proficiency of English Language Learners.*
- *Data useful for charting student progress over time and, for the newly arrived students; charting progress over the first year.*
- *Information about the language proficiency levels of individual students that can be used in making decisions regarding placement into, or exit from English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs.*
- *Diagnostically useful information about students' strengths and weaknesses in English (with as much specificity as possible within the limitations of a large-scale standardized test.)*

The CELLA tests four areas:

- *Listening*
- *Speaking*
- *Reading*
- *Writing*

Table B presents the anchor points specified in the 2006-2007 CELLA Interpretive Guide. Although as stated above, CELLA cut scores have not yet been established, Tables C, D and E display the gains made in the three subscales from the initial CELLA administration in Fall 2006 to the second CELLA administration in Spring 2007. Table F compares the performance of ELL students on the three subtests of the CELLA (Listening and Speaking, Reading, and Writing). Little interpretive guidance is available thus far, but comparison of the mean scale scores with the anchor points in Table B provides some insight into the gains ELL students made from 2005-2006 to 2006-2007.

Table B. Scale Score Anchor Points for CELLA

SCALE SCORE ANCHOR POINT	LISTENING/SPEAKING
620	Students usually have a small vocabulary and know only a little grammar. They are still learning how to ask and answer basic questions.
660	Students have a basic vocabulary. They can ask and answer basic questions but are still learning how to participate in conversations.
700	Students know enough vocabulary and grammar to take part in conversations. They are still learning to use English to understand what is being taught in class.
740	Students have a good knowledge of vocabulary and grammar. They can participate in most conversations and can use English to learn new ideas in their classes.
SCALE SCORE ANCHOR POINT	READING
620	Students are just beginning to read. They can recognize many common words in English and can read and understand some very simple sentences.
660	Students are still learning to read, but are close to becoming independent readers. They can read and understand short passages written in very simple language.
700	Students are developing as independent readers. They can easily read short passages written in very simple language and are learning to read passages that are moderately complex.
740	Students are independent readers developing their skills. They can easily read and understand short passages that are moderately complex and are learning to read challenging short passages.
780	Students are capable independent readers. They have a good vocabulary and are learning to read challenging short passages with thorough comprehension.
SCALE SCORE ANCHOR POINT	WRITING
620	Students are learning to write letters and single words.
660	Students can write letters and single words and are learning to write sentences independently.
700	Students can write sentences and are learning to write simple paragraphs. Their writing may contain errors that make it hard to understand.
740	Students can write simple paragraphs and are learning to write more complex paragraphs. Their writing still contains some errors, but it can usually be understood.
780	Students can write simple or complex paragraphs. Their writing can be understood easily and shows a strong vocabulary and the ability to use advanced grammatical errors.

Table C. CELLA Test Results – Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 – Listening and Speaking

Grade	Test Date	% below Level 1	% in Level 1	% in Level 2	% in Level 3	% in Level 4	Tested	Mean SS
KG	Fall 2006	47%	45%	7%	0%	0%	1975	611
	Spring 2007	11%	50%	35%	4%	0%		651
	Change	36%	-5%	-28%	-4%	0%		40
1	Fall 2006	10%	47%	36%	6%	0%	2351	653
	Spring 2007	1%	16%	56%	24%	2%		683
	Change	9%	31%	-20%	-18%	-2%		30
2	Fall 2006	4%	16%	54%	24%	2%	1959	680
	Spring 2007	1%	6%	38%	45%	10%		703
	Change	-3%	-10%	-16%	21%	8%		23
3	Fall 2006	3%	7%	46%	40%	5%	1881	695
	Spring 2007	0%	3%	22%	55%	20%		718
	Change	-3%	-4%	-24%	15%	15%		23
4	Fall 2006	3%	4%	24%	55%	13%	1641	708
	Spring 2007	1%	2%	10%	48%	39%		732
	Change	-2%	-2%	-14%	-7%	26%		24
5	Fall 2006	3%	4%	19%	52%	23%	1421	716
	Spring 2007	0%	2%	8%	40%	50%		740
	Change	-3%	-2%	-11%	-12%	27%		24
6	Fall 2006	3%	4%	13%	46%	34%	1142	723
	Spring 2007	1%	2%	8%	34%	55%		743
	Change	-2%	-2%	-5%	-12%	21%		20
7	Fall 2006	3%	6%	12%	40%	38%	853	726
	Spring 2007	1%	2%	9%	33%	55%		746
	Change	-2%	-4%	-3%	-7%	17%		20
8	Fall 2006	5%	4%	14%	38%	39%	890	724
	Spring 2007	1%	4%	10%	28%	58%		748
	Change	-4%	0%	-4%	-10%	19%		24
9	Fall 2006	2%	4%	12%	31%	51%	572	731
	Spring 2007	1%	2%	9%	21%	67%		749
	Change	-1%	-2%	-3%	-10%	16%		18
10	Fall 2006	1%	3%	11%	34%	51%	405	737
	Spring 2007	0%	1%	6%	26%	66%		754
	Change	-1%	-2%	-5%	-8%	15%		17
11	Fall 2006	1%	3%	11%	28%	57%	343	739
	Spring 2007	0%	2%	6%	22%	71%		755
	Change	-1%	-1%	-5%	-6%	14%		16
12	Fall 2006	0%	2%	7%	26%	64%	247	746
	Spring 2007	0%	1%	6%	15%	79%		760
	Change	0%	-1%	-1%	-11%	15%		14

Based on only the scores of students who tested in the Fall of 2006 and the Spring of 2007 and who tested at the same grade level. All invalidated scores changed to missing for these tables.

Table D CELLA Test Results – Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 – Reading

