**District ELL Program Description Worksheet**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| District: |  | | | | |
| ELL Administrator/Coordinator: | | |  | | |
| Number of ELLs enrolled: | |  | | No. of Languages Spoken: |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Language distribution: *(percentages of total ELL population speaking the top three languages)* | | | |
| Language: |  | Percentage: |  |
| Language: |  | Percentage: |  |
| Language: |  | Percentage: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Age Distribution: *(number of students at each grade)* | | | | | | | |
| K-2 |  | 3-5 |  | 6-8 |  | 9-12 |  |

This is document serves as a worksheet to determine the particular English Language Instructional Program model(s) employed in your district/school and to ensure that the program model(s) are comprehensively designed and implemented with respect to current research. Any given district may have more than one model in place, so it may be necessary to evaluate programs by school.

This worksheet is broken into several sections. The first is an inventory or evaluation of the existing program(s). This may need to be accomplished more than once depending on the number of program models that currently exist. It should serve as a reference later when evaluating the programs against research-based program criteria.

**Section 1: Assessing the program(s) in place**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| District: |  |
| School(s): |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| What is the goal of the ELIP? | English language development |  |
| Bilingualism (Languages: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_) |  |
|  |  |  |
| What is the target *language* population? | ELLs of the same first language |  |
| ELLs of multiple first languages |  |
| ELLs and other second language learners (non-ELLs) |  |
|  |  |  |
| What is/are the language(s) of instruction? | English only |  |
| English and other language equally |  |
| Transitioning from other language to English over time |  |
| English with some concept facilitation in other language as needed |  |
| Other *(specify):* |  |
|  |  |  |
| What are the target grades? | K-2 |  |
| 3-5 |  |
| 6-8 |  |
| 9-12 |  |
|  |  |  |
| What is/are the ELP level(s) of the ELLs to be served by this program? | 1 – ENTERING |  |
| 2 – BEGINNING |  |
| 3 – DEVELOPING |  |
| 4 – EXPANDING |  |
| 5 – BRIDGING |  |
|  |  |  |
| What is the length of time in US schools of the ELLs served by this program? | 0 Years (newcomers) |  |
| 1-2 Years |  |
| 3-4 Years |  |
| More than 4 years |  |
|  |  |  |
| What content areas are taught by an ESL certified teacher? | Language Arts |  |
| Mathematics |  |
| Science |  |
| Social Studies |  |
| Others  *(specify)*: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| In what classroom setting do students receive their primary ESL instruction | ESL Class |  |
| Content/General Education classes |  |

**Section 2: Determining the program model**

Which program model most closely matches the indicators identified above?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1. Program Models for Educating English language learners** | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Model** | **Goal** | **Target Language Population** | **Native Language(s) of Students** | **Languages of Instruction** | **Target Grades** | **ELL ELP Levels** | **ELL Time in U.S. Schools** | **Teacher Certification** | **Primary ESL Instruction** |
| ***Bilingual Education Models*** | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| Two-way or dual-language | Bilingualism | Majority and minority | English (non - ELL) and one minority language | Native language and English as a second language | Most effective K-6 | 1 – 6 | 0 - 3 | Bilingual Certified for target lang. | English component |
| Maintenance or developmental | Bilingualism | Minority | One minority language | Native language and English as a second language | K-12 | 1 – 6 | 0 - >4 | Bilingual Certified for target lang. | Content / Gen-Ed BL Classes |
| Transitional bilingual (TBE) | English language development | Minority | One minority language | Native language and English as a second language | K-12 | 1 – 6 | 0 - >4 | Bilingual Certified for target lang. | Content / Gen-Ed BL Classes |
| ***English-only Models*** | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| English as a second language (ESL) \* | English language development | Minority | Multiple minority languages | English as a second language | K-12 | 1 – 6 | 0 - >4 | ESL or ESL endorsed Language Arts | ESL Class |
| Structured or Sheltered Immersion (SI) | English language development | Minority | Multiple minority languages | English as a second language (some clarification in native language in some programs) | K-12 | 1 – 6 | 0 - >4 | ESL and content area for all teachers | Content / Gen-Ed Classes |
| Collaborative ESL and General Education | English language development | Minority | Multiple minority languages | English as a second language (some clarification in native language in some programs) | K-12 | 1 – 6 | 0 - >4 | ESL for collaboration teachers, content certification for classroom teachers | Content / Gen-Ed Classes |
| ***Other models*** | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| Newcomer program | English language development | Minority, recent arrivals with limited L1 literacy | Multiple minority languages | Different models:   * Second language only * Second language with some native language support * Native language and second language | 6-12 | 1 – 2 | 0 - 1 | ESL and content area for all teachers | Content / Gen-Ed Classes |
| Source: Adapted from Brisk (2006) pg. 33-34, including only those models discussed by Christian (2006). | | | | |  |  |  |  |

