Program Description

Summary Description of Program

The English Language Learner program (ELL) is intended to identify and serve students who need English language support services.

The program screens all students upon their initial entry into Special School District to determine whether the student’s home environment includes a language other than English and whether the student has limited English proficiency (LEP). Students identified as LEP are given ELL services as needed, and monitored for an additional two-year period after services have ended.

Purpose or Mandate

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

Which specific CSIP/MSIP goals does this Program support?

This program supports CSIP Goal Area 1 (Student Success) through Objectives 1.1 (Ensure achievement for all students), 1.2 (Ensure that all students are ready to participate in college, career, or community programs) and 1.3 (Ensure student satisfaction and engagement).

Who are the Customers/Stakeholders?

Students ages 3-21 may be identified as ELL and may receive services. Parents of students so identified are notified in a language they understand of the results of language-proficiency assessments and of the availability of services.
**What are the Customer/Stakeholder requirements?**

(1) ELL students expect to meaningfully participate in their educational programs and services in a language they understand. (2) Parents expect to make well-informed educational decisions about the participation of their child in the ELL program and in other educational options and services.

**6. How were the Customer/Stakeholder requirements determined?**

These requirements are derived from SSD’s *2011 Lau Plan*, developed in response to the DESE regulations and Federal laws cited above.

**What is this program expected to accomplish?**

This program is expected to identify all SSD students who are eligible for ELL services, upon their first entry into SSD. For students so identified, the program will provide appropriate ELL services. Upon exiting the needed services, students will be monitored for an additional two-year period.

**Briefly describe how this Program works (i.e. how do the resources and activities produce the intended outcomes?)**

Home language surveys are sent to any new enrolling student in the beginning-of-year packet and to any student enrolling later during the school year. Upon the return of the home language survey, the building coordinator/principal reviews each survey for positive or questionable responses. Any positive or questionable response is forwarded to the ELL coordinator in the Central Office.

The evaluation staff member responsible for administering the W-APT screening instrument is notified of the student’s need for screening and the screening is administered within two weeks of enrollment. If the W-APT indicates ELL services are necessary, an ELL service plan is developed and appropriate support services are provided by a certified ELL teacher.

ELL students are assessed annually using the ACCESS instrument. When the student meets appropriate transitional criteria, the student exits the ELL program. Monitoring continues for an additional two years after exiting the program.

**What resources (type and quantity) are required to execute this plan?**

This program uses:

- 5 School psychologists, as needed
- 1 ELL-certified teacher, as needed (of a total of 9 currently certified)
- a W-APT screening instrument
- a WIDA annual assessment test

---

Action Plan Summary

Previous Cycle Goals and Outcomes

2010-2012 Overall Goals
Goal 1: The Program will meet Federal Compliance requirements

Goal 2: Students who speak a language other than English at home will be systematically identified and provided effective programs to meet assessed needs.

2010-2012 Outcomes
SSD will annually meet 100% of all Federal compliance requirements as measured by DESE self-monitored checklist.
100% of SSD students will be screened in order to identify ELL students and provide them with appropriate services.

2012-2014 Overall Goals
Goal 1: The program will meet Federal Compliance guidelines.

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

2012-2014 Outcomes
The program will annually meet 100% of all Federal Compliance requirements as measured by DESE self-monitoring checklist.
100% of SSD students will be screened in order to identify ELL students and provide them with appropriate services.


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

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

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

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

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

Budgeted Total Annual Costs:
Less than $1,000

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

Source(s) of Funds
District budget

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

What is this program’s cost per customer (student)? Less than $1,000
Program Evaluation Authority

*Castañeda v. Pickard 1981* (U.S. Supreme Court) requires districts to have “a system established to evaluate the (ELL) program.”

Board Policy IM requires a biennial evaluation of the ELL program.

**Qualitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used**

- What are the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?
- How well did this program fulfill its purpose or mandate?
- What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement /weaknesses of the program?
- How well-aligned are the program’s priorities and processes with the goals of the program?
- What is the level of deployment of this program’s services?
- How should resources be changed to put more focus on achieving the goals?
- How should goals be changed, added, or removed?

**Quantitative Measures - Evaluation questions to be used**

- What is the status of the program’s progress toward achieving its goals?
- What are the actual costs of this program, and how do they compare to planned costs?
- What is the estimated actual benefit-cost or cost-effectiveness of this program?

**Quantitative Measures - Criteria for Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Results</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Summary

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

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

What were the major accomplishments or benefits of this program?
This program has negligible impact on student performance in SSD. That conclusion does not indicate a shortcoming of the program or its implementation but, rather, is based on the negligible number of students served. During the latest evaluation period, only one student (a senior at North Technical High School) has met the screening criteria for eligible services. That student is in the two-year monitoring period, and no longer requires ELL assistance. In addition to monitoring that student, the program continues to screen all other students for ELL eligibility.

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

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

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

**Goal 1:** The program will meet Federal Compliance guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>The program will annually meet 100% of all Federal Compliance requirements as measured by DESE self-monitoring checklist.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results:</strong></td>
<td>MET.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Results</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>100% of SSD students will be screened in order to identify ELL students and provide them with appropriate services.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results:</strong></td>
<td>MET WITH MINOR DEVIATION. 100% of enrolling students were screened, and the screening identified no eligible students. Two weeks after school started, a student was discovered to be in the monitoring phase of a partner-district ELL plan, which the screening process had not revealed. Monitoring of that student has resumed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Results</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurable Objective 1:</th>
<th>100% of identified students will show positive progression in ACCESS test scores, year to year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results:</strong></td>
<td>NOT APPLICABLE. The one eligible student has been enrolled for less than one year, and has not yet received end-of-year ACCESS testing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Results</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do customers and other stakeholders consider to be the strengths and opportunities for improvement/weaknesses of the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Necessary staff and processes are in place to accomplish the purpose of this program:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o a Board-appointed ELL coordinator, as required by DESE and federal mandates;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o evaluation staff trained to administer the W-APT screening instrument;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o staff to provide translated materials for parents, as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The student who was initially “lost” in our process was, in fact, quickly identified by back-up processes, was tested within the testing window, and is receiving appropriate services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

How well aligned are the program’s processes with the goals of the program?
This program's processes are well-aligned with the goals of the program.

Deployment Level of Program Services
Services are fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or schools.

Should resources be changed to improve this program? □ Yes  X  No

Should goals be changed, added or removed? □ Yes  X  No

Board Approved: 4/14/2015

2014-2015 Program Evaluation  English Language Learner (ELL)  Page 3 of 4
Evaluation Implications

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

Actual Total Annual Costs: Less than $1,000

Staff: School psychologist
      ELL teacher

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

General Recommendation Resulting from this Evaluation
Select from the following possible recommendations resulting from the evaluation:
- Continue the program as is. It is meeting or exceeding all expected outcomes.
- Expand the program, replicating effective components.
- Streamline, refine, or consolidate elements of the program.
- Redesign the program.
- Reevaluate the purpose and/or goals of the program.
- Discontinue ineffective or nonessential program components.
- Discontinue the program.
- Other (Specify.)

Action Plans

Review of Action Plan progress since last report.

Action Plan 1: Work with Communications Department to find a process for making SSD site accessible in other languages.
Progress on Action Plan: Communications Department has agreed to explore Google translate options for the SSD website.

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

What specific actions are needed?

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

Medium- and Long-term: N/A