Grade	Test Date	% below Level 1	% in Level 1	% in Level 2	% in Level 3	% in Level 4	% in Level 5	Tested	Mean SS
KG	Fall 2006	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1731	396
KG	Spring 2007	90%	6%	3%	1%	0%	0%		531
	Change	-10%	6%	3%	1%	0%	0%		135
1	Fall 2006	82%	13%	3%	1%	0%	0%	2068	566
1	Spring 2007	26%	27%	25%	18%	3%	1%		650
	Change	-56%	14%	22%	17%	3%	1%		84
2	Fall 2006	22%	27%	34%	16%	1%	0%	1979	655
2	Spring 2007	6%	11%	30%	42%	7%	3%		696
	Change	-16%	-16%	-4%	26%	6%	3%		41
3	Fall 2006	8%	12%	46%	31%	2%	0%	1847	682
3	Spring 2007	3%	5%	26%	54%	10%	1%		708
	Change	-5%	-7%	-20%	23%	8%	1%		26
4	Fall 2006	5%	7%	23%	56%	9%	1%	1608	704
4	Spring 2007	2%	3%	13%	52%	27%	4%		725
	Change	-3%	-4%	-10%	-4%	18%	3%		21
5	Fall 2006	4%	4%	16%	53%	20%	2%	1418	716
5	Spring 2007	1%	2%	9%	43%	36%	9%		737
	Change	-3%	-2%	-7%	-10%	16%	7%		21
6	Fall 2006	9%	4%	13%	40%	33%	2%	1214	716
6	Spring 2007	5%	2%	9%	33%	44%	6%		731
	Change	-4%	-2%	-4%	-7%	11%	4%		15
7	Fall 2006	7%	4%	9%	36%	41%	2%	924	723
7	Spring 2007	4%	2%	6%	31%	50%	7%		738
	Change	-3%	-2%	-3%	-5%	9%	5%		15
8	Fall 2006	5%	3%	9%	32%	46%	5%	936	730
8	Spring 2007	3%	1%	7%	26%	51%	11%		744
	Change	-2%	-2%	-2%	-6%	5%	6%		14
9	Fall 2006	5%	0%	2%	24%	61%	7%	654	742
9	Spring 2007	3%	0%	2%	18%	62%	15%		752
	Change	-2%	0%	0%	-6%	1%	8%		10
10	Fall 2006	2%	0%	1%	20%	67%	11%	474	753
10	Spring 2007	1%	0%	1%	16%	59%	23%		761
	Change	-1%	0%	0%	-4%	-8%	12%		8
11	Fall 2006	2%	0%	1%	16%	65%	18%	400	758
11	Spring 2007	2%	0%	2%	14%	59%	24%		761
	Change	0%	0%	1%	-2%	-6%	6%		3
12	Fall 2006	2%	0%	1%	9%	64%	23%	295	761
12	Spring 2007	1%	0%	1%	13%	57%	29%		765
	Change	-1%	0%	0%	4%	-7%	6%		4

Based on only the scores of students who tested in the Fall of 2006 and the Spring of 2007 and who tested at the same grade level. All invalidated scores changed to missing for these tables.

Table E. CELLA Test Results – Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 - Writing

Grade	Test Date	% below Level 1	% in Level 1	% in Level 2	% in Level 3	% in Level 4	% in Level 5	N Tested	Mean SS
KG	Fall 2006	98%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1820	541
	Spring 2007	42%	45%	13%	1%	0%	0%		623
	Change	-56%	43%	13%	1%	0%	0%		82
1	Fall 2006	33%	51%	15%	1%	0%	0%	2183	630
	Spring 2007	6%	29%	52%	13%	0%	0%		668
	Change	-27%	-22%	37%	12%	0%	0%		38
2	Fall 2006	3%	20%	67%	8%	1%	0%	2070	671
	Spring 2007	1%	6%	61%	29%	4%	0%		692
	Change	-2%	-14%	-6%	21%	3%	0%		21
3	Fall 2006	5%	17%	47%	30%	2%	0%	1910	683
	Spring 2007	2%	6%	31%	53%	7%	1%		703
	Change	-3%	-11%	-16%	23%	5%	1%		20
4	Fall 2006	3%	8%	29%	52%	8%	0%	1654	701
	Spring 2007	1%	3%	17%	56%	20%	2%		718
	Change	-2%	-5%	-12%	4%	12%	2%		17
5	Fall 2006	2%	6%	20%	56%	15%	1%	1450	711
	Spring 2007	1%	3%	12%	57%	24%	3%		723
	Change	-1%	-3%	-8%	1%	9%	2%		12
6	Fall 2006	4%	7%	15%	46%	27%	1%	1195	714
	Spring 2007	2%	3%	12%	45%	36%	2%		726
	Change	-2%	-4%	-3%	-1%	9%	1%		12
7	Fall 2006	2%	7%	14%	42%	32%	2%	896	719
	Spring 2007	1%	2%	12%	40%	41%	3%		730
	Change	-1%	-5%	-2%	-2%	9%	1%		11
8	Fall 2006	3%	7%	12%	38%	36%	2%	907	721
	Spring 2007	1%	4%	11%	34%	45%	4%		731
	Change	-2%	-3%	-1%	-4%	9%	2%		10
9	Fall 2006	1%	7%	19%	47%	25%	2%	637	717
	Spring 2007	1%	3%	16%	45%	32%	4%		726
	Change	0%	-4%	-3%	-2%	7%	2%		9
10	Fall 2006	1%	3%	18%	48%	28%	2%	466	722
	Spring 2007	0%	2%	11%	48%	34%	5%		730
	Change	-1%	-1%	-7%	0%	6%	3%		8
11	Fall 2006	0%	4%	15%	47%	31%	3%	394	726
	Spring 2007	1%	2%	13%	43%	36%	5%		731
	Change	1%	-2%	-2%	-4%	5%	2%		5
12	Fall 2006	0%	1%	11%	45%	39%	4%	293	732
	Spring 2007	0%	0%	9%	46%	38%	6%		735
	Change	0%	-1%	-2%	1%	-1%	2%		3

Based on only the scores of students who tested in the Fall of 2006 and the Spring of 2007 and who tested at the same grade level. All invalidated scores changed to missing for these tables.

Table F. Mean Scale Scores for Listening and Speaking, Reading, and Writing

Grade	Test Date	Listening/Speaking		Reading		Writing	
		Tested	Mean SS	Tested	Mean SS	N Tested	Mean SS
KG	Fall 2006	1975	611	1731	396	1820	541
	Spring 2007		651		531		623
	Change		40		135		82
1	Fall 2006	2351	653	2068	566	2183	630
	Spring 2007		683		650		668
	Change		30		84		38
2	Fall 2006	1959	680	1979	655	2070	671
	Spring 2007		703		696		692
	Change		23		41		21
3	Fall 2006	1881	695	1847	682	1910	683
	Spring 2007		718		708		703
	Change		23		26		20
4	Fall 2006	1641	708	1608	704	1654	701
	Spring 2007		732		725		718
	Change		24		21		17
5	Fall 2006	1421	716	1418	716	1450	711
	Spring 2007		740		737		723
	Change		24		21		12
6	Fall 2006	1142	723	1214	716	1195	714
	Spring 2007		743		731		726
	Change		20		15		12
7	Fall 2006	853	726	924	723	896	719
	Spring 2007		746		738		730
	Change		20		15		11
8	Fall 2006	890	724	936	730	907	721
	Spring 2007		748		744		731
	Change		24		14		10
9	Fall 2006	572	731	654	742	637	717
	Spring 2007		749		752		726
	Change		18		10		9
10	Fall 2006	405	737	474	753	466	722
	Spring 2007		754		761		730
	Change		17		8		8
11	Fall 2006	343	739	400	758	394	726
	Spring 2007		755		761		731
	Change		16		3		5
12	Fall 2006	247	746	295	761	293	732
	Spring 2007		760		765		735
	Change		14		4		