*\* IMPORTANT NOTE: If the ELIP is solely ESL, steps must be taken to ensure that instruction and assessment in all non-ESL classes meet the minimum requirements for overcoming language barriers in accordance with Lau v. Nichols (1974). See the Office of Civil Rights website for further information -*  [*http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/index.html*](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/index.html)

**Section 3: Determining the quality of the program model**

Find the program model below that you selected in section 2 and answer the criteria questions presented. If you answer no to any of the questions, efforts must be made to ensure that the criterion is put in place.

*The program/model criteria questions below are adapted from a study conducted by the Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast and Island (REL-NEI) commissioned by the Rhode Island Department of Education. A list of references for the REL-NEI study can be found at the end of this document.*

**Two-Way Bilingual Education**

Two-way bilingual education is an educational approach that integrates native English speakers and native speakers of another language for content and literacy instruction in both languages. These programs have been in existence in the United States for nearly 50 years, but in the past 20 years they have become more popular. The majority of these programs are Spanish/English programs in public elementary schools. Two-way programs are also referred to as dual-language programs.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | |
| **Program goals** | **YES** | | **NO** | |
| Are the goals of the program to: |
| develop high levels of proficiency in the student’s first language? |  | |  | |
| develop high levels of proficiency in a second language? |  | |  | |
| develop academic performance for both groups of students that will be at or above grade level? |  | |  | |
| demonstrate positive cross-cultural attitudes and behaviors? |  | |  | |
| **Target Population** |
| Does the program target language majority (native English speakers) and language minority students? |  | |  | |
| **Primary program features** |
| Does the program include fairly equal numbers of two groups of students: language majority students and language minority students? |  | |  | |
| Is the program integrated, meaning that the language majority students and language minority students are grouped together for academic instruction (i.e. not just physical education and music) for all or most of the day? |  | |  | |
| Does the program provide core academic instruction (i.e., content and literacy courses) to both groups of students in both languages?  *Depending on the program model, literacy instruction might not be provided to both groups in both languages initially, but by about year three, all students are typically receiving literacy instruction in both languages.* |  | |  | |
| **Elements/Components for Program Success** |
| Is parent involvement integral to program? |  | |  | |
| Is there a system in place to accomplish ongoing language proficiency progress monitoring? |  | |  | |
| Is there a comprehensive language development intervention plan for students who fail to make adequate progress? |  | |  | |
| Does the program provide a minimum of 4 to 6 years of bilingual instruction to participating students? |  | |  | |
| Is the focus of instruction the same core academic curriculum that students in the general education program experience? |  | |  | |
| Is optimal language input (input that is comprehensible, interesting, and of sufficient quantity) as well as opportunities for output provided to students, including quality language arts instruction in both languages? |  | |  | |
| Is the target (non-English) language used for instruction a minimum of 50 percent of the time (to a maximum of 90 percent in the early grades), and English at least 10 percent of the time? |  | |  | |
| Does the program provide an additive bilingual environment where all students have the opportunity to learn a second language while continuing to develop their native language proficiency? |  | |  | |
| Do classrooms include a balance of students from the target language and English backgrounds who participate in instructional activities together? |  | |  | |
| Are positive interactions among students facilitated by the use of strategies such as cooperative learning? |  | |  | |
| Are general characteristics of effective schools incorporated into the program, such as qualified personnel and home-school collaboration? |  | |  | |
| Is the program an integral part of the whole school operation?  or…  Is the program a whole-school reform initiative where all teachers, administrators, parents, and students are involved? |  | |  | |
| Does building administration maintain a supportive school-wide climate and supervise teachers and students to ensure quality implementation and improvement? |  | |  | |
| Does staff development for teachers and administrators include ways of addressing and altering power relationships in the school: socio-political issues of diversity, difference, ethnicity, equity, bias, power struggles, and/or views about bilingual education? |  | |  | |
| Are teachers part of learning communities at the school that can be used to enhance agency and capacity for maintaining/improving the program? |  | |  | |
| Are staff development, implementation visits, and implementation reports from outside the school used to sustain the quality of the program? |  | |  | |
| Is the instructional program created through a comprehensive balanced curriculum: interdisciplinary learning of both languages through all the content areas articulated with the English language arts and target language arts/reading programs? |  | |  | |
| **Use of Languages** |
| *Separation of languages*: |
| Do the teachers use the minority language exclusively during instructional time in the minority language, and English exclusively during instructional time in English? |  | |  | |
| Do students have the opportunity to be fully immersed in each language and have a strong reason to function in each language? |  | |  | |
| *Language Distribution*: (most programs use a combination of two or all three methods) |
| Does your program distribute instruction in each language: |  | |  | |
| By time: some time blocks are allocated for English and others for the minority language (example, morning versus afternoon)? |  | |  | |
| And/or | And/or | | | |
| By topic: some content areas are taught in English and some in the minority language. Language arts should be taught in each language? |  | |  | |
| And/or | And/or | | | |
| By person: two teachers working together; one provides English instruction and the other provides minority language instruction? |  | |  | |
| *Percentage of instructional time in each language:* |
| 50/50 model: 50 percent in English and 50 percent in the minority language from K through 5/6 grades. |  | |  | |
| Or… | Or… | | | |
| 90/10 model: 90 percent of instruction is the native language (English for language majority students and the native language of the language minority students) and 10 percent in the second language) increasing to 50/50 by 4th grade |  | |  | |
| *Source: Howard & Christian (2002)* |

