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Introducing the LTEL Series
Four-Part LTEL Series:

1. Developing a Plan for Your LTELs: Analyzing Current Local Conditions and the Needs of LTELs
2. Planning Responsive Programs for LTELs: Building Comprehensive Programs and Services for LTELs at a School or District Level
3. Designing Responsive Curriculum and Instruction for LTELs: Developing the Academic Skills, Language and Literacy Abilities LTELs Need
4. Deepening Our Understanding of Language and Literacy Development for LTELs: Focus on Language Complexity

Introductions:
What is Your Role with Respect to LTELs? Who is (or needs to be) on your team?
Four-Part LTEL Series:

1. Developing a Plan for Your LTELs: Analyzing Current Local Conditions and the Needs of LTELs

Session I: At This Session You Will:
- Review TESOL’s 6 Principles for Exemplary Teaching of English Learners in Order to Apply the Principles to LTELs Across the Sessions
- Problematize the LTEL Label by Reviewing Current Critiques and Productive Uses of the Term
- Begin to Gather Essential Information Needed to Understand the Needs of Your Local LTEL Student Population
- Gather and Review High School Completion Rates for Students Identified as LTEL in NYC, Your District and Your School
- Conduct an Environmental Scan of the Types of Programs and Services you Currently Have and Need
- Identify Existing Personnel Delivering Instruction to LTELs or Providing Support Services in Order to Offer the Professional Development Needed to Support Effective Service Delivery
A Word About Handouts

We have made copies of materials you need during the workshop to participate in the planned activities.

You will be given access to the PowerPoint after the workshop so that you can have access to all other slides should you wish to review or reproduce any of them or link to the URLs provided.

Key Resource Document for this Session

Reparable Harm
Fulfilling the Unkept Promise of Educational Opportunity for California’s Long Term English Learners

Laurie Olsen, Ph.D.
A CALIFORNIANS TOGETHER RESEARCH & POLICY PUBLICATION

First Edition 2010

https://www.rcoe.us/educational-services/files/2012/08/NEA_Meeting_the_Unique_Needs_of_LT_ELs.pdf

Current Edition 2014

Posted on RBE-RN Site
Reviewing TESOL’s 6 Principles for Exemplary Teaching of English Learners in Order to Apply the Principles to LTELs Across the Sessions

www.the6principles.org

Illustrated with K-12 classroom practices, sample techniques, vignettes, charts and other graphics, and resource lists
The 6 Principles Writing Team

Helene Becker, Norwalk Public Schools, CT
Nancy Cloud, Rhode Island College
Andrea Hellman, Missouri State University
Linda New Levine, ESL/EFL Consultant, Vero Beach, FL
Deborah Short, Academic Language Research & Training, VA

Foreword by Jim Cummins
Additional support from Sherry Blok and Karen Woodson

The 6 Principles Book Chapters

• Chapter 1: A Vision for Exemplary English Language Teaching
• Chapter 2: What Teachers Should Know About English Language Development To Plan Instruction
• Chapter 3: The 6 Principles for Exemplary Teaching of English Learners
• Chapter 4: Additional Roles for Teachers of English Learners
• Chapter 5: Establishing a Culture of Shared Responsibility
All educational personnel
- respect, affirm, and promote students’ home languages and cultural knowledge and experiences as resources;
- celebrate multilingualism and diversity;
- support policies that promote individual language rights and multicultural education;
- help prepare students to be global citizens.
Principle 1: *Know your learners.*
Teachers learn basic information about their students’ families, languages, cultures, and educational backgrounds to welcome them in the classrooms and better prepare and deliver lessons.

Principle 2: *Create conditions for language learning.*
Teachers create a classroom culture that will ensure that new students feel comfortable in the class. They make decisions regarding the physical environment, the materials, and the social integration of new students to promote language learning.

### Important Characteristics to Know About English Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to supportive resources</th>
<th>Educational background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home language</td>
<td>Socio-emotional background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td>Learning preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of proficiency</td>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life experiences</td>
<td>Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home language literacy level</td>
<td>Gifts and talents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home language oral proficiency</td>
<td>Life goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs</td>
<td>Sociopolitical context of home country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which of these are essential to know about LTEL Students?
Other Important Student Characteristics

- Length of Time in the US
- Amount and Location of Prior Schooling in the US (Public/Private)
- Countries in Which Educated/Schooling Patterns in those Countries
- Family Composition/Family Situation
- Any Trauma or Special Considerations

Anything else?

Principle 3: Design high-quality lessons for language development.
Teachers develop lessons that are meaningful for students and promote language learning, learning strategies, and critical thinking skills. These lessons evolve from the learning objectives.

Principle 4: Adapt lesson delivery as needed.
Teachers continually assess as they teach -- observing and reflecting on learners’ responses to determine if the students are reaching the learning objective. If students struggle, teachers consider the possible causes and adjust their lessons.
Principle 5: Monitor and assess student language development.
Language learners learn at different rates so teachers regularly monitor and assess their language development to advance their learning efficiently. Teachers also gather data to measure student language growth.

