

Dr. Virginia P. Rojas

**West Windsor-
Plainsboro
Regional School
District Report**



Bilingual & ESL Program 2009

Table of Contents

Session	Materials	Page
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
	✓ COMMENDATIONS	3
	✓ RECOMMENDATIONS	4
	PREFACE & BACKGROUND INFORMATION	6
	ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS & KEY ISSUES	8
	✓ PROGRAM STRUCTURE	9
	✓ ASSESSMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY	17
	✓ CURRICULUM	19
	✓ INSTRUCTION	20
	✓ PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	22
	✓ FAMILY & COMMUNITY	23
APPENDIX A	REFERENCES	25
APPENDIX B	CONSULTANT BIOGRAPHY	29
APPENDIX C	WW-P PROGRAM REVIEW SCHEDULE	30
APPENDIX D	ESL/ BE PROGRAM RATING SCALE	31
APPENDIX E	ELL/ DI CLASSROOM OBSERVATION	40
APPENDIX F	UBD & DI SELF-ASSESSMENT	45

Executive Summary

A comprehensive report details the commendations and recommendations of this summary:

Commendations

1. West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District is commended for its solicitation of this linguistic audit showing their commitment to the implementation of exemplary language-in-education policies, programs, and practices.
2. West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District is commended for the assignment of a Supervisor to oversee the ESL and Bilingual Program. Doing so indicates the district's intent and commitment to institutionalize the program as the community demography continues to shift toward multilingualism.
3. West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District is commended for the establishment of the ESL and Bilingual Task Force to review the ongoing development and implementation of research-based best practices.
4. West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District is commended for the hiring of sufficient numbers of instructional support teachers over past years and for ensuring that representative language groups are provided with bilingual teachers.
5. West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District is commended for its strong, instructionally effective, and knowledgeable ESL and bilingual staff members. These teachers - each and every one of them - are commended for their dedication and advocacy to the ESL and bilingual students entrusted in their care. It is evident that key staff members have been and continue to be the mainstays of ESL and bilingual program development and implementation in the district. Their work is impressive.
6. West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District is commended for its ongoing provision of instructional materials for its ESL and bilingual programs. It is evident that ESL and bilingual children are provided with

equitable resources to support their learning, including access to technological resources.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District refine its ESL and bilingual program design for the purposes of moving towards whole-district inclusion and ownership of the program and its students and, in so doing, articulate an action plan for program institutionalization in the face of continued demographic shifts in the community and the upcoming retirements of key program leaders. It is recommended that a full-time K-12 ESL and Bilingual Supervisor be appointed in order to focus on program refinement and institutionalization.
2. It is recommended that West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District develop an assessment and accountability action plan as a basis for ESL and bilingual program refinement, curriculum planning and professional development. Specific emphases should be placed on the integration of assessment and accountability into program and curriculum planning and the alignment of student achievement with the New Jersey WIDA ESL and Bilingual Standards,
3. It is recommended that West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District systematically implement a standards-based ESL and bilingual curriculum framework as per the New Jersey WIDA ESL and bilingual standards. It is further recommended that the WIDA benchmarks are eventually integrated into mainstream classrooms in the core subject areas of Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies (as per the spirit of the WIDA standards).
4. It is recommended that West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District administrators and teachers build a repertoire of best instructional practices for its changing student population. Such practices should be grounded in the WIDA benchmarks and should focus on the provision of responsive instructional conditions for linguistically- and culturally-diverse students (i.e. building background knowledge, scaffolding meaning, extending language, and affirming identity); on research-based academic literacy strategies (i.e. vocabulary, reading and writing); and on differentiation of

instruction and assessment using grade-level and standards-based curriculum frameworks.

5. It is recommended that West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District continues to build consensus and professional capacities among administrators and teachers - about who they are, who they service and why, and about the roles of English and the primary languages and cultures of students - and to create equitable language policies and practices to represent the changing demography of the district. The results of the ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale - though limited - demonstrate a range of perceptions which exist among administrators and teachers regarding current program services (see Appendix D). Similarly, the meeting with district administrators evidenced disparate understandings of district ESL and bilingual program delivery models.

6. It is recommended that West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District establishes a structure for ongoing focus groups with students, parents and community members as its demographic nature continues to shift in the coming years. The focus groups should include all representative linguistic and cultural groups (including monolingual English groups).

Preface and Background Information

The major aim of the two-day visit to West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District (WW-P) was to conduct a linguistic audit of the bilingual and ESL program. Time was spent meeting with representative bilingual and ESL teachers and district administrators to gather information on community demographics, program delivery models, and related curricula issues. A very few classrooms were visited in order to observe the program in action, and focus groups sessions were held with high school students who have excelled or are currently enrolled in the program. The consultant met with the ESL and Bilingual Review Committee consisting of teachers, administrators, and a Board of Education member and with a group of representative parents. ESL and bilingual program descriptions and documents outlining the perceptions of what ESL and bilingual teachers identified as program needs were provided for this consultant's subsequent review. The results of the ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale provided by the consultant were returned for analysis (see Appendix D for results). My time in the district was extremely limited and I have therefore concentrated on those factors which I feel are of the greatest significance and about which I am sure there has been and will continue to be dialogue.

WW-P School District is one which over the years has experienced a demographic shift in its school population. Specifically, the district has seen an increase in the numbers of ESL and bilingual students and forecasts further growth in the coming decade. The ESL and bilingual programs services four major language groups; that is, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Spanish. While specific demographic data was not provided to the consultant, the ESL and bilingual Supervisor commented that predictions show less Spanish-speaking students but more Asians enrolling; namely, students from India and Pakistan. While it is true that many of these students may use English in addition to their primary languages in their homes, it is important not to over-generalize their academic English proficiency or to under-estimate their linguistic and cultural diversity. Clearly, WW-P schools have to prepare their schools for this changing demography.

WW-P School District is commended for appointing a part-time Supervisor and for establishing an ESL and Bilingual Task Force to oversee this work. Task Force members - including teachers, Principals, the appointed Supervisor, and a Board of Education member - are clear in their desire to establish models of teaching and learning grounded in ESL and bilingual theories and research. Moreover, they strongly support the principle of *all* teachers as teachers of ESL and bilingual students as the district demographic patterns change and the ESL

and bilingual enrollment increases. The WW-P administration is commended for its vision, focus, inspirational lead and strategic direction to further develop a language education program which is research-based, academically engaging, data-driven, instructionally focused, and learner-centered. WW-P is commended for the timeliness of soliciting this linguistic audit in order to further the development of the ESL and bilingual program.

As is often the case with support programs, key staff members have been and continue to be instrumental in the development of the ESL and bilingual program. The results of their work is impressive: the establishment of magnet programs at five elementary schools to house ESL and bilingual programs strands for Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Spanish student populations and the establishment of comprehensive ESL Sheltered Programs and bilingual tutorials at Community Middle School and High School South. As is also typical in the evolution of ESL and bilingual support programs, the program originated as one in which ESL and bilingual teachers were hired to address the needs of second language students; specifically, students are pulled out for English- or primary-language instruction and, as they acquire more English proficiency, are fully integrated into mainstream classrooms. WW-P foresees that as the student population continues to diversify, so too must program and service delivery. Rather than rely on the model of ESL and bilingual teachers being exclusively responsible for second language students, WW-P is beginning to shift towards more inclusive models which encourages all teachers to have ownership for the language acquisition and academic attainment of their second language student population. In this model, a collaborative and inclusive ESL and bilingual program and curriculum takes precedence and, as a result, language education specialists and mainstream teachers work together to support second language acquisition and academic achievement as a part of rather than apart from the mainstream environment.