Based on only the scores of students who tested in the Fall of 2006 and the Spring of 2007 and who tested at the same grade level

In Tables C, D, and E, a negative change score is a desirable result, even more so in the lower proficiency levels. The three rows for grade 3 in Table C indicate that in the fall of 2006, 46% of ELL students were at Level Two, which means they had only a basic vocabulary and were still learning how to converse. By the spring of 2007, only 22% of third grade ELL students were at that proficiency level, with 55% at Level Three (knowing enough vocabulary and grammar to take part in conversations). Results of all three subscales of the CELLA evidence this trend of upward movement through the proficiency levels.

Observe also that in the higher grades, more students were at higher proficiency levels, as would be expected. Table C indicates that in the fall of 2006, 47% of first grade ELL students were at proficiency Level One while only 2% of twelfth grade ELL students were at this level. Also note that the number of students tested decreases as grade level increases. It is easier to show change in percentage points with a smaller group than a larger group. The Mean Scale Score (MSS) columns of Tables C, D, and E display an increase at every grade level for all three subscales, with larger increases at the lower grade levels, which reflects the pattern of results for other standardized tests.

The largest average gain across all grade levels was made in Reading (30), followed by Listening and Speaking (23), and Writing (14). To move from one proficiency level to another requires an increase of 40 points. The lower grade levels showed larger increases but bear in mind that at the higher grade levels, a greater proportion of students began at higher proficiency levels.

STRATEGIES

Grant funding allowed ELL staff to provide numerous instructional services that were supplemental to those services provided by existing State and locally-funded activities. The strategies employed by ELL staff to help ELL students increase English proficiency are listed below, with specific details following. This format is also used for the remaining sections of this report.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Strategy 1.

Provide extended learning opportunities by highly qualified teachers and bilingual education paraprofessionals for LEP students before, during, and after regular school hours.

The opportunity was given to all sites to use grant funding to provide extended learning programs (ELPs). The decision to utilize the funds for ELPs was at the discretion of each site and was based on academic need, as determined by FCAT level, grades, teacher observation, etc. The same criteria for ELPs were used for ELL and non-ELL students. If a student had academic needs, that student had access to whatever programs existed at his or her school. Some schools had their ELPs before the school day began and other schools had after school ELPs. If a program at a particular school expended all designated funds, grant funds could be used to help sustain the program.

Extended year programs (EYPs) are for all students who are qualified. ELL provided funds for some extended year programs at schools with a high percentage of ELL students. ELL students had equal access.

Table G. Percent of ELL and Non- ELL Students Attending Before/After School Programs

	Students Attending Before/After School Programs					
	District Total N	After School N	%	District Total N	After School N	%
	2005-2006			2006-2007		
Elementary						
ELL Students	14696	2375	16.2%	15150	2007	13.2%
Non-ELL Students	82773	8569	9.7%	82315	7567	9.2%
Middle						
ELL Students	3968	1511	38.1%	4053	1433	35.4%
Non-ELL Students	44585	11195	25.1%	43993	11669	26.5%
Senior High						
ELL Students	3301	218	6.6%	3376	41	1.2%
Non-ELL Students	54882	3119	5.7%	54720	919	1.7%
Total in District						
ELL Students	21965	4104	18.7%	22579	3481	15.4%
Non-ELL Students	182240	22883	12.6%	181028	20156	11.1%

When considering all grade levels, 15.4% of ELL students participated in before school or after school programs, with approximately 11% of non-ELL students participating. The level with the largest percentage of ELL students receiving supportive academic services before or after school was middle school. In middle school, 35.4% of ELL students participated in extended learning opportunities compared to 26.5 % of non- ELL students.

A sharp decline in the participation of both ELL and non-ELL students is seen when comparing elementary and middle school participation to that of high school students. This is logical when one considers that many high school students obtain employment after school. When comparing 2005-2006 with 2006-2007, there was a decrease in the percentage of ELL high school students as well as non-ELL high school students (from 6.6% to 1.2% and from 5.7% to 1.7% respectively.)

Percentages of ELL students participating in Extended Year Programs (summer school) are provided in Section B, Goal 1, Strategies 3,7, 8,12,13,15, and 16.

Strategy 2

Provide necessary instructional materials for ELL students and teachers.

School sites were encouraged to purchase educational materials that would meet the academic needs of ELL students. See the Description of Program section of this report for procedural details regarding how grant funds were used to address this strategy.

Strategies 3 and 4

3. Apply cross-cultural knowledge when developing and using classroom management techniques.

4. Provide active support and encouragement of cultural differences, such as culture-specific non-verbal communications, gestures, facial expressions, and eye contact.

These topics were covered in professional development courses as well as during coaching interactions. Training and coaching opportunities were provided throughout the school year as well as the summer. As explained earlier, ELL resource personnel monitored the needs of schools and when a need was identified, such as a large number of first-time teachers, the necessary training and/or coaching was provided.

Strategy 5

Implement use of heritage language dictionary in the classroom on a daily basis.

Schools were able to purchase heritage language dictionaries with grant funds. The decision was left to the ELL personnel and administration at each site. In 2006-2007, \$10,000 in grant funds was utilized to purchase dictionaries.

Strategy 6

6. Modify appropriate instructional program to meet the needs of the ESOL students.

Teachers were provided with documentation that provided guidance in the accommodations available to ELL students.

Strategies 7 – 12

7. Check for content comprehension.

8. Utilize instructional approaches to address language learning styles.

9. Explain vocabulary terms in words and illustrations known to the ELL student.

10. Provide visual context clues.

11. Construct alternative assessments for LEP students using a variety of modalities.

12. Adapt content area tests to the appropriate language level of the LEP student.

Teachers had the responsibility of checking for content comprehension. The strategies listed above were part of the syllabi for in-service classes and in other trainings given to teachers, such as trainings at faculty meetings and professional learning communities.

Strategy 13

13. Provide bilingual social workers and supplemental paraprofessionals to support parents and students in English learning skills.

The bilingual social workers, school psychologists and counselors were funded through the grant to provide support to ELL students and their families. Support was also provided via family literacy training; see Strategy 3 in Goal D.