**Maintenance/Developmental Bilingual Education**

**Maintenance or developmental bilingual education programs are similar to two-way programs in that they promote bilingualism and biliteracy but they serve solely language minority students. Students receive at least 50% of their instruction in their native language throughout at least the elementary school years. This model is also called “late-exit” bilingual education.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program goals** | **YES** | **NO** |
| Are the goals of the program to: |
| develop and maintain students’ native language? |  |  |
| develop full English proficiency? |  |  |
| develop grade-appropriate levels of achievement in all subjects? |  |  |
| develop a positive attitude toward the native culture and that of the majority group? |  |  |
| **Target Population** |
| Does the program target language minority students only? |  |  |
| **Primary program features** |
| Does the program provide literacy and subject matter instruction in both the native language and in English as needed in order to attain/maintain academic proficiency in both languages? |  |  |
| **Elements/Components for Program Success** |
| Is parent involvement integral to program? |  |  |
| Is there a system in place to accomplish ongoing language proficiency progress monitoring? |  |  |
| Is there a comprehensive language development intervention plan for students who fail to make adequate progress? |  |  |
| Is the focus of instruction the same rigorous core academic curriculum that students in the general education program experience? |  |  |
| Is optimal language input (input that is comprehensible, interesting, and of sufficient quantity) as well as opportunities for output provided to students, including quality language arts instruction in both languages? |  |  |
| Does building administration maintain a supportive school-wide climate and supervise teachers and students to ensure quality implementation and improvement? |  |  |
| Does the program provide an additive bilingual environment where all students have the opportunity to learn English while continuing to develop/maintain their native language proficiency? |  |  |
| Are positive interactions among students facilitated by the use of strategies such as cooperative learning? |  |  |
| Are general characteristics of effective schools incorporated into the program, such as qualified personnel and home-school collaboration? |  |  |
| Does staff development for teachers and administrators include ways of addressing and altering power relationships in the school: socio-political issues of diversity, difference, ethnicity, equity, bias, power struggles, and/or views about bilingual education? |  |  |
| Are teachers part of learning communities at the school that can be used to enhance agency and capacity for maintaining/improving the program? |  |  |
| Are staff development, implementation visits, and implementation reports from outside the school used to sustain the quality of the program? |  |  |
| Is the instructional program created through a comprehensive balanced curriculum: interdisciplinary learning in both languages through all the content areas? |  |  |
| **Use of Languages** |
| *Separation of language -*  *Does your program distribute instruction in each language:* |
| By time: some time blocks are allocated for English and others for the minority language (example, morning versus afternoon; alternate days or half-days)? |  |  |
| And/or | And/or | |
| By topic: some content areas are taught in English and some in the minority language? |  |  |
| And/or | And/or | |
| By person: two teachers working together; one provides English instruction and the other provides minority language instruction? |  |  |
| *Percentage of instructional time in each language:* |
| Does the program carry out instruction in the target language for as much as 70 percent of the school day in early grades with English taught as a second language and transition to roughly 50/50 English and target language as students master English in later grades? |  |  |

**Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE)**

**In TBE programs, academic instruction in the students’ native language is provided while they learn English. As their English proficiency develops, students move to all-English mainstream classes. The expectation in many of the programs is that students will be ready to move into mainstream classes within one to three years. This model is also referred as “early exit” bilingual education programs.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program goals** | **YES** | **NO** |
| Are the goals of the program to: |
| develop English skills without delaying or sacrificing content courses? |  |  |
| prepare students to enter mainstream English-only classrooms at the end of 1-3 years? |  |  |
| develop full English proficiency within 1-5 years depending on the ELLs initial proficiency level? |  |  |
| develop grade-appropriate levels of achievement in all subjects? |  |  |
| develop a positive attitude toward the native culture and that of the majority group? |  |  |
| **Target Population** |
| Does the program target language minority students only? |  |  |
| **Primary program features** |
| Does the program utilize literacy in the native language as a foundation for English reading and writing? |  |  |
| Is the native language used only as a support for students to learn content and English? |  |  |
| **Elements/Components for Program Success** |
| Is parent involvement integral to program? |  |  |
| Is there a system in place to accomplish ongoing language proficiency progress monitoring? |  |  |
| Is there a comprehensive language development intervention plan for students who fail to make adequate progress? |  |  |
| Is the focus of instruction the same rigorous core academic curriculum that students in the general education program experience? |  |  |
| Is the use of the native language for scaffolding instruction differentiated based on student needs to ensure an effective transition to English over time? |  |  |
| Is optimal language input (input that is comprehensible, interesting, and of sufficient quantity) as well as opportunities for output provided to students, including quality language arts instruction in English? |  |  |
| Does building administration maintain a supportive school-wide climate and supervise teachers and students to ensure quality implementation and improvement? |  |  |
| Does the program provide a rich language environment where all students have the opportunity to learn English through scaffolding in their native language? |  |  |
| Are positive interactions among students facilitated by the use of strategies such as cooperative learning? |  |  |
| Are general characteristics of effective schools incorporated into the program, such as qualified personnel and home-school collaboration? |  |  |
| Does staff development for teachers and administrators include ways of addressing and altering power relationships in the school: socio-political issues of diversity, difference, ethnicity, equity, bias, power struggles, and/or views about bilingual education? |  |  |
| Are teachers part of learning communities at the school that can be used to enhance agency and capacity for maintaining/improving the program? |  |  |
| Are staff development, implementation visits, and implementation reports from outside the school used to sustain the quality of the program? |  |  |
| Is the program designed and implemented in such a way as to ensure that students can be placed appropriately, based on language proficiency, in order to effectively transition to English? |  |  |
| Is the instructional program created through a comprehensive balanced curriculum: interdisciplinary language learning through all the content areas? |  |  |
| **Use of Languages** |
| * 50/50 model: Program students receive equal amounts of instruction in English and the native language until they are mainstreamed. |  |  |
| or | or | |
| * 90/10 model: Program starts 90 percent of the instruction in the minority language, gradually increasing English until ELLs are mainstreamed and/or exited. |  |  |