WW-P ESL and bilingual teachers are commended for their outstanding advocacy and commitment to ensuring the linguistic and academic rights of second language students. It is obvious that the historical evolution of the program has been driven by this dedication, and as a result, students have had a supportive and safe environment upon their entrance to the district's schools. Specialist teachers are aware that ESL and bilingual students must feel linguistically and academically secure while accessing mainstream curriculum, and several mainstream initiatives came to the attention of this consultant while visiting campuses. At Town Center School, the ESL teacher collaborates with a kindergarten teacher to support the ESL and bilingual students who now represent the linguistic and cultural majority in the class. In-class bilingual support is provided in a seventh-grade Science class at

Community Middle School by Chinese, Japanese, and Korean teachers. Finally, ESL World History and American Studies classes at High School South are co-taught by a mainstream Social Studies teacher and an ESL teacher. All of these initiatives are in keeping with professional research and practice and are positioning WW-P for the eventual implementation of an inclusive and collaborative ESL and bilingual program model.

The remainder of this report focuses on ways to further these efforts. It is highly probable that in the next decade, linguistically- and culturally-diverse students will continue to increase in WW-P schools to the point that they may one day be the majority rather than the minority of students. Preparing mainstream programs and teachers for this demographic reality is essential. This report posits questions and puts forth recommendations based on observations, the academic literature, and a professional perspective gained from working with a significant number of ESL and dual-language programs around the globe as well as with linguistically-diverse districts in the US as an ASCD faculty member.

Essential Questions and Key Issues

It is within this spirit of renewal that I propose the following questions to West Windsor-Plainsboro Regional School District for continued reflection:

1. How can all aspects of the ESL and bilingual program structure continue to evolve to achieve the goals of additive bilingualism, biliteracy, and the attainment of grade-level academic expectations? How can the ESL and bilingual program be institutionalized to address the needs of the changing demography and to ensure equity for all groups? How can the planning process include all stakeholders?
2. How can the ESL and bilingual program create and maintain an infrastructure that supports an assessment and accountability process designed to generate multiple data for program accountability and improvement, curriculum planning, and professional development? How can assessment be used as a cornerstone to connect the work of second language and mainstream classrooms?
3. How can the ESL and bilingual program fully articulate a high-quality, standards-based and assessment-driven curriculum which is vertically and horizontally aligned within the program as well as with the mainstream core-

subject areas of English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies as per the spirit of the WIDA ESL and bilingual standards? How can this curriculum work facilitate the preparation of mainstream teachers to comfortably *own* linguistically- and culturally-diverse students?

4. How can responsive ESL and bilingual instruction extend into mainstream classrooms in ways that meet the needs of English native speakers, English-proficient speakers, and multilingual students of the district? How can the fact that responsive ESL and bilingual instruction is grounded in best practices for all students be made explicit to academic leaders and mainstream teachers?
5. How can the ESL and bilingual program provide a long-term quality professional development program which expands all administrators' and teachers' knowledge about and capacities for supporting second language education?
6. How can the ESL and bilingual program continue to develop a responsive infrastructure for positive, active, and sustained relations with students' families and the community?

ESL and Bilingual Program Structure

Studies of effective ESL and bilingual programs conclusively demonstrate that high-quality programs have a cohesive, district-wide shared vision committed to the goals of additive bilingualism and inclusiveness as well as articulated grade-level expectations for academic achievement. Undoubtedly, the ESL and bilingual teachers and the ESL and Bilingual Task Force members endorse these goals. Less apparent is a shared vision among checklist respondents about the nature and delivery of the program (see the ESL and Bilingual Rating Scale item #1, 4, 5, 6, 7, & 8 in Appendix D). Observations made by the consultant and discussions with school leaders, teachers, parents and students similarly indicate ambiguity about the goals and structure of the ESL and bilingual program.

First, it seems that there is a perception that the program is inclusive in nature when, in reality, the program is more exclusive. The following chart summarizes the amount of instructional time that ESL and bilingual students with

	<p>High school ESL and Sheltered Instruction ESL Content Classes (all students in classes are ESL)</p>	<p>ESL Level I in 60- or 120-minute class periods for Language Arts (depending on schedule)</p> <p>ESL Levels II & III in 60-minute class periods for Language Arts (depending on schedule)</p> <p>ESL Levels I, II, & III in 60-minute class period for ESL Writing (depending on schedule)</p> <p>ESL Levels I, II, & III in 60-minute class period for ESL Writing (depending on schedule)</p> <p>ESL Science I Earth & Physical Science for ESL Level I students</p> <p>ESL Science II Biology for ESL Levels II & III students</p> <p>ESL World History for ninth grade ESL students co-taught by a Social Studies and ESL teacher</p> <p>American Studies I & II for tenth grade ESL students co-taught by a Social Studies and ESL teacher</p>
--	---	---

		<p>Language Arts I transition class for grades nine through 12 ESL students exited from ESL Language Arts</p> <p>Bilingual/ Study Skills in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Spanish for 60-minute</p>
Inclusive provision	<p><u>Elementary school</u> Push-in support</p> <p><u>Middle school</u> Push-in support for 7th grade Science only</p>	<p>A few ESL teachers work inside mainstream classrooms using scaffolding or sheltered instructional strategies, enabling access to grade-level standards in afternoons</p> <p>In-class support in Science provided by bilingual teachers (Japanese, Korean, & Chinese)</p>

The historical evolution of the WW-P ESL and bilingual program seems to mirror that of other programs in the US in that it is *medical* in its origin. A special program was created for non-English background students who needed to *be fixed* by specialists or protected from mainstream classrooms, very similar to the Special Education program models of the past. The underlying premise of this separate program is that students' lack of English proficiency is an obstacle which needs to be overcome before they can participate in mainstream classrooms. In this kind of model, mainstream teachers do not always envision as their

responsibility any need to modify or differentiate the classroom environment to accommodate ESL or bilingual students since it is often perceived as the exclusive responsibility of the ESL and bilingual specialists to make students fit into a sort of 'one size fits all' instructional model. The current move in Special Education, ESL and even mainstream classroom instruction is shifting away from this model as evidenced in the current emphases on differentiated instruction as well as developmental or process-oriented instructional approaches (e.g. developmental reading and writing processes). This shift focuses more on the *ecology* of the learning environment; that is, the mainstream classroom using instructional tasks, strategies, assessments, and materials that are managed by teachers to support varying learning needs of students in order to help them meet identified expectations. Research indicates that many of the effective practices used in academic classrooms to deepen the understandings and skills of diverse mainstream students are very similar to effective ESL and bilingual practices. Building the mutual capacities of mainstream and ESL and bilingual teachers focuses on supporting the needs of linguistically- and culturally-diverse students as one particular group of learners within the mainstream environment.

The intent of the New Jersey WIDA ESL and bilingual standards is to provide K-12 ESL students access to content comparable to their English-proficient peers (note: New Jersey is one of nineteen states to adopt these standards for ESL and bilingual programs). Across the US, many states are in the process of reconfiguring their ESL programs towards this end; that is, they are implementing an array of more inclusive ESL and bilingual models and training teachers - mainstream and specialists alike - in responsive instructional conditions for second language students. The more that ESL and bilingual expectations are aligned with grade-level mainstream classrooms and the more that ESL and bilingual students have access to those classrooms, the more the ESL and bilingual program can easily and equitably support ESL and bilingual students' eventual access to and success in mainstream academic programs.