Principle 6: Engage and collaborate within a community of practice.
Teachers collaborate with others in the profession to best support their learners in terms of programming, instruction, and advocacy. They also continue their own professional learning.

Which of these professionals must be involved to improve the programming for LTELs?
THE 6 PRINCIPLES FOR EXEMPLARY TEACHING OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

THE 6 PRINCIPLES IN ACTION

WHO SHOULD USE THE 6 PRINCIPLES?
The 6 Principles are for any teacher who wishes to improve teaching and learning in EL classrooms, for those who are new to teaching, and for any teacher who wants to improve their practice.

WHO ARE THE 6 PRINCIPLES?
The 6 Principles are informed by decades of research in language acquisition and language development. They are drawn from decades of research in how students learn and develop language, and are designed to guide teachers in their instruction of English learners.

THE 6 PRINCIPLES FOR EXEMPLARY TEACHING OF ENGLISH LEARNERS

1. KNOW YOUR LEARNERS
   - Make explicit connections between language and culture.
   - Build on students' prior knowledge and life experiences.
   - Recognize students' identities and cultural backgrounds.
   - Identify students' strengths and areas for improvement.
   - Establish clear expectations for students.
   - Foster a sense of belonging and community.

2. Creating Conditions for Language Learning
   - Make the physical environment inviting and supportive.
   - Provide opportunities for students to practice language.
   - Design activities that are meaningful and challenging.
   - Engage students in authentic language use.
   - Foster a positive classroom culture.
   - Encourage students to participate in class discussions.

3. Design High-Quality Lessons for Language Development
   - Plan lessons that are meaningful, challenging, and engaging.
   - Use a variety of teaching strategies to meet diverse learning needs.
   - Provide opportunities for students to develop language skills.
   - Create a supportive learning environment.
   - Encourage students to reflect on their learning.

4. Monitor and Assess Student Language Development
   - Monitor students' progress regularly.
   - Use multiple methods of assessment.
   - Provide feedback to students.
   - Use assessment data to inform instruction.
   - Encourage students to self-assess.

5. Engage and Collaborate Within a Community of Practice
   - Collaborate with other teachers.
   - Reflect on practice.
   - Engage in professional development.
   - Participate in school-based communities of practice.
   - Use technology to connect with colleagues.

6P Quick Guide is Posted for You

www.the6principles.org
Definitions

Long-Term (>6 Years of ELL Services)
Long-term ELLs (LTEls) are defined as those ELL students who have received more than 6 years of service and have yet to pass the NYSESLAT, the assessment used to determine proficiency in English, and are therefore still entitled to ELL services.
If enter in later elementary grades could still be on the way to LTELL; Monitoring years in program is critical!

Grade by Grade (KG entrant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade level</th>
<th>At the End of This Year; Possible Years in Program</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>At Risk of LTELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>On Way to LTELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LTELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>LTELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>LTELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>LTELL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characteristics of LTELLs

- Have lived most or all of their lives in the United States
- Are often orally bilingual and sound like native English speakers, but do not have well-developed academic literacy skills in English
- Often have developed habits of non-engagement, learned passivity, and invisibility in school
- Perform below grade level in reading and writing and, as a result, struggle in all content areas

Are your LTELs like those described by Kate Kinsella?

http://bcove.me/llbab62k
1 minute
What language needs does Kinsella raise in her commentary? Is everything she mentions being worked on in Intermediate/Advanced ENL/ELA classes?

Characteristics of LTELLs (Olsen, 2010; 2014)

- Distinct language needs
- High functioning social language
- Weak academic language and gaps in reading/writing
- Stuck at Intermediate (Transitioning, Expanding) Level
- Want to go to college — unrealistic views of their academic preparation
- Discouraged Learners by HS—may need to reach in MS
Course Access and Course Completion are Barriers

Long term ELLS Don’t have the academic language know-how to succeed in English classes or master the complex lexicon of other required courses such as chemistry or algebra.

Some LTELLs only have a quarter of the credits they need to graduate.

- Experience high degrees of inconsistency in the prior schooling, resulting in limited opportunities for academic language development in either English or their native language
- Which in turn impacts their performance in language arts as well as content classes
- They do not receive specialized services designed for their needs and instead are placed in programs that are mismatched to their language abilities (ESL classes with newer arrivals) and learning needs (remedial options for native speakers)
- They read and write several grade levels below their actual grade level (approximately 3)
- They are frequently retained which contributes to their lack of confidence and disengagement in learning
- Leads to high drop out rates

NYC – LTELL Study

Menken & Kleyn 2010
What's In a Name?