**English as a Second Language (ESL)**

**ESL is a program that provides special classes in the English language for students who are not proficient in the language. The evolution of ESL methodologies has been a dynamic process over the past fifty years. In the first half of the twentieth century, most language teaching relied on the direct method of instruction or a grammar translation approach. But the 1950s, audio-lingual methods surfaced that focused on oral development. This method was displaced by the communicative method for ESL teaching that prepares students to use functional language in meaningful, relevant ways both orally and in writing.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program goals** | **YES** | **NO** |
| Are the goals of the program to: |
| provide developmentally appropriate English language instruction tailored for students’ level of English proficiency? |  |  |
| develop full English proficiency within 1-5 years depending on the ELLs initial proficiency level? |  |  |
| develop a positive attitude toward the native culture and that of the majority group? |  |  |
| **Target Population** |
| Does the program target language minority students only? |  |  |
| **Primary program features** |
| Do ELLs spend most of the day in mainstream classrooms but attend one or more periods of ESL (either in the mainstream classroom or in a separate)? |  |  |
| Does the ESL program have its own curriculum that supports, supplements, and reinforces the district language arts curriculum? |  |  |
| **Elements/Components for Program Success** |
| Is parent involvement integral to program? |  |  |
| Is the focus of instruction in the ESL class at the same level of rigor as the general education program? |  |  |
| Is the use of sound, research-based techniques central to the instructional program? |  |  |
| Is there a system in place to accomplish ongoing language proficiency progress monitoring? |  |  |
| Is there a comprehensive language development intervention plan for students who fail to make adequate progress? |  |  |
| Is optimal language input (input that is comprehensible, interesting, and of sufficient quantity and quality) as well as opportunities for output provided to students, including quality language arts instruction in English? |  |  |
| Is there a match between program resources and the community of ELLs served? |  |  |
| Does building administration maintain a supportive school-wide climate and supervise teachers and students to ensure quality implementation and improvement? |  |  |
| Does the program provide a rich language environment where all students have the opportunity to learn academic English through scaffolded instruction? |  |  |
| Are positive interactions among students facilitated by the use of strategies such as cooperative learning? |  |  |
| Are general characteristics of effective schools incorporated into the program, such as qualified personnel and home-school collaboration? |  |  |
| Does staff development for teachers and administrators include ways of addressing and altering power relationships in the school: socio-political issues of diversity, difference, ethnicity, equity, bias, power struggles, and/or views about students of cultural and linguistic diversity? |  |  |
| Are ESL teachers part of learning communities at the school that can be used to enhance agency and capacity for maintaining/improving the program? |  |  |
| Are staff development, implementation visits, and implementation reports from outside the school used to sustain the quality of the program? |  |  |
| Is the program designed and implemented in such a way as to ensure that students can be placed appropriately, based on language proficiency, in order to effectively attain English proficiency in a timely manner? |  |  |
| **Use of Languages** |
| Is instruction in English? (*native language supports may be provided when appropriate and possible*) |  |  |
| For students who are literate in their native language, are native language texts provided to supplement English texts or clarify key concepts? |  |  |
| Are other native language resources provided (audio books, broadcasts, podcasts, multimedia) when possible? |  |  |

**Sheltered or Structured Immersion (SI)**

**SI is an approach for teaching content to ELLs in strategic ways that make the subject matter concepts comprehensible while promoting the students’ English language development. The SI term is used to refer to a program where students are expected to remain for two or three years and to instructional techniques that are often implemented in conjunction with other program characteristics. This model is also referred as “Specifically designed academic instruction in English” (SDAIE). The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) is both an observation instrument and a sheltered instruction model for teachers to plan and deliver lessons. It was first created in the early 1990s by Echevarría, Vogt & Short and has been updated since then. As of 2010, SIOP has been used in districts throughout all 50 states.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program goals** | **YES** | **NO** |
| Are the goals of the program to: |
| provide developmentally appropriate English language instruction tailored for students’ level of English proficiency? |  |  |
| develop full English proficiency within 1-5 years depending on the ELLs initial proficiency level? |  |  |
| provide effective content instruction while developing English language proficiency? |  |  |
| develop a positive attitude toward the native culture and that of the majority group? |  |  |
| **Target Population** |
| Does the program target language minority students only? |  |  |
| **Primary program features** |
| Does the program offer ELLs grade-level, core content courses taught in English using instructional strategies that make the content concepts accessible to them and promote the development of academic English? |  |  |
| **Elements/Components for Program Success** |
| Is parent involvement integral to program? |  |  |
| Is the use of sound, research-based techniques central to the instructional program? |  |  |
| Is there a system in place to accomplish ongoing language proficiency progress monitoring? |  |  |
| Is there a comprehensive language development intervention plan for students who fail to make adequate progress? |  |  |
| Is optimal language input (input that is comprehensible, interesting, and of sufficient quantity and quality) as well as opportunities for output provided to students in all content areas? |  |  |
| Is there a match between program resources and the community of ELLs served? |  |  |
| Does building administration maintain a supportive school-wide climate and supervise teachers and students to ensure quality implementation and improvement? |  |  |
| Does the program concentrate on the simultaneous development of content and English language proficiency? |  |  |
| Does the program provide a rich language environment where all students have the opportunity to learn academic English through scaffolded instruction in all content areas? |  |  |
| Are positive interactions among students facilitated by the use of strategies such as cooperative learning? |  |  |
| Are general characteristics of effective schools incorporated into the program, such as qualified personnel and home-school collaboration? |  |  |
| Does staff development for teachers and administrators include ways of addressing and altering power relationships in the school: socio-political issues of diversity, difference, ethnicity, equity, bias, power struggles, and/or views about students of cultural and linguistic diversity? |  |  |
| Are sheltered instruction teachers part of learning communities at the school that can be used to enhance agency and capacity for maintaining/improving the program? |  |  |
| Are staff development, implementation visits, and implementation reports from outside the school used to sustain the quality of the program? |  |  |
| Is the program designed and implemented in such a way as to ensure that students can be placed appropriately, based on language proficiency, in order to effectively attain English proficiency in a timely manner? |  |  |
| **Use of Languages** |
| Is instruction in English? (*native language supports may be provided when appropriate and possible*) |  |  |
| For students who are literate in their native language, are native language texts provided to supplement English texts or clarify key concepts? |  |  |
| Are other native language resources provided (audio books, broadcasts, podcasts, multimedia) when possible? |  |  |