Regarding English language learning skills, adult education classes and literacy classes were provided. Additionally, English language learning materials for adults were purchased, and the Leadership and Acculturation Center (formerly called Immigrant Acculturation Center) began using those materials.

Strategy 14

14. Provide extensive classroom libraries, including books on tape. School sites are encouraged to purchase educational materials that will meet the academic needs of ELL students.

As part of the supplies mentioned earlier, schools spent a total of \$700,276.00 on materials related to reading.

MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOLS

The preceding narrative addressing Strategies 1 through 14 for elementary schools also applies to strategies for middle and high schools. Middle and high schools also utilized grant funds to facilitate application of Strategy 15 and Strategy 16, a-g, as described following.

Strategy 15

Provide tutoring by certified teachers and bilingual liaisons as needed.

Grant funds could be used to provide tutoring. The decision was at the discretion of school personnel. ELL staff, either district or school level, assisted with decision-making about the need for tutoring.

Strategy 16a-16g.

16. Provide LEP liaison personnel at middle schools to serve as a resource to students, teachers, and families. School liaisons will:

- a. Analyze student data and arrange for appropriate tutorials*
- b. Provide additional learning time and tutoring for students as needed*
- c. Perform as an advocate for LEP students and their families*
- d. Ensure the correct class scheduling of LEP students*
- e. Ensure that all required paperwork is accurate and up to date*
- f. Arrange translation services for LEP students and families*
- g. Collaborate with school social workers, psychologists, and guidance counselors to ensure that all LEP students' needs are met.*

All sites with high ELL populations were allocated resource and paraprofessional units. These ELL personnel provide the services described in the Program Description section of this report.

GOAL B. Instructional Services to Increase the Academic Achievement of Current and Former ELLs/ELL Students

Goal 1: By 2013-14, all ELL students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and math.

Performance Indicator 1.1: The percentage of ELL students, in the aggregate, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment.

Performance Indicator 1.2: The percentage of ELL students, in the aggregate, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment.

Performance Indicator 1.3: The percentage of ELLs who score proficient on the Reading FCAT will increase in 06/07 by 13% (from 35% to 48% by May 30, 2007). This objective was not met.

Performance Indicator 1.4: The percentage of ELLs who score proficient on the Mathematics FCAT will increase in 06/07 by 13% (from 40% to 53% by May 30, 2007). This objective was not met.

PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 1

This section of the report presents the percentage of ELL students scoring at level 3 or higher on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). In accordance with Florida's A+ Plan as well as the No Child Left Behind Act, the academic achievement of Florida's students is tested each spring. The FCAT has achievement levels, ranging from 0 to 5, with 3 and above being considered proficient.

Tables H and I present the percent of ELL students in the district who attained proficiency in reading and mathematics in 2006-2007. As Tables H and I show, the percent of students scoring at a proficient level decreases as the grade level increases, a trend that is likewise observed in non-ELL students, although the decrease is less for math than for reading.

In reading, 37.1 percent of ELL elementary students achieved an FCAT score of Level 3 or above, while in middle and high schools the percentages were approximately 12.7 and 3.5. In mathematics, 37.1 percent of ELL elementary students scored 3 or higher, with 21.7 percent of middle school students and 20.3 percent of high school students reaching Level 3 in FCAT. This pattern of decreasing scores in the higher levels is evident with non-ELL students as well and questions have been raised about the difficulty of the test at higher levels.

Table H: Percent of ELL Students Scoring 3 or Higher in Reading on the *FCAT* 1

Reading	Level 3 or Higher			Level 3 or Higher		
	Total Tested	N	%	Total Tested	N	%
	2006			2007		
Elementary*						
ELL Students	4864	1868	38.4%	4975	1845	37.2
Non-ELL Students	38717	27300	70.6%	38783	27412	70.6
Middle*						
ELL Students	2988	377	12.6%	3094	392	12.7
Non-ELL Students	39988	23123	57.8%	40010	23299	58.2
Senior High*						
ELL Students	2218	54	2.4%	2277	79	3.5
Non-ELL Students	29648	10316	34.8%	30376	10442	34.1
Total in District*						
ELL Students	10070	2299	22.8%	10346	2316	22.4%
Non-ELL Students	108353	60739	56.1%	109169	61153	56.0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Summary Created by Laura H. Brown-Lue • Not all students are administered the <i>FCAT</i>. • ELL students who have attended an English speaking school less than one year can be administered an alternative assessment. • It should be noted that third grade FCAT reading scores are purported to be inflated. 						

Table I:
Percent of ELL Students Scoring 3 or Higher in Mathematics on the *FCAT*

Mathematics	3 or Higher			3 or Higher		
	Total Tested	N	%	Total Tested	N	%
	2006			2007		
Elementary*						
ELL Students	4876	1911	39.2%	4975	1845	37.1
Non-ELL Students	38748	25958	66.9%	38783	26608	68.6
Middle*						
ELL Students	2984	604	20.2%	3094	671	21.7
Non-ELL Students	40014	23676	59.2%	40010	24335	60.8
Senior High*						
ELL Students	1838	423	23.0%	1780	361	20.3
Non-ELL Students	27244	17028	62.5%	27170	16700	61.5
Total in District*						
ELL Students	9698	2938	30.3%	10346	2877	27.8%
Non-ELL Students	106006	66662	62.9%	109189	67643	62.0%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Summary Created by Laura H. Brown-Lue • Not all students are administered the <i>FCAT</i>. • ELL students who have attended an English speaking school less than one year can be administered an alternative assessment. <p>It should be noted that third grade FCAT reading scores are purported to be inflated.</p>						

Appendix B presents the District's progress as a whole regarding Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). Results indicated that in 2006-2007, 34 percent and 41 percent of ELL students were at grade level or above in reading and mathematics respectively, as displayed in Table J.

Table J: FCAT Percentages at or Above Grade Level Based on AYP*

	Reading		Math	
	2006	2007	2006	2007
District	56	56	61	63
ELL	35	34	40	41

*District-wide results across all grade levels for students who took FCAT or a state-approved alternative.

Performance indicators 1.3 and 1.4 specify an increase of 13 percentage points in reading (from 35% to 48%) and in mathematics (from 40% to 53%). Table J indicates that ELL students scored substantially

below the total group and that neither the total group nor ELL students achieved the specified increases. The percentage of all district students at or above grade level in reading remained the same, while there was a slight increase in mathematics. The percentage of ELL students at or above Grade Level in reading declined by one percentage point and in mathematics increased by one percentage point.

