

The Kansas State Department of Education
Title III Improvement Plan Guide
2011-2012

The Title III Improvement Plan is due **October 28, 2011**. Please submit the Plan to Melanie Manares at mmanares@ksde.org.

The goals of Title III English Language Acquisition are to ensure that all English language learners (ELLs) attain English proficiency and meet challenging state academic standards. To measure progress in meeting these goals, States receiving funds under Title III must develop annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) which include three components:

1. Annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English
2. Annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency and
3. Adequate yearly progress (AYP) in reading and mathematics for ELLs as required under Title I.

The first two AMAOs are based on the Kansas English Language Proficiency Assessment (KELPA) results. A district must have at least 10 ELLs in order to be eligible to receive Title III funding and be held accountable for meeting AMAOs 1 and 2. Districts wishing to participate in Title III but not able to generate \$10,000 in Title III funds (the minimum grant allowance) will join a consortium of other districts wishing to receive Title III funding.

The third AMAO - AYP - is based on the Kansas reading and mathematics assessments. AYP refers to the percent of students who are at or above standard on the State content assessments. The AYP determination is only applicable when the number of English language learners in the district is at least 30 students. AYP is not determined for a subgroup that has fewer than 30 students.

The State determines the targets for each of the AMAOs. Districts must meet all three AMAOs each year in order to meet the Title III accountability requirements. The AMAO targets for 2009-2014 are:

<p><u>AMAO 1 Making Progress:</u> Percent of K-12 English language learners (ELLs) served by Title III in each district that will demonstrate an annual increase in their "Total Score" on the Kansas English Language Proficiency Assessment (KELPA).</p> <table border="1" style="margin: 10px auto; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">AMAO 1 Targets for 2009-2014</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009-10</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-11</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>36%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AMAO 1 Targets for 2009-2014		Year	%	2009-10	20%	2010-11	24%	2011-12	28%	2012-13	32%	2013-14	36%	<p><u>AMAO 2 Attaining English Proficiency:</u> Percent of K-12 ELLs served by Title III in each district that will demonstrate "4-Fluent" in the "Total Category" of the KELPA.</p> <table border="1" style="margin: 10px auto; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">AMAO 2 Targets for 2009-2014</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009-10</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-11</td> <td>18%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>21%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td>24%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>27%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AMAO 2 Targets for 2009-2014		Year	%	2009-10	15%	2010-11	18%	2011-12	21%	2012-13	24%	2013-14	27%	<p><u>AMAO 3 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP):</u> Each district participating in Title III that has an ELL subgroup must make AYP in both reading and math for the subgroup in order to make AMAO 3. AYP is based on the Kansas Reading Assessment and the Kansas Math Assessment. The following table reflects the AYP targets:</p> <table border="1" style="margin: 10px auto; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">AYP Targets for 2009-2014 (Percent of ELLs Scoring at Meets Standard & Above)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Reading</th> <th>Math</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2009-10</td> <td>81.3%</td> <td>76.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010-11</td> <td>86.0%</td> <td>82.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011-12</td> <td>90.7%</td> <td>88.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2012-13</td> <td>95.3%</td> <td>94.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2013-14</td> <td>100%</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	AYP Targets for 2009-2014 (Percent of ELLs Scoring at Meets Standard & Above)			Year	Reading	Math	2009-10	81.3%	76.4%	2010-11	86.0%	82.3%	2011-12	90.7%	88.2%	2012-13	95.3%	94.1%	2013-14	100%	100%
AMAO 1 Targets for 2009-2014																																																			
Year	%																																																		
2009-10	20%																																																		
2010-11	24%																																																		
2011-12	28%																																																		
2012-13	32%																																																		
2013-14	36%																																																		
AMAO 2 Targets for 2009-2014																																																			
Year	%																																																		
2009-10	15%																																																		
2010-11	18%																																																		
2011-12	21%																																																		
2012-13	24%																																																		
2013-14	27%																																																		
AYP Targets for 2009-2014 (Percent of ELLs Scoring at Meets Standard & Above)																																																			
Year	Reading	Math																																																	
2009-10	81.3%	76.4%																																																	
2010-11	86.0%	82.3%																																																	
2011-12	90.7%	88.2%																																																	
2012-13	95.3%	94.1%																																																	
2013-14	100%	100%																																																	

A Title III district that does not meet all AMAOs for two consecutive years is required to develop an improvement plan that addresses the factors that prevented it from achieving all AMAOs. The plan will be in effect for two years. In an effort to ensure the district is meeting all AMAOs, and that ELLs have the best opportunities to learn, the district must address all of the items on the following pages in its improvement plan.