**Collaborative ESL and General Education**

**The model of collaborative ESL and general education has some components of both ESL and sheltered instruction. Students are not scheduled for ESL class and are not provided with direct ESL instruction as in a strictly ESL program.? On the other hand, students are not given all language instruction through content classes. Rather, an ESL teacher works with one or more content teachers to collaboratively plan instruction using effective ESL strategies in the content classes. A minimum amount of scheduled common planning time is required. Support is provided to the content teachers as well as the students in this model, although the trade-off is generally less time spent supporting the ELLs directly by the ESL teacher. An active collaborative teaching environment does not necessarily mean that the teachers concerned are carrying out team teaching all or any of the time, although team teaching can be a component of a collaborative model.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program goals** | **YES** | **NO** |
| Are the goals of the program to: |
| provide developmentally appropriate English language instruction tailored for students’ level of English proficiency in all content classes? |  |  |
| develop full English proficiency within 1-5 years depending on the ELLs initial proficiency level? |  |  |
| provide effective content instruction while developing English language proficiency? |  |  |
| develop a positive attitude toward the native culture and that of the majority group? |  |  |
| **Target Population** |
| Does the program target language minority students only? |  |  |
| **Primary program features** |
| Does the program offer ELLs grade-level, core content courses taught in English using instructional strategies that make the content concepts accessible to them and promote the development of academic English? |  |  |
| Is collaboration between ESL and general education staff central to the program? |  |  |
| **Elements/Components for Program Success** |
| Is parent involvement integral to program? |  |  |
| Is the use of sound, research-based techniques central to the instructional program? |  |  |
| Is there a system in place to accomplish ongoing language proficiency progress monitoring? |  |  |
| Is there a comprehensive language development intervention plan for students who fail to make adequate progress? |  |  |
| Is optimal language input (input that is comprehensible, interesting, and of sufficient quantity and quality) as well as opportunities for output provided to students in all content areas? |  |  |
| Is there a match between program resources and the community of ELLs served? |  |  |
| Does building administration maintain a supportive school-wide climate and supervise teachers and students to ensure quality implementation and improvement? |  |  |
| Is there an explicit shared understanding of general education and ESL teachers’ roles and responsibilities? |  |  |
| Does building administration support collaboration between ESL and content teachers by constructively engaging in and supporting the process? |  |  |
| Does the program provide a rich language environment where all students have the opportunity to learn academic English through scaffolded instruction in all content areas? |  |  |
| Are positive interactions among students facilitated by the use of strategies such as cooperative learning? |  |  |
| Are general characteristics of effective schools incorporated into the program, such as qualified personnel and home-school collaboration? |  |  |
| Does staff development for teachers and administrators include ways of addressing and altering power relationships in the school: socio-political issues of diversity, difference, ethnicity, equity, bias, power struggles, and/or views about students of cultural and linguistic diversity? |  |  |
| Are collaborative teacher teams given adequate and structured time to collaborate? |  |  |
| Are collaborative teacher teams given training to effectively collaborate? |  |  |
| Are language needs given the same priority as content needs within the collaborative classroom (curricular space for English language development)? |  |  |
| Are staff development, implementation visits, and implementation reports from outside the school used to sustain the quality of the program? |  |  |
| Are there systematic mechanisms in place for feedback to administration from collaborative teacher teams? |  |  |
| **Use of Languages** |
| Is instruction in English? (*native language supports may be provided when appropriate and possible*) |  |  |
| For students who are literate in their native language, are native language texts provided to supplement English texts or clarify key concepts? |  |  |
| Are other native language resources provided (audio books, broadcasts, podcasts, multimedia) when possible? |  |  |