READING STRATEGIES

Strategies 1 and 2

- 1) *Provide supplemental, research-based instructional materials, including READ 180*
- 2) *Provide extensive reading libraries geared towards ELLs which are aligned to the district's reading plan.*

School sites were encouraged to purchase educational materials that would meet the academic needs of ELL students.

Strategy 3.

- 3) *Provide extended year learning opportunities, including Saturday academy*

See also Strategies 7,8 12, 13, 15, and 16 (in Mathematics Strategies section of this report.) All students who had an Academic Improvement Plan on record or who had an FCAT less than level 3 were invited to attend extended learning programs and extended year programs. The opportunity was given to all sites to use their funding to provide extended year learning opportunities (summer school). The decision to utilize the funds for that purpose was at the discretion of each site.

The same criteria for ELPs were used for both ELL and non-ELL students. If a student had academic needs, that student had access to whatever programs existed at his or her school. Some schools had their ELPs before the school day began and other schools had after school ELPs. If a program at a particular school expended all designated funds, grant funds could be used to help sustain the program.

Table K displays the percentages of ELL and non-ELL students attending summer school programs during 2005-2006 and 2006-2007. When considering the district as a whole, there is little change between the participation rates for ELL and non-ELL students when comparing across years. However, the number of elementary, middle, and high school ELL students participating in extended year learning opportunities increased by 259, 74, and 62 students respectively. Because they were aware that ELL students had lower achievement levels when compared to non-ELL students, particularly at the middle and high school levels, ELL district office personnel consistently emphasized the importance of increasing academic achievement. Although it is difficult to find ELL materials for grades 6 through 12, ELL personnel at the district and school level continued to search diligently. Additionally, ELL District Office staff report that schools in general were particularly concerned about the academic achievement of their ELL students. ELL program staff suggested that school personnel exerted extra effort to inform ELL students of their opportunity to participate in summer school and other extended learning opportunities.

Table K. Percent of ELL and Non-ELL Students Attending Summer School by Year¹

	Students Attending Summer School Program					
	District Total	N	%	District Total	N	%
	2005-2006			2006-2007		
Elementary						
ELL Students	14696	3346	22.8%	15150	3605	23.8%
Non-ELL Students	82773	7821	9.4%	82315	9196	11.2%
Middle						
ELL Students	3968	170	4.3%	4053	244	6.0%
Non-ELL Students	44585	1777	4.0%	43993	1931	4.4%
Senior High						
ELL Students	3301	91	2.8%	3376	153	4.5%
Non-ELL Students	54882	2541	4.6%	54720	2812	5.1%
Total in District						
ELL Students	21965	3607	16.4%	22579	4002	17.7%
Non-ELL Students	182240	12139	6.7%	181028	13939	7.7%

¹ Summary Created by Laura H. Brown-Lue

Strategies 4 and 10

4) *Provide alternative assessment tools to monitor ELL's academic achievement and to make changes to instruction if needed. The tools include District benchmark tests in all content areas, practice FCAT tests, Fluency probes, Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), DIBELS, teacher observation, weekly tests, timed reading, FCAT NRT, and district semester exams.*

Training, documents and guidelines were provided to teachers and administrators on the proper procedures to conduct alternative assessments. Training in alternative assessments was given through in service classes, faculty meetings, and professional learning communities. When new assessments were mandated by federal or state guidelines (such as the CELLA), special training was provided to personnel who would administer the alternative assessments. Support was given as necessary by ELL staff.

Strategy 5:

5) *Support Just Read, Florida's goal that all Florida students are able to read at or above grade level by 2012. The services provided by Title III will further this goal in several ways. The student data will assist in identifying gaps in reading performance. The supplemental education services offered at the school level will further facilitate the attainment of Florida's reading benchmarks. Parent outreach programs are*

aimed toward language acquisition and literacy skills, which are important factors in promoting reading ability in children.

A portion of Title III funding was allocated to the District's K-12 Reading Initiative. The sum was determined by availability of funds and the degree to which different components of the initiative would most benefit ELL students who are participating. For example, efforts to increase academic achievement for struggling readers would be a high priority for allocation of ELL funds.

MATH STRATEGIES

Strategy 6

Provide professional development aimed at increasing subject matter knowledge and ESOL teaching skills for teachers instructing ELLs in core subject areas.

Content area training opportunities were provided throughout the school year and summer.

Strategies 7 and 8

7) Provide extended learning opportunities, including Saturday academies.

8) Provide tutoring for struggling students

The opportunity was given to all sites to provide tutoring and extended learning opportunities for ELL students. The decision was at the discretion of each site. The resource teachers and resource specialist at the schools routinely checked on academic progress of the ELL students in that school. They also monitored any programs being conducted at their school and stayed in close contact with school staff to identify needs of ELL students.

Procedurally, guidance counselors routinely identified struggling ELL students at the school level. Teachers reviewed test scores and grades, and any academic needs of ELL students were referred to the ELL resource teacher. The resource teacher then made recommendations, which might be to obtain tutoring after school or during school hours or to utilize other services available for ELL students.

Table L. Percent of ELL and Non-ELL Students Attending After School Programs ¹

	Students Attending After School Programs					
	District Total N	After School N	%	District Total N	After School N	%
	2005-2006			2006-2007		
Elementary						
ELL Students	14696	2375	16.2%	15150	2007	13.2%
Non-ELL Students	82773	8569	9.7%	82315	7567	9.2%
Middle						
ELL Students	3968	1511	38.1%	4053	1433	35.4%
Non-ELL Students	44585	11195	25.1%	43993	11669	26.5%
Senior High						
ELL Students	3301	218	6.6%	3376	41	1.2%
Non-ELL Students	54882	3119	5.7%	54720	919	1.7%
Total in District						
ELL Students	21965	4104	18.7%	22579	3481	15.4%
Non-ELL Students	182240	22883	12.6%	181028	20156	11.1%

¹ Summary Created by Laura H. Brown-Lue

See Goal A, Strategy 1, for a description of procedural detail on extended learning opportunities.

Strategy 9

9) *Provide parent outreach programs and training.*

Parent involvement, enrichment and training opportunities were made available through district and school based activities listed below, which included:

- District Advisory Council (District-based)
- Parent Advisory Council (school-based)
- Leadership and Acculturation Center (District-based)
- Adult Literacy and English Courses (District- and school-based)
- Other school-based activities

For more details, see Goal D of this report.

Strategy 10

10) Provide alternative assessment tools to monitor ELL's academic achievement and to make changes to instruction if needed. Assessments include district benchmark tests in all content areas, practice FCAT tests, teacher observation, weekly tests, FCAT NRT, and district semester exams.