An ESL and bilingual program conceived within an inclusive framework does not view non-English proficient students as remedial or structurally position the program separately; rather, ESL students are viewed as assets to the academic capital of a school and the ESL and bilingual program as the foundation for a linguistically- and culturally-diverse community. An inclusive ESL and bilingual program philosophy steers clear of past learning-support approaches to emphasize the centrality of language to all learning and the ways in which this is best accomplished. The conceptual clarity and vitality of how languages are acquired in school settings - how long they take, what the processes look and sound like along

the way, and what is the responsibility of each and every member of a school staff to enhance their attainment - is articulated and assented to in a district-wide vision.

The following recommendations aspire to facilitate a commitment to move towards a more inclusive ESL and bilingual vision and program structure:

1. It is recommended that a language-policy-across-the curriculum be developed in order to commit to the inclusion of linguistically- and culturally-diverse students in WW-P schools. The purpose of the language policy is to create a shared vision and mission to successfully implement language-in-education programs which recognize and embrace the central role that all languages and cultures play in the overall identity of a school district. This work should not be done in isolation but should involve representatives from the World Language Department, English Language Arts, and core subject areas related to the WIDA ESL and bilingual Standards (Math, Science, and Social Studies). The expansion of the ESL and Bilingual Task Force may be a strategic option to successfully accomplish this recommendation.
2. It is recommended that a well-articulated action plan - robust in its content, yet flexible in its structure - is designed and implemented in several phases (i.e. Phase 1: Establishing a K-12 Inclusive Framework for ESL and Bilingual Programs, Phase 2: Determining the Implementation of Specific ESL and Bilingual Program Elements, Phase 3: Implementing the ESL and Bilingual Plan, and Phase 4: Reviewing and Revising the Plan). The plan should address recommendations made in this report as well as current academic literature.
3. It is recommended that a shift towards a more inclusive ESL and bilingual program in the elementary schools be supported.
 - a. It is recommended that ESL teachers are supported to attend grade-level team planning meetings and to offer more in-class instruction in addition to the 40-minute pullout sessions.
 - b. It is recommended that the bilingual program should consider moving towards two-way dual language programs which involve native-English background students who acquire the target language in the same classrooms where bilingual students receive primary-language instruction. If given the choice, it is possible that English-background parents would welcome the opportunity for their children to acquire

- Chinese, Japanese, Korean, or Spanish in two-way dual-language programs.
- c. It is recommended that the practices of placing beginning ESL students with younger students or grouping fourth and fifth grade ESL and bilingual students together in the same mainstream classroom for the purposes of more in-class support immediately discontinue (note: it is unclear whether or not these practices are still occurring).
 - d. Finally, it is recommended that the ESL teacher-student ratio be distributed equitably.
4. It is recommended that a shift towards a more inclusive ESL and bilingual program in the middle school be supported.
- a. It is recommended that the ESL and bilingual program standardize its offerings since the current program is uneven (e.g. no in-class support for Science in sixth or eighth grades and no ESL support for social Studies in eighth grade).
 - b. It is recommended that sheltered ESL courses are taught either by a certified Social Studies teacher who is trained in ESL strategies or by a co-teaching arrangement with an ESL or bilingual teacher and a Social Studies teacher (i.e. currently this class is taught by ESL teachers not certified in Social Studies).
 - c. It is recommended that mainstream teachers in Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies are provided with training in ESL and bilingual instruction so that the growing number of ESL and bilingual students can be distributed into mainstream classrooms rather than exclusively separated into ESL and bilingual classrooms.
 - d. It is recommended that the ESL and bilingual teachers are positioned to push into mainstream content classrooms more often to effectively coach students and teachers as needed for responsive instruction and assessment.
 - e. It is recommended that ESL Levels I, II, and III are combined for the dual purpose of freeing up ESL teachers to work with mainstream classrooms as well as to model differentiated instruction within the ESL and bilingual program.
 - f. Finally, it is recommended that the bilingual program consider moving towards two-way dual language programs as an option for second language instruction for English-background and non-English background students alike.

5. It is recommended that a shift towards a more inclusive ESL and bilingual program in the high school be supported.
 - a. It is recommended that the ESL and bilingual program redefine its sheltered program offerings in ways which allow students access to their English-proficient peers in mainstream classrooms (note: focus groups discussions with ESL and bilingual students indicated that they perceive the ESL sheltered classes as too easy and that they feel marginalized socially from their peers).
 - b. It is recommended that mainstream teachers in Language Arts, Mathematics, Science (including Health), and Social Studies are provided with training in ESL and bilingual instruction so that the growing number of ESL and bilingual students can be distributed into sheltered mainstream classrooms rather than exclusively separated into sheltered ESL and bilingual classrooms.
 - c. It is recommended that the ESL and bilingual teachers are positioned to push into mainstream content classrooms more often to effectively coach students and teachers as needed.
 - d. It is recommended that The ESL Writing and Reading classes be eliminated for the dual purpose of freeing up the time of ESL teachers to support students in mainstream classrooms and of reemphasizing the need for all high school teachers to be teachers of content-based reading and writing skills for all students.
 - e. Finally, it is recommended that the bilingual study skills class consider moving towards two-way dual language classes as an option for second language instruction for English-background and non-English background students alike.

6. It is recommended that a full-time K-12 ESL and Bilingual Supervisor be appointed with the following responsibilities: oversight of program model development, planning, and coordination; vertical and horizontal articulation of the K-12 ESL and bilingual program; leadership, program advocacy and communication; assessment and accountability; the development of a curriculum scope, sequence and alignment with the NJ WIDA ESL and bilingual standards; instructional supervision; and the implementation of recommendations accepted from this report.

ESL and Bilingual Assessment and Accountability

Studies of effective ESL and bilingual programs conclusively demonstrate that high-quality programs collect a variety of data - using standardized and classroom-based assessments - for program accountability and instructional improvement. WW-P ESL teachers administer the standardized assessment test ACCESS (i.e. an English-language proficiency test developed by the WIDA Consortium) for ESL and bilingual program-entry and exit-criteria on designated home campuses and for the purpose of NCLB accountability (note: it is unclear whether the Idea Proficiency Test is still being used as well). The consultant was not provided with additional information but is assuming that WW-P utilizes other standardized instruments to measure ESL and bilingual students' academic achievement in addition to their English-language proficiency (i.e. assumptions are based on the ESL and Bilingual Rating Scale responses for items #9, 13, 14 and 23 in Appendix D).

With the advent of inclusive ESL and bilingual programs, the emphasis on students' achievement on grade-level standards and benchmarks is broadening. The changing ESL and bilingual paradigm is in tandem with changes in the ways in which all students are to be assessed within the standards movement; specifically, through the use of classroom-based performance assessments. In this framework, an analysis of curricula expectations determines what is to be considered evidence of attainment. The use of classroom-based assessments to expand upon the collection of standardized data clearly delineates the roles and responsibilities of ESL and mainstream teachers in an inclusive and content-based ESL program and curriculum. Moreover, the use of classroom-based assessments by bilingual teachers allows consistent collection of standards-based data in the two languages.

Ultimately, the collection of performance assessments scored against the WIDA standards and benchmarks serves as contextual evidence that ESL and bilingual students have access to and are able to show evidence of attaining grade-level subject-area benchmarks in either of the two languages. This organized, systematic collection of critical evidence - in addition to the aforementioned standardized measures - constitutes a comprehensive portfolio-based assessment system which can be used for any or all of the following purposes:

- ✓ a tool to solidify collaborative instructional support for ESL and bilingual students;
- ✓ a tool to monitor students' progress and plan the transition of students out of the ESL and bilingual program;

- ✓ a tool to provide evidence of ESL and bilingual students' attainment of grade-level expectations in order to provide an equitable framework for feedback and reporting;
- ✓ a tool to provide critical data for related-learning issues; namely, identifying ESL and bilingual students who may also have learning needs;
- ✓ a tool to collect data for program evaluation and improvement;
- ✓ a tool to provide a principled basis for focused professional development; and ultimately,
- ✓ a tool to reaffirm to teachers and community members that the presence of ESL and bilingual students does not negatively impact upon the community's educational standards.