**Newcomer Program**

Newcomer programs are programs designed to meet the academic and transitional needs of newly arrived immigrants who lack the literacy skills needed to participate in regular school work, particularly those in middle and high school. Typically, students attend these programs before they enter other language support programs (e.g. mainstream with ESL support, bilingual, or SI) given that those programs assume that students have minimum literacy skills and are acculturated to school. These programs are more prevalent in urban areas.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program goals** | **YES** | **NO** |
| Are the goals of the program to: |
| provide developmentally appropriate English language instruction tailored for students’ level of English proficiency? |  |  |
| accelerate the students’ learning so they can make the transition to other school programs and be prepared for the literacy and content demands of bilingual, SI, ESL, or mainstream classes? |  |  |
| help student develop beginning English proficiency? |  |  |
| provide students with as much instruction in the content areas as possible to both fill gaps in background knowledge and prevent them from falling behind academically while acquiring beginning English skills? |  |  |
| support students in acclimating to the U.S. school system? |  |  |
| develop a positive attitude toward the native culture and that of the majority group? |  |  |
| **Target Population** |
| Does the program target newly arrived language minority ELLs with limited native language literacy only? |  |  |
| **Primary program features** |
| Is the program designed to meet the specific needs of ELLs with limited native language literacy in middle and high school grades? |  |  |
| Is the program relatively self-contained? (*students may interact with mainstream students for part of the day depending on the location and setting of the program*) |  |  |
| Are the class sizes kept to a minimum (generally below 10-12 students per teacher) |  |  |
| **Elements/Components for Program Success** |
| Is parent involvement integral to program? |  |  |
| Is the use of sound, research-based techniques central to the instructional program? |  |  |
| Is there a system in place to accomplish ongoing language proficiency progress monitoring? |  |  |
| Is there a comprehensive language development intervention plan for students who fail to make adequate progress? |  |  |
| Is optimal language input (input that is comprehensible, interesting, and of sufficient quantity and quality) as well as opportunities for output provided to students in all content areas? |  |  |
| Is there a match between program resources and the community of ELLs served? |  |  |
| Does the program provide support for native language development through courses, materials, paraprofessionals, and/or tutors? |  |  |
| Does the program provide flexible scheduling to extend time for learning and to allow students to exit when they are ready? |  |  |
| Does the program have content courses made comprehensible through sheltered instruction or the native language? |  |  |
| Is there regular monitoring and assessment of students’ language and content knowledge? |  |  |
| Are quality, multilingual staff provided with professional development targeted to the needs of adolescent newcomers? |  |  |
| Does the program provide field trips and curriculum activities to familiarize students with school routines and expectations, American culture, the community, and the U. S.? |  |  |
| Does the program help orient the families to the new environment by arranging family events, encouraging parents to take adult ESL classes, and helping families link up to social and health services, for example? |  |  |
| Are there structured activities to ensure that newcomers interact with English speaking students (either other ELLs of higher English proficiency or native English speakers)? |  |  |
| Is there an articulated transition plan for moving students through the language development and content courses offered in the program and into the regular programs (ESL, bilingual, or mainstream) available elsewhere in the district? |  |  |
| Are there formative and summative evaluations of the program’s implementation and the students’ progress as well as monitoring the students once they leave the newcomer program? |  |  |
| Does building administration maintain a supportive school-wide climate and supervise teachers and students to ensure quality implementation and improvement? |  |  |
| Are positive interactions among students facilitated by the use of strategies such as cooperative learning? |  |  |
| Are general characteristics of effective schools incorporated into the program, such as qualified personnel and home-school collaboration? |  |  |
| Are newcomer teachers part of learning communities at the school that can be used to enhance agency and capacity for maintaining/improving the program? |  |  |
| **Use of Languages** |
| Is instruction in English? (*native language supports may be provided when appropriate and possible*) |  |  |
| or | or | |
| Is instruction in English and the native language for sufficiently sized groups of a single native language? |  |  |
| Are other native language resources provided (audio books, broadcasts, podcasts, multimedia) when possible? |  |  |