1) Establish a Team

Missing any of the AMAOs for two consecutive years will put a district on improvement. Missing any of the AMAOs for four consecutive years will mean that the State is required to modify the curriculum, program and method of instruction, or determine whether the district will continue to receive Title III funds and require the district to replace relevant education personnel. Districts do not have to miss the same AMAO from year to year in order to be considered “missing AMAOs”. For this reason, focus should not be limited to a particular AMAO or challenge. It will take time, and a team of people with varying areas of expertise to move the district toward ensuring ELLs have greater success in learning English and achieving academic standards.

The Title III Improvement Team develops the Title III Improvement Plan for the district. The responsibilities of the Title III Improvement Team are to set a vision for the district that meets the needs of English language learners, gather and analyze qualitative and quantitative data, identify strengths and challenges in serving English language learners, set goals for improving AMAO status and success of ELLs, select Scientifically Based Researched (SBR) Strategies for instruction and professional development of all staff, establish an Action Plan, and determine implementation, monitoring, and evaluation tools and protocols.

The required team members are the Superintendent, the Title III Director/Coordinator or lead teacher, an ESL teacher or teachers, a general education teacher (Math /Reading especially) with ELLs in the classroom, and a testing coordinator to assist with gathering and analyzing data. If the ELL population is significant in the district, a family or parent representative or community leader should also be on the team. Keeping in mind the diversity of the ELL population, there may be need for more than one family/parent and community member representative as there will be need for a representative for each language/culture.

Other team members may include a social worker or counselor if ELLs are struggling with adjusting to a new culture or way of life (some ELLs coming from war-torn regions or who have experienced great personal turmoil or stress may be in need of counseling for issues beyond typical culture shock). There may be need for these roles on the team if the ELLs are from refugee/asylee families or have other special circumstances (international adoption, one parent out of the home, etc.) where the family may not be best able to interact with the district or communicate wants/needs as effectively as a member of their community, counselor or social worker could.

In cases where there are a number of ELLs with special learning needs, a member of the Special Education team should also be invited to participate in the improvement plan. ELLs may be in need of Special Education services as well as ESOL services. If that is the case, SPED and ESOL staff need to be in communication with each other about the students they share and will both need to be represented on this team.

2) Vision

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> KELPA | <input type="checkbox"/> AMAOs | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/community engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reading | <input type="checkbox"/> ESOL Program Type | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development/support for all staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Writing | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff qualifications | <input type="checkbox"/> Content areas (reading, math, science, etc) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Listening | <input type="checkbox"/> Budget/use of funds | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Speaking | <input type="checkbox"/> Support for Students | |

Describe a vision for the district over the next three to five years in terms of the topics in the box above. Since AMAOs are the measure for determining whether a district will complete a Title III Improvement Plan, and AMAOs are determined using the KELPA and State Math and Reading assessments, these assessments and the AMAOs should be addressed in the vision.

If the district can predict a need or desire for a different type of ESOL program based on its ELL demographics, staff qualifications, and what it knows about employment opportunities for parents in the area, include that in the vision. Having more students in a particular language group may allow the district to expand a program or begin a different type of ESOL program, for example.

Consider whether the funding sources available to the district are being utilized to their full potential. State ESOL, Titles I, II A, III, and Migrant are funding sources that may be allowable for instruction, professional development and student support.

Ensure students and their parents feel welcomed, supported and safe at school. How can the district engage parents and community members in order to ensure student success in school? Is the district meeting parents as much or more as parents are meeting the district? How do students feel about school? How do staff and other students engage ELLs in the school environment?