The following recommendations are intended to solidify the ESL and bilingual program assessment and accountability process:

1. It is recommended that the ESL and bilingual program institutionalize the use of electronic portfolios as per the discussion above to collect standards-based evidence of ESL and bilingual students' language proficiency and academic achievement. Doing so requires that ESL and bilingual teachers align the WIDA ESL and bilingual standards and benchmarks with grade-level core subject-area standards and benchmarks as the basis for data collection. No other assessment system can accommodate as wide a range of learners' skills as found in a multilingual setting, make as much sense of the learning process when it is potentially confounded by the second language acquisition process, or demonstrate learning and achievement more accurately than a comprehensive standards-based assessment framework.
2. It is recommended that reporting and feedback be systematically grounded in this portfolio process. One of the biggest concerns voiced by high school students and mainstream teachers as well as ESL and bilingual parents involved the issue of equitable grading.
3. It is recommended that specific assessment concepts become pervasive in all WW-P classrooms in order to facilitate the connection of assessment to grade-level curriculum expectations and instruction as well as the connections between inclusive ESL/ bilingual and mainstream classrooms. These are: (a) assessment-driven instruction or planning the instructional process backwards toward the attainment of grade level formative and summative assessments, (b) differentiated assessments or using multiple

forms of assessments offering a wide variety of ways for diverse learners to show what they know and can do, and (c) the use of self-assessments or the involvement of students in analyzing their own work.

ESL and Bilingual Curriculum

Studies of effective ESL and bilingual programs conclusively demonstrate that successful programs have a curriculum which has the following characteristics:

- ✓ It is aligned with the vision and goals of bilingualism, biliteracy and multiculturalism;
- ✓ It is clearly aligned with grade-level standards and assessment;
- ✓ It is horizontally and vertically aligned;
- ✓ It is meaningful, academically challenging and incorporates higher order thinking;
- ✓ It is enriched rather than remedial; and
- ✓ It incorporates a variety of materials and integrates technology.

The WIDA ESL and bilingual standards are intended to provide such a curriculum framework. Currently, it does not seem that the WIDA framework is consistently used in the ESL and bilingual program in WW-P (as per discussions with ESL and bilingual teachers and the ESL and Bilingual Rating Scale responses for items #5 and 12 in Appendix D).

These standards do not stand alone as did traditional ESL and bilingual frameworks but rather connect second language acquisition to academic subject areas. They provide ESL and bilingual students immediate access to challenging, grade-level content and create a concrete vision of academic success by describing the language proficiencies needed to attain the same high-level content area standards as English-proficient students. The five standards are:

1. English language learners communicate for social, intercultural and instructional purposes within the school setting;
2. English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the area of *language arts*;
3. English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the area of *mathematics*;
4. English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the area of *science*; and
5. English language learners communicate information, ideas, and concepts necessary for academic success in the area of *social studies*.

The expanded scope of these standards concentrates on developing academic language proficiency through academic content areas. Obvious is the expectation that ESL and bilingual students are prepared with the type of language features and skills needed to carry out grade-level, mainstream academic tasks. The traditional ESL and bilingual curriculum shifts away from the teaching of discrete and disconnected language skills on social topics to the use of language skills embodied in subject-area outcomes. For example, the use of a linguistic feature or appropriate vocabulary qualifies as *skills* about a particular content area (e.g. using the past tense to retell historical events, future tense to hypothesize the outcomes of a scientific investigation, descriptive adjectives for characterization in a literature circle discussion, and expository connectives to explain the solutions to math problems).

The following recommendations are intended to facilitate the implementation of the WIDA ESL and bilingual curriculum framework as the basis for sustained collaboration between ESL/ bilingual and mainstream classrooms:

1. It is recommended that a curriculum development and implementation plan that is connected to the WIDA standards and is aligned with grade-level core subject area standards is put into action under the direction of the recommended K-12 ESL and Bilingual Supervisor.
 - a. It is recommended that this curriculum is coordinated within and across grade levels within the ESL and bilingual program as well as cross-referenced with the mainstream core subject areas (Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies).

ESL and Bilingual Instruction

Studies of effective ESL and bilingual programs conclusively demonstrate that a variety of instructional strategies to promote comprehension are used for different learning styles and language proficiency levels, that instructional tasks are challenging enough to promote high levels of language development and critical thinking skills, that the two languages of instruction are appropriately separated according to program design, that cooperative learning is used to facilitate verbal interaction and genuine dialogue among students, and that foster positive interactions between teachers and students and among students. Observations of ESL and bilingual classrooms provided evidence of these characteristics as did responses for items #15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 24 on the ESL and Bilingual Rating Scale in Appendix D). One of the essential questions put forth at the

beginning of this report, however, was how to extend these capacities to mainstream classrooms in order to accommodate the increasing numbers of linguistically- and culturally-diverse students and to move towards and to institutionalize responsive ESL and bilingual instructional practices.

Enabling ESL and bilingual students to meet the WIDA grade-level and content-based standards calls for all teachers' increased instructional capacities. ESL and bilingual teachers, for example, may not have training to support students in all content areas as required in inclusive ESL and bilingual programs. In fact, only recently have ESL and bilingual teacher preparation courses focused on the design of content-based curriculum and instruction. Likewise, mainstream teachers in general lack the training to help linguistically- and culturally-diverse students succeed academically. Teachers' capacities to provide one curriculum together must be seamless in order to enable ESL and bilingual students do what they might not otherwise be able to do without the mutual support.

The value of responsive instructional strategies for ESL and bilingual students is that they do not change the complexity of what is to be learned but rather breaks it into manageable parts for students. Teachers who are trained in the use of ESL and bilingual instruction acquire the capacity to help students accomplish tasks within their ranges of language acquisition and in ways that move them progressively forward. Teachers also learn to monitor ESL and bilingual students' transfer of developing proficiencies as a result of specific strategies; otherwise, neither they nor their students will have evidence of what can be done that couldn't be done before in academic contexts.

As students increase their English proficiency, however, strategies used by ESL and bilingual teachers are not enough to address the students' academic literacy skills and conceptual understandings. This work ultimately requires all teachers to have a repertoire of academic literacy tools in all subject areas as well as instructional capacities for differentiating materials, tasks, strategies, and student groupings while maintaining the same expectations for all students and for integrating technology into daily lessons. The rigor of a curriculum is not so much in the expectations but rather in the instructional capacities of teachers to connect student learning to curriculum expectations where, given ample support, all are will succeed.

