
UPDATE FROM THE OFFICE OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (OELA)

Joanne H. Urrutia
Deputy Director

May 17, 2012

Reform Initiative

- i3
- RTT
- RTT- Enhanced Assessment Grants
- RTT- Early Learning Challenge
- Flexibility Plan

FLEXIBILITY TO IMPROVE ACHIEVEMENT AND INSTRUCTION

- Flexibility regarding the 2013-2014 timeline for achieving 100 percent proficiency
- Flexibility regarding district and school improvement and accountability requirements
- Flexibility related to the use of Federal education funds

“This voluntary opportunity will provide educators and State and local leaders with flexibility ... to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction.”

– Secretary Duncan

PRINCIPLES FOR IMPROVING ACHIEVEMENT AND INSTRUCTION

1. College- and career-ready expectations for all students

2. State-developed differentiated recognition, accountability, and support

3. Supporting effective instruction and leadership

4. Reducing duplication and unnecessary burden

PRINCIPLE 1: COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY EXPECTATIONS

- Adopt college- and career-ready standards in reading and mathematics
- Transition to and implement standards statewide for all students and schools
- Develop and administer aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth
- Adopt corresponding English language proficiency standards and aligned assessments

Adopt CCR standards

2011-12

Implement CCR standards and **pilot** assessments

2012-13

Administer assessments

2013-14

2014-15

PRINCIPLE 1: COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY EXPECTATIONS

- Commit to develop and adopt **English language proficiency (ELP) standards** that correspond to college- and career-ready standards
- Transition to and implement ELP standards statewide for all EL students and schools
- Develop and administer aligned, high-quality ELP assessments that measure student growth and reflect the academic language skills necessary to access college- and career-ready standards

**Commit to
adopt** ELP
standards

2011-12

Adopt
ELP
standards

2012-13

Implement ELP
standards and
pilot assessments

2013-14

2014 →

PRINCIPLE 2: DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY & SUPPORT

- Develop system to ensure continuous improvement in all Title I schools
- Set ambitious but achievable performance targets
- Provide recognition for high-progress and highest-performing schools
- Effect dramatic, systemic change in the lowest-performing schools
- Identify and implement interventions in schools with the greatest achievement gaps and with subgroups that are furthest behind
- Build state, district, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools

Set new
targets

2011-12

Recognize schools, **implement** interventions & **build** capacity

2012-13

2013-14

2014-15

PRINCIPLE 2: DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY & SUPPORT

- Take into account the achievement of ELs when identifying focus schools
- Identify and implement effective interventions for ELs in focus and priority schools
- Overall state plans are rigorous and comprehensive enough to help improve results for ELs in all schools

Set new
targets

2011-12

Recognize schools, **implement** interventions & **build** capacity

2012-13

2013-14

2014-15

PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION & LEADERSHIP

- Teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that:
 - Will be used for continual improvement of instruction
 - Meaningfully differentiate performance
 - Use multiple valid measures, including student growth
 - Evaluate teachers and principals on a regular basis
 - Provide clear, timely, and useful feedback
 - Will be used to inform personnel decisions

Adopt state
guidelines

2011-12

Develop
local systems

2012-13

Pilot local
systems

2013-14

Implement
local systems

2014-15

PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION & LEADERSHIP

- Teacher and principal evaluation and support systems that:
 - Meaningfully differentiate performance
 - multiple valid measures
 - a significant factor data on student growth (Els)
 - other measures of professional practice
 - Use multiple valid measures, including student growth
 - Alternative measures of student learning such as interim assessments, end-of-course tests, objective performance-based assessments, and ELP assessments.

Adopt state
guidelines

2011-12

Develop
local systems

2012-13

Pilot local
systems

2013-14

Implement
local systems

2014-15

Overview of Evaluation Activities



National Evaluation of Title III Implementation

- *Initiated on October 2008*
- *Overseen by the Policy and Program Studies Service (PPSS) within the U.S. Department of Education.*
- *Conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) with several subcontractors.*

National Evaluation of Title III Implementation

Study Objectives:

- To describe state and district progress and variation in the implementation of Title III
- To examine actual implementation in the field
- To determine progress on ELP and state content assessments
- To maintain a focus on the diversity among English learners

Evaluation Briefs

- *Title III Policy: State of the States*
- *Title III Accountability: Behind the Numbers*
- *Title III Accountability and District Improvement Efforts: A Closer Look*

Available at:

<http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/accountability/> or

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oeped/ppss/reports.html#titleiii>

National Evaluation of Title III Implementation: Upcoming Reports

- *Exploring Approaches to Set English Language Proficiency Performance Criteria and Monitor English Learner Progress* (March 12)
- *A Survey of States' English Language Proficiency Standards* (June 2012)
- *Report on State and Local Implementation* (May 2012)
- *A Description of English Learner Student Achievement in Six Jurisdictions* (Late summer 2012)

Exploring Approaches to Setting English Language Proficiency Performance Criteria and Monitoring English Learner Progress

- This report describes analytical methods that can be applied to longitudinal student-level achievement data in order to identify empirically based ELP and academic achievement goals for EL students. The methods are organized by these questions of great interest to policy makers and educators:
 - What analytical methods can be used to determine a meaningful and empirically based ELP performance standard?
 - What analytical methods can be used to establish a realistic, empirically anchored time frame for attaining a given ELP performance standard?
 - How can an English Learner's ELP level be taken into account when setting academic progress and proficiency standards?