Consider the district’s staff qualifications. Are all staff prepared and equipped to provide quality instruction to ELLs? Are there appropriate numbers of ESOL endorsed teachers in the district? Is there sufficient collaboration among the ESOL endorsed staff and content teachers with ELLs in their classes? Do content teachers participate in professional development regarding instructional strategies for ELLs or cultural competency necessary for relating to the ELL population? How well are strategies implemented?

Consider standards and curriculum. How can ELLs be supported in their understanding of the content area subjects and in ESOL standards? Is there curriculum available that engages or supports ELLs’ strengths and maximizes their learning in the content areas and ESOL?

3) Gather and Organize Data

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> KELPA | <input type="checkbox"/> AMAOs | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/community engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reading | <input type="checkbox"/> ESOL Program Type | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development/support for all staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Writing | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff qualifications | <input type="checkbox"/> Content areas (reading, math, science, etc) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Listening | <input type="checkbox"/> Budget/use of funds | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Speaking | <input type="checkbox"/> Support for Students | |

Gather data from the check boxes and describe what was gathered in the box provided in the Plan. The data gathered should be both qualitative and quantitative and can be in the form of surveys, assessment results, expense sheets, etc. The tables at the end of this document might also be useful in gathering data to be analyzed later. Also keep in mind that KELPA reports from CETE can be exported to Excel files that can be sorted and organized by individual student and utilized in a number of ways. Questions to consider for this part are provided below.

Gather the KELPA data and note how students are performing. Note, for example, whether a grade level, proficiency level, or subtest (language domain) is particularly outstanding. These data should also be broken down by school. Note whether there is something very different about one school compared to another that may require change based on what these data reveal. Note students' scores in the subtests – this can be used later to determine how close to the next level of proficiency students are and whether particular students could benefit from some additional support to increase their scores more quickly. Identify individual students who show the least gain or the slowest growth – later this can be used to determine whether any additional or more intensive supports might be necessary for those students, or whether a different type of ESOL program would be better for them. Also gather data on how well students perform on the State Math and Reading Assessments. Document areas of particular trouble to ELLs and which questions or parts of the assessments seem to be the most difficult for ELLs.

Note what ESOL program types are available to ELLs in the district. Some questions to consider: How long do students stay in which types of programs before achieving fluency (AMAO 2)? How do ELLs' grades in other subject areas compare to those in different types of ESL programs (if more than one is offered)? How many contact minutes do students need before beginning to make progress (AMAO 1) or achieve fluency (AMAO 2)? What role does the para play in supporting ELLs? Is there legitimate scientifically based research or support of the effectiveness of the program used for the district's ELL population? Consider whether the curriculum available to ELLs is meeting their needs and whether instruction is delivered appropriately.

Does the district have sufficient numbers of qualified teachers for the ELLs in all grades? Are there any bilingual paras or teachers? Did ESOL endorsed teachers complete the endorsement courses, or PRAXIS only? What professional development or coursework have non-ESOL endorsed teachers had in the areas of second language acquisition and cultural competency? How frequently/how long do ESOL endorsed teachers collaborate with content area teachers about instructing ELLs?

There are many sources of funding available to support the needs of English language learners. State ESOL, Titles I, IIA, III, and Migrant are funding sources that may be allowable for instruction, professional development and student support. Students who are English language learners may also qualify for supports in other programs. Become knowledgeable about the uses of these funds and whether they can be coordinated to provide maximum support for English language learners eligible to receive it. Also look at the district's expenses to note what resources are being spent on instruction, supplies, curriculum, professional development, etc for ELLs and staff supporting them in their learning.

Document any support that students receive from the school that is not considered instruction. Research shows that when students feel connected to school and feel valued by the school, they tend to do better. We also know that when stress is lowered, language learning increases. If the student feels welcomed and valued and fully accepted as a member of the school community, the stress will be lowered and language learning will be increased. Document how the district ensures that students feel safe and supported in the school environment and what instruments measured the support provided. Also consider to what extent parents feel welcomed. Is communication provided in languages parents and students understand? Do parents feel comfortable with school staff? How knowledgeable about the students' and parents' native cultures are all staff in the district? Are staff aware of culture shock, how to recognize it and work with those who are experiencing it? Are there interpreters or bilingual staff from other cultures? Include any survey results obtained by the school/district. Was the survey provided in other languages? Explain how the students feel about being in school and the support they receive, the degree to which they feel staff want them to succeed, how staff feel about the ELLs in the school, how ELLs feel about the other students in the school. How was this information gathered?