The following recommendations intend to build the instructional capacities of WW-P teachers to simultaneously address the needs of native English, English proficient, and non-English proficient students in an inclusive ESL and bilingual program:

1. It is recommended that WW-P ESL/ bilingual and mainstream teachers be supported to expand their repertoire of instructional tools for linguistically- and culturally-diverse students' successful completion of instructional learning experiences and assessment tasks expected in grade-level academic programs.
 - a. It is recommended that these instructional tools include specific ESL and bilingual strategies to build background knowledge, scaffold meaning, extend language, and affirm identity; research-based literacy strategies to build academic vocabulary and reading comprehension and genre-based writing skills; and differentiation strategies to provide access to ESL and bilingual students to academic content while they are in the process of acquiring English.
2. It is recommended that WW-P district administrators build the expectations of "*all teachers as teachers of all learners*" into current staff hiring and retention procedures in order to institutionalize responsive ESL and bilingual instruction. To do so, it is recommended that WW-P articulate standards for teachers which describe levels of acceptable performance; that is, a rubric for teachers (refer to www.nbpts.org for what is expected of K-12 teachers to obtain English as a New Language National Board Certification and checklists in Appendices E and F of this booklet).

ESL and Bilingual Professional Development

Studies of effective ESL and bilingual programs conclusively demonstrate that the quality of its staff correlates with appropriate teaching certification; knowledge of subject matter, curriculum and technology; and repertoire of responsive instructional strategies. As such, it is imperative that WW-P commit to a comprehensive professional development plan which has a sustained goal of preparing administrator and teachers for the unprecedented knowledge and skills necessary to take on the changes recommended in this report (as per responses on items #10, 11, and 25 in the ESL and Bilingual Rating Scale in Appendix D).

Towards this end, the following recommendations are put forth:

1. It is recommended that WW-P sponsors an administrative retreat on the subject of ESL and bilingual education in or to develop a consensual vision, collaborate and make decisions regarding the refinement of the program as

per the recommendations of this report. The retreat affords the opportunity to recommit to and set the direction of an inclusive program.

2. It is recommended that a professional learning community consisting of administrators, ESL and bilingual staff, mainstream teachers, World Language teachers, and language-related specialists be established under the direction of the full-time K-12 ESL and Bilingual Supervisor to design a long-term professional development plan which is inclusive, focused, and intensive. Examples of possible formats for getting this work done can be investigated on www.ncds.org and www.aisr.brown.edu (e.g. study groups, data analysis, lesson study, collaborative assessment conferences, peer coaching).
 - a. It is recommended that the protocols are selected with a critical eye on their impact of transferring into mainstream classroom practices as well as their alignment with the expectations of the aforementioned teacher-expectation rubric.
 - b. It is recommended that WW-P participates in regional or world-wide school reform consortia using virtual networks, e-mail, listservs, and bulletin boards to connect with other professional learning communities.
3. It is recommended that the long-term roles and responsibilities of ESL and bilingual teachers be envisioned not only to support students but in months and years ahead to support collaborating mainstream teachers. The more ESL/ bilingual and mainstream teachers work together, the more mainstream teachers will be comfortable in taking ownership for linguistically- and culturally-diverse students. Ultimately, the more instructionally responsive classrooms are, the greater the impact on *all* students' learning.

ESL and Bilingual Family & Community

Studies of effective ESL and bilingual programs conclusively demonstrate that a responsive infrastructure exists for positive, active, and sustained relations with students' families and the community. As such, the following recommendations are put forth:

1. It is recommended that ongoing focus groups be used to gather information and input from students, parents, and community members (native English,

English proficient, and non-English proficient alike) under the direction of the K-12 ESL and Bilingual Supervisor.

2. It is recommended that the ESL and bilingual program incorporates ongoing parent education designed to help parents understand, support, and advocate for the quality education of the increasing linguistically- and culturally-diverse student population of the district.

Selected References

August, D. & Shanahan, T. (Eds.) (2006). Developing Literacy in Second-Language Learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baetens Beardsmore, H. (1986). (2nd Ed.). Bilingualism: Basic Principles, College Hill Press.

Baker, C. (1995). A Parent's and Teacher's Guide to Bilingualism, Multilingual Matters.

Baldwin, A. Y. (Ed.) (2004). Culturally Diverse and Underserved Populations of Gifted Students, Corwin Press.

Carrasquillo, A.L. & Rodriguez, V. (2003). (2nd Ed.). Language Minority Students in the Mainstream Classroom, Multilingual Matters.

Carrera-Carrillo. L. & Rickert Smith, A. (2006). Seven Steps to Success in Dual Language Immersion: A Brief Guide for Teachers & Administrators, Heinemann.

Cazden, C. (2001). Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning, Heinemann.

Clegg, J. (Ed.). (1996). Mainstreaming ESL: Case Studies in Integrating ESL into the Mainstream Curriculum, Multilingual Matters.

Cloud, N., Genessee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2009). Literacy Instruction for English Language Learners: A Teacher's Guide to Research-Based Best Practice, Heinemann.

Cloud, N. Genessee, F. & Hamayan, E. (2000). Dual Language Instruction: A Handbook for Instruction, Heinle & Heinle.

Collier, V.P. (1995). Promoting Academic Success for ESL Students: Understanding Second Language for School, NJTESOL/BE, (available from Bastos Book Co., P.O. Box 433, Woodside, NY 11377).

Corson, D. (1999). Language Policy in Schools: A Resource for Teachers and Administrators, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Crawford, J. & Krashen, S. (2007). English Learners in American Classrooms: 101 Questions, 101 Answers, Scholastic.

Cummins, J. & Davison, C. (2007). (Eds.). International Handbook of English Language Education, Springer Publications.

Cummins, J. Brown, K., & Sayers, D. (2007). Literacy, Technology, and Diversity: Teaching for Success in Changing Times, Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

Echevarria, J., Short, D. J., & Vogt, M. (2008). Implementing THE SIOP MODEL Through Effective Professional Development and Coaching, Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades, National Center for Education Evaluation and Assistance, US Department of Education, July 2007.

English as a New Language: Standards for National Board Certification, (1996 Draft). National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Freeman, R. (2004). Building on Community Bilingualism: Promoting Multilingualism Through Schooling, Caslon Publishing.

Garcia, G. (2005). Teaching and Learning in Two Languages: Bilingualism and Schooling in the United States, Teachers College Press.

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (Eds.) (2006). Educating English Language Learners: Synthesis of Research Evidence, Cambridge University Press.

Gersten, R., Baker, S. K., Shanahan, T., Linan-Thompson, S., & Scarcella, R. (2007). Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in Elementary Grades, U. S. Department of Education.

Gibbons, P. (2009). English Learners Academic Literacy and Thinking: Learning in the Challenge Zone, Heinemann.

Gottlieb, M. & Nguyen, D. (2007). Assessment and Accountability in Language Education Programs, Caslon Publishing.

Gottlieb, M. (2006). Assessing English Language Learners: Bridges from Language Proficiency to Academic Achievement, Corwin Press.

Hamayan, E. & Freeman, R. (2006). English Language Learners at School: A Guide for Administrators, Caslon Publishing.

Herrera, S. G. , Murry, K. G. & Morales-Cabral, R. M. (2007). Assessment Accommodations for Classroom Teachers of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students, Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

Hill, J. D. & Flynn, K. M. (2006). Classroom Instruction that Works with English Language Learners, ASCD.

Hinkel, E. (Ed.). (2004). Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning, Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Houk, F. A. (2005). Supporting English Language Learners: A Guide for Teachers and Administrators, Heinemann.

Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., & Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K., J. Rogers, D. (2nd Ed.). (2007). Guiding Principles for Dual Language Education, Center for Applied Linguistics.

Lachat, M.A. (2004). Standards-Based Instruction and Assessment for English Language Learners, Corwin Press.

Rojas, V.P. (2007). Strategies for Success with English Language Learners: An ASCD Action Tool, ASCD.

Rothenberg, C. & Fisher, D. (2007). Teaching English Language Learners: A Differentiated Approach, Pearson Merrill/ Prentice Hall.