**Section 4: Creating the program model description / narrative**

Use the information from sections 1-3 and the model outline below to create a comprehensive description of the program model(s). Add any information about that program that is not captured in the information and criteria from sections 1-3 (e.g. school names, numbers of teachers, particular instructional programs in use, description of curricula, number of hours of ESL instruction, program contacts)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of program: |  |
| The primary linguistic goals of the instructional program for ELLs in the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ school district (or particular school) are… *(program goals from section 3 including anticipated length of program duration)*  The target population(s) of students for this program is/are… *(include language group, grade(s), ELP level(s), time in U.S. schools, and other distinguishing characteristics such as native language literacy or newcomer status)*  The primary features of the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ program are… *(include as many of the criteria from section 3 under ‘primary program features’ as possible and add any that are not captured in that part of section 3)*  [Elements/Components for Program Success] *(List and elaborate on the elements from section 3 – ‘Elements/Components for Program Success’ in narrative form. For example, if the criteria is “Parent involvement is integral to the program.”, then list that and explain exactly how that is accomplished. Add any other essential program elements that are not captured in the criteria listed in that part of Section 3.)*  [Use of Language] *(Describe the use of language as identified in Section 3 – ‘Use of Language(s)’)* | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of program:** | **Collaborative ESL and General Education** |
| The primary linguistic goals of the instructional program for ELLs in the Wickersham Elementary School are to:   1. provide developmentally appropriate English language instruction tailored for each students’ level of English proficiency in all content classes, 2. develop full English proficiency within 1-5 years depending on the ELLs initial proficiency level, 3. provide effective content instruction while developing English language proficiency, and 4. develop a positive attitude toward the native culture and that of the majority group   The target population for this program is composed of students who are English language learners of multiple language backgrounds and multiple English proficiencies in grades K-6.  There are two primary features of the Collaborative ESL and General Education program. First, it offers ELLs grade-level, core content courses taught in English using instructional strategies that make the content concepts accessible to them and promote the development of academic English. Second, collaboration between ESL and general education staff is central to the program. Unlike standard ESL programs, students are not scheduled for ESL class. The ESL teacher works with the general education teacher to provide language instruction simultaneously with content instruction through general education classes. Collaborative teams are composed of one ESL teacher and two general education teachers, all fully certified in their respective areas. There are a total of six ESL and twelve general education teachers in the building.  Many elements contribute to the operation of collaborative ESL and general education. The building administration is fully committed to the success of the program and maintains a supportive school-wide climate. Collaborative teams of teachers are provided with one hour each day to collaborate and high-quality professional development to support meaningful and effective collaboration. Collaborative teams establish and maintain an explicit shared understanding of their roles and responsibilities within the team. The principal attends at least one collaboration period every two weeks to get feedback and address any concerns or needs in order to ensure quality implementation and improvement of the program.  There is a comprehensive system in place to monitor students’ language proficiency progress. This system consists of periodic benchmark assessments, teacher developed assessments, and results from the annual summative language proficiency assessment. This information is used to shape instruction on an ongoing basis, inform parents of students’ progress, develop and implement language interventions when necessary, and, along with evaluations from district and state administrators, used to evaluate the effectiveness of the program.  The instructional program and strategies in the classroom are based on sound research regarding second language acquisition. Rich language input that is comprehensible, interesting and of high quality is provided to each student, based on his/her language proficiency, in all content areas. Language needs are given the same priority as the content in collaborative classrooms. For each lesson, both content and a language objectives are established and each is evaluated to ensure that it has been met by all students.  Since ELLs in the collaborative classrooms speak many native languages, all instruction is conducted in English. However, native language supports are provided for students to the greatest extent possible when needed. These might include native language texts to supplement English texts or clarify key concepts for students who would benefit from this support. It may also include other native language resources such as audio books, broadcasts, and multimedia.  Parent involvement is integral to the program’s success. Parents are kept informed of their students’ progress as well as important school events and functions through mailings and phone calls. Translations and interpreters are provided for parents when needed. Additionally, there is an ELL parent advisory in the district that all parents of ELLs are invited to join at the time of enrollment. The advisory meets quarterly or as needed to offer input to school administration on topics of concern or to plan other parent functions.  The program coordinator is Dr. Walsh who works in the central administration building. She can be reached at 555-1212 or by e-mail at [pwalsh@lsd.k12.edu](mailto:pwalsh@lsd.k12.edu). | |