Consider how the district supports training and professional development for all staff. Include the number of hours, frequency and type of professional development staff attended. Document which staff attended the training or professional development, how it was shared with others, and how it was implemented into practice. Also consider whether there is any collaboration time set aside for ESOL teachers and general education teachers to talk about the ELLs they both serve or about professional development they have attended. Also consider whether general education teachers look at KELPA data, and whether ESOL teachers know how students are performing in general education classes. Are they aware of what is covered in lessons for the week so that they can assist in building background knowledge or vocabulary? Tables at the end of this Guide might be useful to begin documenting professional development.

4) Analyze Data, Part A

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> KELPA | <input type="checkbox"/> AMAOs | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/community engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reading | <input type="checkbox"/> ESOL Program Type | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development/support for all staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Writing | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff qualifications | <input type="checkbox"/> Content areas (reading, math, science, etc) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Listening | <input type="checkbox"/> Budget/use of funds | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Speaking | <input type="checkbox"/> Support for Students | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

A. From the data gathered in 3) Gather and Organize Data, identify the district’s strengths in the checkboxes above, then describe the reasons for the strengths in the box provided on the Plan.

Describe what factors are contributing to the district’s strengths and in what ways. Points to consider are: What systemic initiatives or actions has the district implemented in the last two years that were undertaken for improving ELL fluency and progress in learning English, understanding content courses, and meeting standards on state assessments? How has professional development for ESOL endorsed and non-ESOL endorsed teachers been implemented? How has the district supported ELLs and their parents in the school environment? What financial resources have been used to support ELL learning? Have any bilingual paras or teachers been hired recently? Have content area teachers implemented new strategies to support ELLs’ comprehension of their content areas?

In general, based on the data gathered in 3) Gather and Organize Data, what conclusions can be formed for why the district succeeds in certain areas. What contributed to the strengths the district has?

4) Analyze Data, Part B

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> KELPA | <input type="checkbox"/> AMAOs | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/community engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reading | <input type="checkbox"/> ESOL Program Type | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development/support for all staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Writing | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff qualifications | <input type="checkbox"/> Content areas (reading, math, science, etc) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Listening | <input type="checkbox"/> Budget/use of funds | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Speaking | <input type="checkbox"/> Support for Students | |

B. From the data gathered in 3) Gather and Organize Data, identify the district’s challenges in the checkboxes above and describe the reasons for the challenges in the box provided on the Plan. Consider the possible reasons for why the district did not meet AMAOs as expected. The KELPA Score Report Guide found on CETE’s website might provide some helpful information to consider as the district analyzes these data and what it might do to meet AMAOs next year. The tables provided at the end of the Guide might be helpful as well. Questions to consider in analyzing the district’s challenges are:

What factors contributed to the challenges faced by the district? Which AMAOs were missed and by how much? What areas of the KELPA were least successful? Which grade spans presented the least success on the KELPA in meeting AMAOs 1 and 2, and what conclusions can be made for the lack of success? Are students being pulled from reading and math classes (if those are the AMAOs missed) in order to receive ESOL instruction, for example?

Do the numbers and types of ELLs (migrant, refugee, newly arrived) warrant need for a different type of program? Are students receiving additional supports in other content areas (Title I reading, tutoring in math, etc.)? How many hours of targeted ESOL instruction do students receive? What is the relationship between students and teachers/paraprofessionals?

Consider whether curriculum aligns to ESOL Standards and is appropriate for ELLs’ level of academic background, age, etc. Does ESOL instruction align with grade level content curriculum? Does the curriculum align with the ESOL standards and the KELPA?

Is all staff taking advantage of professional development opportunities regarding ELLs, and is it being implemented fully? Do teachers collaborate with each other on the needs and strengths of the ELLs they share?