Schechter, S.R. & Cummins, J. (Eds.). (2003). Multilingual Education in Practice: Using Diversity as a Resource, Heinemann.

Short, D. J. & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). Double The Work: Challenges and Solutions to Acquiring Language and Academic Literacy for Adolescent English Language Learners - A Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Alliance for Excellent Education.

Tomlinson, C.A. & McTighe, J. (2006). Integrating Differentiated Instruction and Understanding By Design, ASCD.

Tokuhama-Espinosa, T. (Ed.) (2003). The Multilingual Mind: Issues Discussed By, For, and About People Living with Many Languages, Praeger.

Verplaetse, L. S. & Migliacci, N. (2007). Inclusive Pedagogy for English Language Learners, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Young, T. A. & Hadaway, N. L. (Eds.). (2006). Supporting the Literacy Development of English Language Learners: Increasing Success in All Classrooms, International Reading Association.

Virginia Pauline Rojas, Ed.D.
Language Education Specialist
123 Salem Road
North Brunswick, New Jersey 08902
telephone/ fax 732 940 1860
VPRojas@aol.com

As an ASCD (www.ascd.org) Faculty member and independent consultant, Dr. Rojas conducts professional training on effective programs and strategies for English Language Learners. Dr. Rojas has been and continues to be a featured speaker at national and international conferences and schools throughout the world. This year she is working with international schools in Central and South America, Europe, the Middle East, and Asia as well as with many school districts throughout the US and Canada.

She is recognized for her leadership and her commitment to the development of second language proficiency among school populations, especially within an *inclusionary* and collaborative context. It is her belief that strategies which assist English Language Learners in K-12 settings are beneficial for all learners and that ESL and classroom teachers need to work together to provide seamless language-development and academic achievement programs. This is her message of her 2007 book Strategies for Success with English Language Learners: An ASCD Action Tool published by ASCD.

Dr. Rojas currently teaches for the International Teachers' Training Center (www.thettc.org) in London and Miami during the summers. She was the former associate director of the international graduate program for The College of New Jersey, the former coordinator of the ESL and Bilingual Master's Program at The College of New Jersey, the former director of the Office of International and Language Education for the New Jersey Department of Higher Education, a faculty member of the Program of American Language Studies at Rutgers University, and an ESL/ bilingual teacher in New Brunswick, New Jersey.

She is married to Thomas Matts, an employee of The College Board in NYC where he directs Advanced Placement Assessment.

WW-P ESL/ Bilingual Program Review

Tuesday - May 19, 2009	
9:00	Meet with Ann Breitman, Supervisor at Town Center Elementary School
9:10 - 10:15	Observe ESL and Bilingual Classes at Town Center Elementary School with Marcy Mandell & Angela Tran
10:30 - 11:30	Observe ESL and Bilingual Classes at Community Middle School with Donna Gil, Mary Santiago & Janet Higgins
11:45 - 1:45	Lunch and observe at High School South with Lynn Grodnick
1:45 - 2:45	Meet with Administrators (#7-10) at High School South
2:50 - 4:00	Meet with Content Teachers K-12 (#7-10) at High School South
Wednesday - May 20, 2009	
10:50	Meet with Roseann Zingaro and students (#8-10) who exited the program at High School South
11:50	Meet with students (#8-10) currently in the program at High School South
1:00 - 4:00	Meet with the ESL/ Bilingual Program Review Committee (#5-7) at Millstone River School in Room C103
4:30 - 5:30	Meet with Parent Group (#20-25) at Millstone River School in Room C103

ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale ©VPROjas, 2009

T=teacher response
 A=administrator response
 U=unidentified response

Unresponsive

Most Responsive

1. Bilingualism

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
			1						1		1	2			2	1		1	2	

Ethos of subtractive bilingualism; i.e. students' primary languages perceived as detrimental to language acquisition

Ethos of additive bilingualism; i.e. students' primary languages honored as beneficial to and necessary for language acquisition

2. Linguistic & Cultural Diversity

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
			1			1						1		1	3	1		1	2	

Students' backgrounds and experiences perceived as irrelevant and at times dismissed as inferior; ethos of *invisible* diversity; perceived as one more thing schools have to do

Connection of students' backgrounds and experiences made to bridge development of new concept, knowledge and skills; ethos of *visible* diversity; integral part of what schools already do

3. Parents

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
						1			2		1	2	1		1	2				

Parents perceived as problematic or disinterested; materials and resources scarce; district isolation from c-b organizations

Involvement of parents, especially in development of primary language and home-school connections; materials and resources available; district partnerships with c-b organizations

ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale ©VPROjas, 2009

4. Program Philosophy (medical vs. ecological)

1			2			3			4			5			6			7					
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U			
			1						1			5	1	1	1						1		

ESL/ BE programs are apart from other school programs; ELL perceived as remedial and are expected to be fixed by ESL/ BE specialists: *fixing* can mean that students complete low-level tasks in tiresome contexts

ESL/ BE programs are integrated with other school programs; ecology of school provides a facilitating environment for ELL' language acquisition and academic achievement: students engaged in academically rigorous tasks in low-anxiety contexts by all

5. Mainstream Articulation

1			2			3			4			5			6			7					
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U			
			1			4		1				1	2		1	1							

Little to no articulation between mainstream and English or ESL/ Bilingual programs, curriculum or teachers for planning or reflection

Mainstream and ESL/ bilingual teachers work collaboratively to provide inclusive instruction using one curriculum - from planning through implementation and reflection; time is allotted for these professional learning communities

6. Bilingual Program Delivery Model

1			2			3			4			5			6			7					
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U			
			3			1							2		1	1							

Program is purposefully transitional in nature for one population with the desired goal of movement into English as rapidly as possible; program uses one language consistently more than the other; language usage is mixed during one-language designation periods

Program is accessible to dual populations with the desired goal of bilingualism for all; involves instruction through two languages; involves periods of instruction during which there is only one language used

ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale ©VPROjas, 2009

7. ESL Program Delivery Model

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
1				1		1			2			1	1		1				1	

Hodgepodge or incoherent set of programmatic interventions across schools, divisions, and grades; pull out perceived as necessary to 'fix' kids

Enriched, cognitively challenging program is consistent and coherent across schools, divisions, and grades; a combination of pull out and push in used to promote mutual ownership.

8. Program Expectations

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
						1			1			4	2	1	1				1	

Low expectations for achievement evident in 'watering down' of content, materials or tasks as a means to provide equity

High expectations for achievement evident in providing access to grade-level content, materials, and tasks; equity built into instructional process

9. Program Entry and Exit Practices

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
									2		1	1	2		1			1	1	

A single test score is used to determine entry and exit from programs

Systematic implementation of standardized measures for entrance- and exit- criteria; exit portfolios provide evidence of language proficiency (e.g. four skills) and academic achievement (e.g. WIDA core content areas); portfolios consist of standardized and classroom-based assessments and instrumentation

ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale ©VPROjas, 2009

10. Administrators' Capacities

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
	1		1			1			2	1		1			2	1				

Administrators depend on ESL and Bilingual teachers' knowledge of research on effective instruction/ assessment practices for ELL

Administrators know research on effective instruction/ assessment practices for ELL; knows how to apply this knowledge to support staff in creating and managing responsive learning environments; uses information for decision making

11. Mainstream/ ESL/ BE Teachers & Support Staff Capacities

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
		1	2			3			1	1		1	2							

ESL/ Bilingual teachers and support staff have uneven knowledge and skills for instruction of ELL. Mainstream teachers have significant gaps in their knowledge and skills for instructing ELL.