Training, documents and guidelines were provided to teachers and administrators on the proper procedures to conduct alternative assessments.

GOAL B. Instructional Services to Increase the Academic Achievement of Current and Former ELLs/ELL Students - CONTINUED

Goal 2: All students will graduate from high school.

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma 1) disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; 2) calculated in the same manner as used in the National Center for Education Statistics reports on the Common Core of Data.

Performance Indicator 2.2: The percentage of students who drop out of high school each year 1) disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; 2) calculated in the same manner as used in the National Center for Education Statistics reports on the Common Core of Data.

District-derived Performance Indicator 2.3: The percentage of ELLs who graduate from high school will increase by 10% in 2006-2007 (from 11% in 2005-2006 to 21% in 2006-2007). This objective was not met.

Performance Indicator 2.4: The percentage of ELLs who drop out of high school will decrease in 2006-2007. "In 0405, 150 ELLs dropped out of school. In 0607, there will be a decrease of at least fifteen students, totaling 135 or less. This objective was not met.

NOTE: Graduation and dropout data were calculated using an unadjusted cohort. Disaggregated data from the Florida DOE will be unavailable until Spring 2008.

PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Goal 2

As displayed in Table M, the graduation rate for all students decreased slightly when comparing 2005/2006 and 2006/2007. There was a greater decrease in graduation rate for minority groups having a smaller population. The graduation rate for ELL students declined from 51.1% in 2005-2006 to 39.2 in 2006/2007. It should be noted that graduation rates likely overestimate the actual graduation rate adjusted for cohort groups.

Examination of Table M also reveals that dropout rates (calculated for high school students, grades 9 through 12) for the district decreased slightly, moving from 2.41% in 2005/2006 to 1.81% in 2006/2007. The dropout rate for ELL students exhibited a slight increase, moving from 3.24% (107 students) in 2005/2006 to 3.41% (115 students) in 2006/2007.

Table M: Percent of Graduates and Dropouts 2005/2006 and 2006/2007 *

	Graduation Rate*		Dropout Rate*	
	2006/2007	2005/2006	2006/2007	2005/2006
All students	76.95	78.4	1.81	2.41
White	83.53	83.5	1.44	1.79
Black	66.27	67.7	2.20	3.58
Hispanic	71.14	75.5	2.34	2.76
Asian	89.66	86.1	0.67	0.71
Am. Indian	71.43	84.9	1.84	0.43
Multiracial	77.81	84.2	1.40	2.12
Disabled	53.73	55.9	2.98	3.84
Economically Disadvantaged	78.53	73.1	0.55	2.13
ELL	39.23	51.2	3.41	3.24
Migrant	70.7	64.0	1.80	6.73
Female	79.62	75.85	1.74	2.65
Male	74.16	80.84	1.89	2.16
All students				

*Graduation rates were calculated using 12th grade students enrolled in 2006-2007 (and 2005-2006) not adjusted for cohort group over a four-year period.

STRATEGIES FOR GRADUATION

Strategy 11

11) Provide parent outreach programs and training regarding high school graduation requirements and options.

Information was provided to parents of ELL students regarding requirements for graduation from high school and other options at the schools level. Guidance counselors routinely provided such information, and a bilingual guidance counselor provided assistance as needed.

Strategies 12, 13, (for graduation)

12) Provide tutoring for struggling students.

13) Provide extended learning opportunities.

See also strategy 3, 7 and 8 above and strategy 1 in Section One. As stated earlier (in section one), the opportunity was given to all sites to use grant funding to provide extended learning programs (ELPs). The decision to utilize the funds for ELPs was at the discretion of each site and was based on academic need, as determined by FCAT level, grades, teacher observation, etc.

14) Provide all ELLs in high school a mentor who will assist them in choosing appropriate curriculum and provide academic counseling.

This activity was not conducted during 2006-2007.

STRATEGIES FOR DROPOUTS

Strategies 5 and 16

15) Provide tutoring for struggling students.

16) Provide extended learning opportunities.

See response for Strategies 12 and 13, as presented above.

Strategy 17

17) Counseling to parents and students regarding alternative curriculum options, including technical programs and dual enrollment.

ELL students and their parents were advised about alternative curriculum options, including technical programs and dual enrollment, at the schools level by the guidance counselor. If the assistance of a bilingual guidance counselor was needed, ELL staff provided that support for the school.

The initial contact for the ELL student or the parent was with the school's guidance counselor. If additional questions or needs arose, the bilingual social worker would provide support. This is in accordance with the policy followed by the ELL office of providing academic services for the district that are supplemental to existing District efforts but that do not supplant such efforts.

GOAL C. Increasing Professional Development for School Personnel – Goal 1 *

Goal 1: Increase the percentage of teachers that participate in teaching practices through professional development training aimed at increasing English language acquisition, increasing subject matter knowledge and pedagogy, and/or increasing teaching skills by 10% in 2006-2007.

Objective 1.1: In 2005-2006, 20% of school personnel teaching, supervising, or supporting LEP students participated in professional development training aimed at increasing English language proficiency, increasing subject matter knowledge and pedagogy, and/or increasing teaching skills. By May 30, 2007, 30% of faculty and staff will participate in these professional development opportunities

* Strategies 1,2, and 3 from the Project Award Notification for Section C are renumbered as Strategies 4, 5, and 6 (and vice versa) to be consistent with the ordering of Goals 1 and 2 of Section C.

PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**Goal 1, Objective 1.1:**

Grant funds provided a substantial amount of ESOL training for district personnel and teachers. Table N displays the course name and hours completed. The 14 courses, which ranged from "ESOL Orientation" to specific teaching methods, were focused on enhancing teacher knowledge of English language acquisition as well as increasing subject matter knowledge, pedagogy, and teaching skills.

Table N. ESOL Training Completed 2006-2007

Component Number and Name	Total Participants	Average Hours	Total Hours
1001003 - ESOL ORIENTATION	498	5	2,413
1001006 - ESOL CULTURE	325	60	19,460
1001007 - Methods of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages	395	60	23,700
1001008 - ESOL Curriculum and Materials Development	341	60	20,419
1001009 - ESOL Applied Linguistics	225	60	13,460
1001010 - Testing and Evaluation of ESOL	201	60	12,060
1001011 - ESOL STRATEGIES	172	15	2,651
1001012 - Empowering ESOL Teachers of Other Subject Areas	126	18	2,270
1001013 - ESOL EMPOWERMENT II(60HR)	43	60	2,580
1001014 - Empowering ESOL Teachers: An Overview, Volume I &	854	52	44,055
1001015 - Teach Language Learning	2	60	120
1001018 - Teach Extension II	1	19	19
1001019 - ESOL online administrators	77	44	3,363
1001020 - ESOL ONLINE GUIDANCE COUNSELLING	15	60	900
	3,275	45	147,470

During the 2006-2007 school year, a total of 3,275 district personnel and teachers completed 147,470 hours of professional development training targeting the goals described above. As Table O depicts, this represents an increase of 1,022 training participants and 50,623 hours when compared with the 2005-2006 school year. The average number of hours increased as well, moving from 42.99 to 45. For a breakdown by school of staff ESOL in-service hours for 2006-2007, see Appendix C.