5) Set Goals

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> KELPA | <input type="checkbox"/> AMAOs | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/community engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reading | <input type="checkbox"/> ESOL Program Type | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development/support for all staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Writing | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff qualifications | <input type="checkbox"/> Content areas (reading, math, science, etc) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Listening | <input type="checkbox"/> Budget/use of funds | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Speaking | <input type="checkbox"/> Support for Students | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

In the checkboxes above indicate the district's areas of focus for the next two years. What strengths will be continued or improved and what challenges will be addressed toward realization of the vision? The goals should be specific, achievable in the next two years and focused on ensuring AMAOs are met and ELLs succeed in ESOL and other academic content areas.

Describe what the district will focus on to narrow the gap between the current reality and the vision described in 2) Vision.

How much progress is to be expected and in which areas? What gains does the district hope to achieve? What resources will be utilized and how will they specifically target the needs (goals)?

6) Action Plan and Monitoring

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> KELPA | <input type="checkbox"/> AMAOs | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/community engagement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reading | <input type="checkbox"/> ESOL Program Type | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional development/support for all staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Writing | <input type="checkbox"/> Staff qualifications | <input type="checkbox"/> Content areas (reading, math, science, etc) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Listening | <input type="checkbox"/> Budget/use of funds | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Speaking | <input type="checkbox"/> Support for Students | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

Identify goals the district will take action on in the checkboxes above. Then in the table provided in the Plan, describe what action steps the district will take to ensure that the goals are met. Include who will be responsible for the action, what the indicators of success will be, and what measurement tools will provide documentation of the success.

7) Evaluate

Evaluate the plan and review the data periodically in order to ensure tasks are on track for completion and goals are being met as planned. Identify in the table provided in the Plan who will be responsible for ensuring the tasks are completed. Other questions to consider:

- How will additional steps to meet the goals be identified and who will decide?
- When will such decisions be made?
- How frequently will monitoring of the success of the action steps take place?

GLOSSARY

AMAO – annual measureable achievement objective

AYP – adequate yearly progress

Bilingual – A class wholly comprised of ELLs who speak the same first language. Instruction in the academic areas is provided in the ELL’s native language with a gradual introduction of English throughout the year.

Dual language - Native English and native Spanish speaking students in the same class with instruction provided in both Spanish and English. All students become bilingual and bi-literate.

EL , ELL – English learner, English language learner. An EL/ELL is a student who has indicated a language other than English on the Home Language Survey and who has scored less than proficient on an English language proficiency assessment.

ELL subgroup – a group of 30 or more English language learners which includes all students who have been identified as qualifying for English language support services as well as those who have exited services within the last two years (monitored students).

ESL – English as a second language

ESOL – English for Speakers of Other Languages

ESOL class period - Students receive ESOL instruction during a regular class period and receive course credit. They should be grouped for instruction according to their level of English proficiency.

ESOL resource center – A variation of the pull-out design in which students are brought together from several classrooms or schools. The resource center concentrates ESOL materials and staff in one location and is usually staffed by at least one full-time ESOL teacher.

Home Language Survey – a survey given to all children that asks about languages the child speaks or has spoken, or hears in the home. Every student in the district should have a home language survey in their file.

KELPA – Kansas English Language Proficiency Assessment

ILP – Individual Learning Plan Each English language learner will have an ILP that addresses student needs as well as how instruction should be carried out, what will be covered and at what levels. Samples can be found on the ESOL webpage at <http://www.ksde.org/Default.aspx?tabid=350> under “Kansas Program Guidelines and Regulations”.

Immigrant – A student aged 3-21 years, not born in the United States, and not having attended one or more schools in any one or more states for more than three full academic years.

LEP – limited English proficient

Modified instruction – A regular education teacher with an ESOL endorsement “modifies” instruction so that the academic content is comprehensible to the English language learner. The class is comprised of both ELLs and non-ELLs – additional language support may or may not be given.

Monitored - An English language learner who is no longer eligible for English language support services and who is being observed and evaluated for English language and academic proficiency. Former ELLs are monitored for two years.

Newcomer – a separate, relatively self-contained educational program with interventions designed to meet the academic and transitional needs of newly arrived immigrants. Typically, students attend these programs before they enter more traditional classrooms with English language support.