The names of the methods that are discussed are organized under the three key topics/questions below:

- Methods for determining empirically based ELP performance standards:
 - Decision consistency analysis
 - Logistic regression analysis
 - Descriptive box plot analysis
- Methods for establishing target timeframes for attaining ELP performance standards:
 - Descriptive analysis
 - Event history analysis
- Methods for taking ELP level into account when setting academic progress and proficiency targets:
 - Progressive benchmarking
 - Indexed progress method
 - Status and growth accountability matrix (SGAM)
- Taken together, these approaches can provide multiple sources of evidence to investigate and corroborate the point at which ELP performance standards, time frames, and targets might be set. The report recommends that multiple approaches be used, when feasible, in order to provide policymakers with more complete, “triangulated” empirical evidence for delimiting a range of performance and defining options to establish an ELP performance standard for ELs.

Report on State and Local Implementation

- The report is based on data collected during the 2009–10 school year through telephone interviews with all state Title III directors, a survey of a nationally representative sample of 1,528 subgrantees, and case studies of a purposive sample of 12 districts nested within five states. The study also analyzed extant data such as data from the Consolidated State Performance Reports.

Some of the key findings are as follows:

- Title III districts vary in the criteria they use to determine which students are considered ELs, so a student who is identified as an EL according to one district's practices may or may not be identified as such in another district.
- In 2009-10, English as a Second Language (ESL) was the most common type of EL service among Title III districts and instruction in the native language was the least common type of EL service.
- Due to variation in how states defined and measured their AMAOs, AMAOs in one state were not comparable to AMAOs in another state. Fifty-five percent of Title III districts nationwide reported meeting all three of their AMAOs in 2008-09.
- In 2009-10, officials in more than half of Title III districts reported difficulty recruiting some categories of teachers for ELs.

Language Instruction Educational Programs (LIEPs): A Review of the Foundational Literature

- Theories of second language acquisition
- The construct of academic English language
- Models and considerations for LIEP design
- Instructional practices and professional development
- School district, school and community culture
- Indicators and evaluation of success

<http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/title-iii/language-instruction-ed-programs-report.pdf> (May 2012)

Findings and Implications

- The research reviewed for this study suggests that ELs who receive language support or specialized instruction show better outcomes on various academic measures than those who receive no special support.
- While multiple meta-analyses and large-scale research studies have found that models following the bilingual approach can produce better outcomes than ESL models, as measured by general academic content assessments or measures of reading comprehension or skills, other studies, including a recent quasi-experimental large-scale study and a recent large-scale experimental study, indicate that the quality of instructional practices matter as well as the language of instruction.
- Researchers also found examples of high-quality programs that come from both bilingual and ESL approaches which suggests that no single approach (e.g., ESL or bilingual) is effective at all times and under all circumstances.

Study Limitations

- This review is not a meta-analytic one about program efficacy or outcomes, nor an effort to determine which LIEP(s) is (are) “best.” It cannot promise that certain programs definitely work, or guarantee specific outcomes, and, due to the nature of the literature and the field, does not support definite conclusions about program quality or efficacy. There simply are not enough experimental or quasi-experimental studies to sustain a comprehensive, outcome-oriented discussion about all the review topics. Thus, no definitive conclusions can be drawn about outcomes or effectiveness for any of these topics.

Studies Recently Initiated

- ***Exploratory Study on the Identification of ELs with Special Needs*** (Started in October of 2011)

Purpose: To conduct exploratory case studies in nine districts to learn about the processes that districts use and the challenges that they face in identifying ELs with special needs.

- ***Case Studies of Current and Former Grantees under OELA's National Professional Development Program*** (Started in September of 2011)

Purpose: To learn about pre-service and in-service teacher training models and approaches that current grantees are using, as well as strategies that former grantees have used to track newly minted teachers after program completion and to plan for continuing program services after the federal grant period.

- ***Analysis of Extant Data on English Learners*** (Started in October of 2011)

Purpose: The purpose of this task order is to analyze extant data from various national data collections in order to compare participation and outcome indicators for ELs and non-EL students

Studies sponsored by OSERS

- ***RTI Effectiveness Model for ELLs (REME)***

A four-year project designed to examine the effectiveness of a culturally responsive multi-tiered Response to Intervention instructional model on the reading achievement of English language learners (ELLs). Colorado University-Boulder: Janette Klingner & John Hoover

- ***Project ELITE (English Learners Institute for Teaching and Excellence)***

This project proposes to implement, iteratively evaluate and refine, and disseminate findings from three evidence-based demonstrations of RTI models with English Learners designed to ensure that all students become adequately proficient readers and users of English during the primary grades of school. UT Austin: Sharon Vaughn; Greg Roberts

- ***RTI for ELLs***

A model demonstration project that will adapt, refine, and evaluate a multi-tiered instructional framework in three K-3 schools. UT Austin: Alba Ortiz; Sylvia Linan-Thompson



Other Relevant Studies in the works . . .

- CRDC (<http://ocrdata.ed.gov/>)
- Fostering Reform and Improvement in the Education of Young English Learners
- EL Practice Guides
- RTT-SIG Implementation and Impact Study
- Promising Practices in Teacher Preparation Programs

Vocabulary Instruction and Assessment for Spanish Speakers

- The Vocabulary Instruction and Assessment for Spanish Speakers (VIAS) project is a 10-year program of research funded through grants from the *Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (IES).
- The grants support research on the literacy and language development of Spanish-speaking English language learners (ELLs) conducted by investigators at the Center for Applied Linguistics and its collaborators, Harvard University, Boston College, the University of Connecticut, and the University of Houston.

<http://www.cal.org/vias/>

**JOANNE H. URRUTIA
DEPUTY DIRECTOR, OELA**

joanne.urrutia@ed.gov

202-401-4300