All teachers & support staff have knowledge of first and second language acquisition and literacy development; knowledge of cross-cultural educational experiences; tools for differentiation and scaffolding materials, instruction for teaching academic content and language, and assessment strategies

12. BE/ ESL Curriculum

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
			1			1	2		3	2		1								

BE/ ESL teachers utilize textbooks as curriculum documents

BE curriculum standards/ benchmarks translated and culturally adjusted from mainstream curriculum documents; ESL curriculum integrates WIDA standards /benchmarks with district content standards/ benchmarks to facilitate access/ transition with mainstream classrooms

ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale ©VPROjas, 2009

13. Classroom-Based Assessments

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
						1			1	1	1	1	1		3	1				

Assessment is conceived of as evaluative; i.e. assessment *of* learning or a single piece of evidence to see 'who got it'; assessments are often selected-response tests of passive knowledge

Assessment is conceived of as informative; i.e. assessment *for* learning so students can show 'what they got' through open-ended performance tasks; teachers can assist learners to 'get more' since tasks are multi-step and require coaching over extended time; formative and summative assessments identified

14. Feedback & Reporting

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
						1			1	1	1	2	1		2	1				

Feedback to students often provided after instruction whereby students are assigned scores based on percentage correct which are averaged over a specified period of time of time for a grade

Feedback to students provided before instruction through qualitative rubrics or checklists/ rating scales which specify performance expectations along with instructional strategies to assist students to attain expectations; achievement grade is based on final level of performance

ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale ©VPROjas, 2009

15. Instructional Planning

1			2			3			4			5			6			7					
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U			
						1			1			2	2	1	2						1		

Instructional plans disconnected from assessment process; strategies might be related to learning targets, might be activities unrelated to specific targets, or might be prescribed from texts; evidence of over-reliance on product orientation

Instruction is planned backwards from assessment tasks in order to target strategies which will enable learners to complete tasks; understanding and use of process orientation of instruction to implement *gradual release of responsibility* to learner

16. Instructional Delivery

1			2			3			4			5			6			7					
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U			
						1			2	1		1		1	2	2		1					

Over-reliance on teacher-centered and whole-class instruction: more often than not it appears that is the teacher who is doing and the 'doing' is through talking; instruction is teacher-directed

Emphasis on learners as makers of meaning and builders of knowledge: instructional strategies are purposefully aligned with skills so that it is the students who are 'doing' and the 'doing' is through the negotiation of meaning; instruction is student-centered

17. Instructional Conditions for ELL

1			2			3			4			5			6			7					
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U			
			1			1			1	1		1			2	1					1		

Use of specific time-honored BE/ ESL instructional approaches, regardless of level or background (e.g. visuals, graphic organizers, linguistic buddies)

Use of specific instructional strategies to activate background knowledge, scaffold meaning, extend language, and affirm identity (i.e. research-based instructional conditions for ELL)

ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale ©VPROjas, 2009

18. Differentiation for ELL

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
						1			2	1		1		1	2			1	2	

Use of traditional instructional arrangements and methods including *single* text, tasks, and instructional strategies for all students; those who do not *fit* do not do well

Use of *multiple* instructional arrangements and methods, materials, tasks and instructional strategies to support a range of knowledge and skill levels within the class

19. Instructional Materials & Resources

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
			1								1	5	1			1		1	1	

One textbook, photocopies or worksheets prevail.

Multiple sources of information and materials including technology is used (i.e. textbook is only one resource for learning; multiple materials used to support learning; the use of instructional software, internet investigations, SMART Boards)

20. Language Instruction Approach

1			2			3			4			5			6			7					
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U			
											1	3	2		1						1		

Language instruction revolves around *'foreign'* language topics (i.e. clothes, house, body parts) regardless of grade level; language teaching is provided through traditional language learning means (i.e. decontextualized skills; grammar and vocabulary as objects of study in hierarchically-sequenced segments); academic content (what students know) and skills (what students can do linguistically) are separated and de-contextualized with an emphasis on language learning as object-of-study

Language instruction is integrated with challenging academic content; language teaching is systematically provided through the study of discourse or genre organization (i.e. linguistic markers and vocabulary for different types of text as related to content-area courses) Academic content (what students know) and skills (what students can do linguistically) are integrated and contextualized with the understanding that language is acquired as a vehicle for meaning

ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale ©VPROjas, 2009

21. First and Second Language Academic Literacy

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
											1	3	2		1	1		1		

Literacy is conceived of and implemented within a learning-to-read- and-write framework; reading and writing are taught separately from content as prerequisite skills to the acquisition or sharing of new information and concepts; fragmented and meaning-taking pedagogy utilized for vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing

Literacy is conceived of and implemented within a reading-and writing-to-learn framework; reading and writing across the curriculum is a meta-goal for acquiring new information and then synthesizing it to share new concepts with peers; balanced and meaning-making pedagogy utilized for vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing

22. Classroom Discourse

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
			1						2			2	2	1	1			1	1	

Students' language characterized by literal-level discourse, often in response to 'yes-no,' 'either-or' type questioning; responses are often *scripted* indicating that students are parroting what teachers and texts say

Students' language characterized by descriptive, persuasive and critical-level discourse, produced in response to divergent, open-ended questions; responses are *generated* by students indicating that students find ways to name their developing cognitive world (e.g. project-based and problem solving emphasis)

ESL and Bilingual Program Rating Scale ©VPROjas, 2009

23. Language Performance

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
						1			3			1	1		2	1	1		1	

Evidence of language performance is conceived of as students' capacities to recall what has been learned in a given context (i.e. coverage-focused)

Evidence of language performance is conceived of as students' capacities to transfer use to new situations and challenges (i.e. results-focused)

24. Struggling or School-Interrupted ELL

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
						1			3				1	1	1	1		1		

Struggling learners fail or are referred to additional 'fix it' specialists for interventions; lack protocol to identify ELL with potential learning needs

Scaffolding strategies or ways of supporting struggling learners are built into backwards planning instructional model before and as a part of protocol to identify ELL with potential learning needs

25. Professional Development

1			2			3			4			5			6			7		
T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U	T	A	U
			1		1	2				1		1			1	1		1	1	

BE/ ESL teachers attend professional conferences (e.g. NJTESOL/ BE, NABE, TESOL)

A variety of professional learning opportunities are provided including professional learning communities, courses, training sessions, and staff coaching and mentoring. The overriding goal is to develop the knowledge and skills of all staff for facilitating language proficiency and academic achievement of ELL

NOTE: References are included in Appendix A of this report.