Table O. Comparison of ESOL Training - 2005/2006 to 2006/2007

Year	Total Training Participants	Average Hours	Total Hours
2005-2006	2,253	42.99	96,847
2006-2007	3,275	45	147,470
Increase	+1022	+2.01	+50,623

* = All school personnel teaching, supervising, or supporting LEP/ELL students.

STRATEGIES

Strategies 1, 2, and 3:

- 1) Using the "train the trainer" model, provide elementary LEP resource teachers with research based ongoing staff development and resource materials aimed at assisting classroom teachers of LEP students.
- 2) Provide three days of research-based summer content teacher training and continuing follow up aimed at instructional strategies and opportunities for modifications in the content area classroom.
- 3) Provide research-based professional development, materials, and continuing follow up to LEP specialists and resource teachers in content specific instructional strategies [Specific researched based pd: CALLA-Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach, Janet Allen- best practices in reading in the content area, Performance Learning Systems- Coaching Training, Sheltered Instruction- SIOP Model].

The ELL program office provided training that was relevant and research-based in order to ensure that all school personnel had the necessary skills to meet the academic needs of the ELL students and to facilitate student achievement. In addition to the training listed above in Table O, eight other trainings were provided from July 2006 through August 29, 2007. The trainings included, for example, New Bilingual Para and New ESOL Resource Teacher Training, Data Processors Training, and Writing is Possible. A total of 610 teachers and other district personnel attended these classes.

Summer content area training was provided at Leto High School, for three days for a total of 18 hours. Teachers from Jefferson, Leto, Chamberlain, King, and Hillsborough High Schools participated in the training, with a total of 70 participants.

Opportunities for training and coaching were ongoing and provided by the program's DRTs and ELL Resource Specialists at school sites. The DRTs and ELL resource specialists decided what training was needed, based upon their knowledge of needs of the teachers at school sites. The training was given by DRTs and ELL Resource Specialists to ELL personnel and teachers.

C. Increasing Professional Development for School Personnel – Goal 2 - CONTINUED

Goal 2: Standardize language acquisition assessment through training aimed at district-wide administration of the CELLA.

Objective 2.1: 100% of targeted LEP personnel will receive training in the administration of the CELLA by May 30, 2007. This objective was met.

Objective 2.1, Strategies 4, 5, and 6

4) Using the “train the trainer” model, provide CELLA training to school site teacher teams.

5) School site teacher teams provide CELLA training to all targeted school personnel.

6) Provide same CELLA training opportunities to private schools as available to SDHC personnel.

The ELL district office employed the “train the trainer” model described earlier in this report to address Strategies 4, 5, and 6. All staff members at the ELL district level received train the trainer training. ELL district level staff then trained administrators, resource teachers, other contracted, non-Board employees, and school site teams. Each school had a school site team consisting of the testing chair, ESOL resource teachers and other persons identified to assist in administering and processing the CELLA. Charter and private schools were invited, via letter, to participate in the trainings. Grant funds were used to contract non-School board employees to assist with administering the CELLA.

Several training opportunities were provided to equip teachers, administrators and other personnel with the necessary knowledge and skills in the administration of the CELLA. On August 16, 2006, March 14, 2007, and July 19, 2007, a total of 216, 214, and 137 personnel were given training in administering the CELLA.

GOAL D. Increasing Parental and Community Participation in the Educational Experience of ELLs/LEP Students

Goal 1: Provide all parents of LEP students with the opportunity to participate in family literacy programs and training activities aimed at improving academic achievement and language acquisition throughout the 2006-2007 school year. This objective was met; see note below. Goal 2: Provide interested community members with the opportunity to participate in family literacy programs and training activities aimed at improving academic achievement and language acquisition throughout the 2006-2007 school year. This objective was met; see note below.

Objective 1.1: 100% of parents of LEP students will be notified on an ongoing basis in a variety of modes and appropriate languages, of parent participation opportunities offered from August 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007. This objective was met; see note below.

Objective 2.1: 100% of interested community members will be notified on an ongoing basis in a variety of modes and appropriate languages, of community participation opportunities offered from August 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. This objective was met; see note below.

PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

NOTE: Because conducting a census of all parents of ELL students and interested community members is impractical, the extent to which Objectives 1.1 and 2.1 were met cannot be verified with any degree of certainty. That fact notwithstanding, it is possible to affirm district and school-based personnel were actively engaged in efforts to increase parent and community involvement as detailed below.

STRATEGIES

Strategy 1

Twice during the school year, in four areas of the district, provide two hour training opportunity for LEP parents and community members, for a total of 8 training opportunities.

Parent trainings/meetings were held in the fall and the spring at various school sites in each area of the district. Each school had a Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) and also a PAC for ELL parents if there were sufficient numbers of ELL parents at a school. At PAC meetings, training was provided on school district resources, how to prepare students for testing, how to understand district policy, etc

Strategies 2, 3, and 4

2) Provide computer literacy training for parents and community members.

3) Provide family literacy training for parents and community members.

4) Provide academic assistance training and tips to parents and community members.

Parents were notified via flyers when trainings are available. In addition, school personnel made telephone calls to alert parents of training opportunities. Academic assistance training and tips consisted of suggestions for how parents could help improve their child's academic achievement. Suggestions and explanations were given such as the importance of setting aside time for reading, having a specifically

designated place at home to study, being available to help a student with homework, and how to use the public library and other resources available to the general public. In addition, the Immigrant Acculturation Center also provides training to parents.

Strategy 5

Tailor area parent and community trainings to the specific needs of the surrounding community.

Parent feedback forms were distributed at PAC meetings. Parents were encouraged to communicate needs and concerns through Parent Feedback forms, communicating with the ELL personnel at school sites or by communicating with the ELL program office.

Strategy 6

Invite parents and community members to participate in Parent Advisory Council (PAC), District Advisory Council (DAC), and School Advisory Council (SAC).