Paraprofessional Support - An aide (preferably one who speaks the child’s first language) provides instruction to the ELL, in the classroom – helping to make the content accessible to the ELL and possibly providing individual language lessons outside of the classroom.

Pull-out – Students spend part of the school day in a mainstream classroom, but are pulled out for a portion of each day to receive instruction in English as a Second Language. Although schools with a large number of ELLs may have a full-time ESOL teacher, some districts employ an ESOL teacher who travels to several schools to work with small groups of students scattered throughout the district.

Push-in – An ESOL teacher comes into the regular classroom to give language assistance to the ELL.

Recently arrived – A recently arrived LEP student is defined as an LEP student who has attended schools in the United States (not including Puerto Rico) for less than 12 months.

Refugee - Any person who is outside his nationality and who is unable or unwilling to return to, and is unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. Refugees will have documentation from the US State Department (Homeland Security) designating them as refugee.

SBR – scientifically based research

Sheltered Instruction - The class is comprised solely of ELLs and the academic subject matter is provided in English through “sheltered” or adapted instruction to teach both English and the academic content material.

SIOP – Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol

SPED – Special Education

Title III Improvement Plan for Districts – Sample Table A

# of ESOL Endorsed Teachers and # of ELLs							
Grade	# ESOL endorsed teachers with coursework	# licensed teachers on an ESOL plan of study	# ESOL endorsed teachers - PRAXIS only (no coursework)	# bilingual teachers (speaking the student's language)	# bilingual paras (speaking language of the students)	# ELLs receiving ESOL support services	# ELLs not receiving ESOL support
K							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							

Teacher/pupil ratio – Use this table to determine whether there is sufficient number of ESOL endorsed teachers working with ELLs, how many ELLs are not receiving services (because of lack of endorsed teachers or parent refusal), and whether teachers have had sufficient training in working with ELLs.

Title III Improvement Plan for Districts – Sample Table B

	# minutes of ESOL support by program type									
Grade	Pull-out	Push-in	Before/After school	SIOP	Modified instruction in content	Dual language	ESOL class	Newcomer	Other	None
K										
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										

Use this table to help determine whether the program type used in the district is working. Also consider why that program type is selected for the district. Are the ELLs who are not in a program receiving other support (tutoring, Title I, etc)? Is it sufficient for them to demonstrate success in English language proficiency and other content areas?

Title III Improvement Plan for Districts – Sample Table C

# minutes of instruction and person providing					
For the week/month of: <i>(repeat table for each week/month of the year)</i>					
Grade	# minutes scheduled	# minutes received	# minutes provided by para	# minutes provided by ESOL endorsed teacher	# minutes provided in content area class by non-ESOL endorsed teacher*
K					
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					

*this will be for students considered “not in services” or “not receiving ESOL support”. Is there a teacher or aide working with the student to provide additional assistance (not ESOL support)?

Use this table to consider whether there are fewer minutes of instruction during certain times of the year (right before breaks, coinciding with any holidays, harvest, hunting) that may be contributing to regression or lack of progress. Are there times during the year when instruction time is heavy (right before assessment, beginning of the year)?

Title III Improvement Plan for Districts – Sample Table D

Percent of ELLs increasing total score on KELPA from previous year		
Grade	% in 2010	% in 2011
K		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		

Use this table to determine whether there is a particular grade that is challenged in increasing scores on the KELPA.

This table tracks scores by grade from one year to the next (two data points needed).

Title III Improvement Plan for Districts – Sample Table E

% of ELLs scoring fluent on KELPA one year		
Grade	% in 2010	% in 2011
K		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		

Use this table to determine the percent of ELLs (by grade) in the district that score fluent on a single year’s KELPA (one data point needed).

Title III Improvement Plan for Districts – Sample Table F

% of ELLs scoring “meets standard” or above on Kansas State Assessments				
Grade	Reading		Mathematics	
	% in 2010	% in 2011	% in 2010	% in 2011
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				

Use this table to determine in which grades ELLs do well on state assessments (Reading and Math) and in what grades they are challenged.

AMAO 3 is district AYP for the ELL subgroup. A district must have 30 or more ELLs to form a subgroup.