<p>ELL SCAFFOLDING & DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM Adapted Carol Tomlinson & Strategic Research. Used with permission.</p>
--

School: _____ Grade: _____ Subject: _____ Period/Time: _____

Teacher: _____ Date: ____/____/____ Observer: _____

I. CONTEXT/GOAL SETTING	Strong	Some	None
1) Established clear content learning goals (knowledge, understanding).			
2) Established clear language acquisition goals (skills).			
3) Expectations for ELL are not lowered (scaffolds planned to enable goal attainment/ performance).			
4) Linked new subject matter to prior learning and/or experience.			
5) Most students appear aware of and understand the learning goals.			
6) Provided rubrics or other guides to focus students on goals.			
7) Closed the class with a focus on goals/meaning of lesson.			
Comments:			

II. STUDENT ASSESSMENT	Strong	Some	None
1) Implemented & used results of pre-assessment to adjust the lesson.			
2) Implemented assessment during lesson to gauge understanding.			
3) Attended to student questions/comments during lesson.			
4) Implemented assessment at end of lesson to gauge student learning.			
5) Used assessments to gather data on content understanding & language development for ELL.			
Comments:			

DI Classroom Observation Form

III. ATTENTION TO INDIVIDUALS/BUILDING COMMUNITY	Strong	Some	None
1) Talked with students as they entered/exited class.			
2) Connected with individual students during class.			
<u>3) Demonstrated understanding of cultural backgrounds of ELL.</u>			
<u>4) Demonstrated understanding of linguistic backgrounds of ELL.</u>			
5) Helped develop awareness of one another's strengths/contributions .			
6) Involved whole class in sharing/planning/evaluating .			
Comments:			
IV. INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES AND CLASSROOM ROUTINES	Strong	Some	None
1) Varied student groupings : individual; pairs; small groups.			
2) Provided for ELL groupings which allowed <u>primary language usage</u> when necessary.			
3) Used multiple modes of instruction , with emphasis on active learning.			
<u>4) Provided for verbal interaction for ELL with proficient students through the use of cooperative learning.</u>			
5) Made flexible use of classroom space, time, materials.			
6) Communicated clear directions for multiple tasks.			
7) Provided effective rules/routines that supported individual needs and <u>provided comprehensible input for ELL.</u>			
8) Displayed effective classroom leadership/management .			
Comments:			

DI Classroom Observation Form

V. POSITIVE, SUPPORTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	Strong	Some	None
1) Demonstrated respectful behavior toward students.			
2) Demonstrated <u>sensitivity and empathy</u> to different cultures/ethnicities.			
3) Acknowledged/celebrated student strengths/successes .			
4) <u>Active participation</u> by a broad range of students.			
5) Students comfortable asking questions/requesting assistance.			
6) Emphasis on competition against self , not other students.			
<u>7) Provided for anxiety reduction for ELL.</u>			
Comments:			

VI. QUALITY CURRICULUM	Strong	Some	None
1) Lesson targeted one or more learning standards .			
<u>2) Lesson targeted on or more language standards.</u>			
3) Lesson focused on important ideas , issues, or problems.			
<u>4) Lesson targeted development of Tier I, II, & III vocabulary for ELL.</u>			
5) Tasks emphasized thought/meaning vs. drill & practice .			
<u>6) Language tasks emphasized generated language vs. scripted language.</u>			
Comments:			

DI Classroom Observation Form

VII. PREPARATION FOR & RESPONSE TO LEARNER NEEDS	Strong	Some	None
1) Showed proactive preparation for a variety of student needs.			
2) Attended appropriately to students who struggle with learning or language (LD; ELL; reading; etc.).			
3) Attended appropriately to students with physical/behavioral challenges .			
4) Attended appropriately to advanced and gifted students, including ELL .			
5) <u>Provided opportunities for ELLs' metalinguistic awareness.</u>			
<p>Comments:</p>			

VIII. EVIDENCE OF DIFFERENTIATION	Strong	Some	None
1) Content: e.g. materials of varied readability, interest, <u>ELL levels, & cultural bias</u> ; multiple ways to access ideas/information; etc.			
2) Process: e.g., tiering; contracts; compacting; readiness-based small-group instruction; different homework; choices about how to work (alone, pair, small group); tasks in multiple modes; variety of scaffolding; etc.			
3) Products: e.g., product assignments with multiple modes of expression; with choices about how to work (alone, pairs, small group); opportunity to connect learning with individual interests; variety of assessment tasks; variety of scaffolding; etc.			
<p>Comments (example of differentiation based on readiness, interest, learning profile, & <u>language proficiency levels of ELL</u>):</p>			

DI Classroom Observation Form

1a. Did the lesson meet the needs of learners at **all achievement and linguistic levels**? (✓ one only)

- (1) Yes (2) No

1b. If No, toward what **type/s of student** did the lesson seem geared? (✓ all that apply)

- (1) Below basic (2) Basic (3) Proficient (4) Advanced

Examples:

Figure 5.1: A Classroom Observation form used for summative assessment in a district with a second order change initiative in differentiation.

<p>What did the students do well?</p>	<p>Why did the students do well?</p>
<p>Where do the students need to improve?</p>	<p>How can the students improve?</p>

Understanding by Design + Differentiating Instruction

Sources: From Integrating Differentiated Instruction and Understanding by Design by Carol Ann Tomlinson and Jay McTighe, 2006, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Instructional Principles:

1. Provides supported reading for students who have difficulty with text material (e.g. reading buddies, taped portions of text, highlighted texts, graphic organizers for distilling text, double entry journals, etc).
2. Introduces key vocabulary through simple definitions and icons or illustrations.
3. Provides English language learners with linguistic buddies, dual-language dictionaries, primary language internet sites, and opportunities for primary language usage for learning.
4. Provides resources at a range of reading levels and at varying degrees of content complexity.
5. Uses small-group instruction to conduct concept attainment lessons.
6. Connects enduring understandings (e.g. big ideas) with a variety of student experiences, cultures, interests, and perspectives during discussions.
7. Uses a variety of techniques to provide participation opportunities for all students to verbally interact (e.g. Think Pair Share, cueing).
8. Provides varied homework assignments as needed.
9. Provides opportunities for all students to be actively engaged in tasks.
10. Models reading strategies and then provides mini-lessons as a follow up.
11. Forms flexible and fluid instructional groups based on ongoing or formative assessment data.
12. Provide alternative assignments for students who evidence mastery on formative assessments.

13. Invites students to propose alternative ways of accomplishing goals.
14. Uses 'heads up' oral reminders to the class to call student attention to potential trouble spots in their tasks and responses.
15. Uses regular 'teacher talk' groups as one assessment strategy to gather information about students' progress.
16. Offers periodic mini-workshops on skills or topics with which students may experience difficulty or on skills or topics designed to push forward the thinking and production of advanced learners.
17. Offers students the option of working alone or with a partner when feasible.
18. Uses rubrics with elements and criteria focused on key content goals as well as personalized elements designed to appropriately challenge various learners and cause them to attend to particular facets of the work important to their own development.
19. Tiers activities when appropriate so that all students are working toward the same goals but at varying levels of difficulty.
20. Offers varied modes of exploring or expressing learning when appropriate.

Assessment & Grading Principles for Determining Student Success:

1. Gives quizzes orally and provides more time for quizzes for students who need these options.
2. Allows use of the primary language as needed so students can show what they know.
3. Allows students to use alternative ways of completing assessments.
4. Provides options for various ways to express the desired outcomes.
5. Guides or directs the work of one or more small groups periodically

throughout assessment work.

6. Offers option of working alone or with partners on assessments.
7. Uses rubrics with elements and criteria focused on key content goals as well as personalized elements designed to appropriately challenge various learners and cause them to attend to particular facets of the work important to their own development.
8. Allows students peer consultations directed by critique guides that focus the 'consultant' on key product requirements delineated in rubrics.
9. Provides optional planning templates or organizers to guide students' products or assessment work.
10. Continues to use regular 'teacher talk' groups as a means of gathering data and assisting students with assessment work.
11. Bases grades on clearly specified learning goals and performance standards.
12. Uses valid evidence for grading; that is, bases grades on criteria and not norms (criterion-referenced vs. norm referenced).
13. Distinguishes between assessment and grading as follows: assessment focuses on gathering information about student achievement that can be used to make instructional decisions and grading is an end-point judgment about student achievement. Grading does not have to be based on all assessments.
14. Avoids grading based on (mean) averages which can be misleading.
15. Focuses on achievement only and reports other factor separately (e.g. class participation, attendance, behavior, attitude).

What we already do:

What we need to do more of (and how we plan to do it):