PAC meetings were held twice per year (spring and fall). The meetings were relatively large, with many parents attending. The PAC meetings focused on needs at a particular school. DAC meetings were held with representatives from PACs at schools and were smaller meetings. DAC meetings focused more on district-wide issues. In PAC and DAC meetings, district ELL staff who were fluent in Haitian, Creole, Vietnamese or Korean attended as needed, to assist with translation.

Strategy 7

Educate school sites to invite LEP parents to participate in Parent Teacher Student Association (PTSA).

This strategy was the responsibility of each school.

Strategy 8

Schedule Parent Resource Bus at school and community sites to provide additional support and services under the auspices of the district's parent involvement department.

Title I funds, rather than Title III funds, were utilized for the Parent Resource Bus.

Strategy 9

Provide bi-lingual translators as necessary to ensure parental involvement.

If school documents needed to be translated, a form was available on-line on the ELL portion of the district website. Translation services would then be provided for the school, as requested.

Strategy 10

Provide Spanish language mirror version of SDHC website for parents with Internet access with all school district information readily available.

The Spanish language website was provided by funding other than Title III.

Strategy 11

Communicate via email with parents and community members who have email access.

The ELL office typically did not communicate with ELL parents via email because many ELL parents do not use email. Any announcements, notifications, etc. that were sent via email would also have had to be sent via paper copy.

Strategy 12

Invite parents of private school LEP students to participate in SDHC parent trainings at the SDHC school site closest to their school or home.

Participating private schools were invited to participate in parent activities as well as trainings.

School Accountability*

In addition to monitoring district and state assessments, the district will utilize a variety of strategies aimed at holding elementary and secondary schools accountable for meeting the goals and objectives in this proposal.

*Although School Accountability was not specifically designated as a goal in the Project Award Notification, the information below is supplied regarding how the specified strategies were addressed.

STRATEGIES

Strategy 1

Provide all teachers with an ESOL Strategies Checklist, to be filled out quarterly and monitored by school site administrators.

Teachers were provided with the ESOL Strategies Checklist and received training on how to use them. Appendix D contains a copy of the ESOL Strategies Checklist. The checklist was used, one per teacher. The teacher was to check which ESOL strategies they used in their classroom. The checklists were kept at the school and were collected by the ESOL resource teacher or administrator. The issue of how often the checklist had to be completed was a contractual issue with the Classroom Teachers' Association.

Strategy 2

Provide ESOL training to all school personnel.

Training opportunities were provided throughout the school year and summer. These professional development activities were described in detail in Section Three of this report.

Strategy 3

Regular site visits by the ELL Supervisor and ELL District Resource Teachers.

Besides regular visits to schools made by the DRTs, the ELL program supervisor also visited schools regularly.

Strategy 4

Regular school site administrator classroom walk-through observations.

Walk-through observations were the responsibility of each school site administrator.

Strategies 5, 6, and 7

5) Regular communication with school level personnel through face-to-face meetings and electronic communication.

6) Monthly meetings between district LEP personnel and LEP teachers.

7) Quarterly meetings between district LEP personnel and school site administrators.

ELL District Resource teachers (DRTs) maintained open communication, both personal and electronically with their schools. Some DRTs covered several schools regularly and talked to teachers before, during and after school and at other school-based meetings, such as faculty meetings and professional learning

communities. DRTs remained aware of needs of the students and teachers of ELL students at the schools they covered.

Strategy 8

LEP District Resource Teachers assist with student placement, promotion, and other school site duties as needed.

In schools with no ELL personnel, District Resource Teachers visited periodically and on an as-needed basis to assist with programmatic procedures and needs of ELL students.

Strategy 9

LEP Office provides appropriate LEP guidelines and follow-up through out the school year.

LEP guidelines addressed a number of important issues. Some of these are, for example, ELL student placement, type of documentation to be kept for ELL students, notification to be sent to parents, schedule for students to be evaluated, strategies to be used, and other information relevant to the academic success of ELL students.

The ELL program office ensured that all personnel had access to the program's guidelines and procedures by making them available through email. The guidelines were also posted in the ELL folder on the district intranet.

Strategy 10

LEP Office provides up-to-date research-based training throughout the year to ensure that all school personnel possess the skills necessary to achieve project goals and objectives.

Please refer to Section Three of this report.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

1. Supplementary services focused on increasing the language proficiency of all ELLs were provided for elementary, middle, and high school students.
2. The targeted increase in percentage of students scoring at or above minimum proficiency on selected language acquisition assessments--the Comprehensive English Language Learners Assessment (CELLA) and the Stanford-9 Abbreviated)--was not met.
3. The percentage of ELL middle and high school students utilizing the after school program did increase.
4. The CELLA was successfully administered in the Fall of 2006 and in the Spring of 2007, and baseline data were obtained. Because cut scores have not been established, it could not be determined whether there was an increase across the designated proficiency levels. Based on mean scale score anchor points, that students were making progress towards English language proficiency is evident.
5. The designated achievement gains in reading and mathematics on the State's assessment, which seem particularly challenging, were not met by ELL students. However, ELL staff, at the district as well as at the school level, did employ the strategies specified in the grant.
6. The designated increases in the graduation rate of ELL students and decrease in the dropout rate were not obtained. Again, these goals seem particularly challenging, and staff utilized the specified strategies.
7. A broad array of professional development courses aimed at increasing English language proficiency was provided for school personnel who taught, supervised, or supported ELL students. District staff participated in over 146,000 hours of professional training concerning the needs of ELL students.
8. Personnel involved in administration of the CELLA received appropriate training.
9. Parents of ELL students as well as interested community members participated in family literacy training, although it is not possible to ascertain whether there was an increase over the participation rate of 2005-2006. District schools employed the strategies specified in the grant to notify parents and interested community members of training opportunities.
10. The ELL Program Office staff utilized a variety of strategies to hold schools accountable for meeting grant goals and objectives.
11. ELL District Office staff and other district personnel involved in assisting ELL students utilized grant funding to help students and their families succeed.

Recommendations

1. Continue to work toward increasing academic achievement, particularly reading.
2. Consider expending greater efforts to increase participations of ELL students in summer school programs.
3. Consider expanding existing efforts to increase graduation rates and to decrease dropout rates of ELL students.
4. High goals are commendable but goals should be set so that they are achievable with effort.
5. Maintain the commendable level of training provided for district personnel involved in teaching ELL students.
6. Continue providing support for parents and interested community members.
7. ELL District Office staff is well experienced and mechanisms are in place in the district to appropriately employ grant funds. Continue to pursue grant funding to support the ELL program.
8. An evaluation with goals focused on issues specific to Hillsborough County Public Schools would likely yield guidance that would benefit the ELL program.