Problematizing the LTEL Label by Reviewing Current Critiques and Productive Uses of the Term

Erin Butler Twitter Account: https://twitter.com/enributler
Coordinator of Bilingual/ESL/Spanish Immersion/World Languages, Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District, Texas
Critiques of the Label:

- Deficit Model; focuses on "shortcomings" of students, rather than the programs that served them
- Effect of Label on Students (Stigma Associated with Prolonged Classification as ELL); Secondary Students Had Negative Views of Their Continued Placement in ESL
- Dependent on Reclassification/Exit Criteria—They May Meet One or More Criteria But Remain in ESL
- Variable Placement and Programmatic Responses Once Given the Label
- Limits Ability to Enroll in Other Classes
- May Experience Linguistic Isolation and Watered Down Content Classes
- Tend to Get Remedial "Interventions"; not Rigorous and Engaging Curriculum

Karen D. Thompson, Oregon State University 2015, Using California Data

"Receiving the Label Provides No Benefits; No Special Services"
Critiques of the Label:

- A category that serves to position students of color and their literacy practices as “languageless”
- May have received insufficient or inappropriate instruction—in particular in literacy
- Have highly varied educational and linguistic backgrounds that are obscured by the label
- May not have received instruction that promoted the registers of schooling; Access to opportunities for substantive dialogic academic discourse were limited
- Standardized test scores control exit
- They have high aspirations that are not being met

Amanda K. Kibler, et al 2017, South Atlantic Region, Hampshire County School District

Critiques of the Label:

- Positions students as deficient; Hurts the Students it was designed to help
- These students are inexperienced with testing practices that determine if students are proficient in English (Standardized ELA Assessments)
- Portrayed as “still learning English”
- On a more holistic level, we need to design learning experiences that are situated in a multidimensional understanding of the academic, social and linguistic abilities and experiences of these young people and provides academic enrichment.
- LTEl marginalizes many young people’s sophisticated use of English and erases other relevant aspects of their identities and experiences
- There is not one standardized test score that is synonymous with English Proficiency: Many native speakers also score low on ELA assessments but are not placed in ESL classes
- We need to create academic environments in which this population can experience on-going success.

Maneka Brooks, 2016; http://brooksphd.com/blog/
“the fact that a student does not perform at a certain level on a standardized assessment of English language arts (ELA) does not mean that s/he has yet to acquire English.”

multiple factors can impact how an individual performs on a standardized assessment. These factors include, but are not limited to, differences in background knowledge, test anxiety, and biases within the test itself.

S.T.O.P. Activity: In Groups of 4

Now that you have seen the critiques of the LTEL label, look again at the major critiques and:

Person 1: Mark those that define or describe the students as “S”.

Person 2: Mark those that pertain to our testing approaches as “T”.

Person 3: Mark those that describe obstructive beliefs about LTELs as “O”.

Person 4: Mark those that describe failures in our programmatic responses as “P”.
Now that you have seen the critiques of the LTEL label, look again at the major critiques and:

Person 1: Mark those that define or describe the students as “S”.
Person 2: Mark those that pertain to our testing approaches as “T”.
Person 3: Mark those that describe obstructive beliefs about LTELs as “O”.
Person 4: Mark those that describe failures in our programmatic responses as “P”.

Critiques of the Label:

- Deficit Model: focuses on “shortcomings” of students, rather than the programs that served them.
- Effect of Label on Students (Stigma Associated with Prolonged Classification as ELL): Secondary Students Had Negative Views of Their Continued Placement in ESL.
- Dependent on Reclassification/Exit Criteria—They May Meet One or More Criteria But Remain in ESL.
- Variable Placement and Programmatic Responses Once Given the Label.
- Limits Ability to Enroll in Other Classes.
- May Experience Linguistic Isolation and Watered Down Content Classes.
- Tend to Get Remedial “Interventions”; not Rigorous and Engaging Curriculum.


Critiques of the Label:

- A category that serves to position students of color and their literacy practices as “languageless”.
- Have highly varied educational and linguistic backgrounds that are obscured by the label.
- Standardized test scores control exit.
- They have high aspirations that are not being met.
- May have received insufficient or inappropriate instruction—In particular in literacy.
- May not have received instruction that promoted the registers of schooling; Access to opportunities for substantive dialogic academic discourse were limited.

Karen D. Thompson, Oregon State University 2015, Using California Data.

“Receiving the Label Provides No Benefits; No Special Services”
Response to this Criticism:

- Study the criteria being used to exit/reclassify students
- When students meet some but not all of the criteria; consider more fine-grained and responsive ways of looking at student performance
- Evaluate our programs, especially the adequacy of preparation we offer intermediate and advanced ELs – how well they respond to each learner's individual needs
- Ensure full development of academic language by comprehensive and well-designed programs to prevent students from staying in programs for 6 or more years without success

Continued....

- Create specialized enrichment programs for students currently carrying the LTEL label, not “remedial” programs. Ensure that they are taught in strong programs designed for their specific identified needs by expert second language and literacy specialists
- Focus on program inadequacies, not supposed student deficits.
- Ensure that program options do not preclude students from participating in enriching academic classes
- Establish Heritage Language classes for students to further develop their home language; a class for native speakers
Unlike newcomers who show up on the district’s doorstep with varying levels of schooling in their home countries, long-term English-learners have been part of the district for years; They’re homegrown.

Helen Choi,
ELL Program Coordinator,
Los Angeles Unified School District

Table Discussion #1

What are the implications for your site regarding the use of the ‘LTEL’ label?

What can you do at your school or in your district to strengthen programs to prevent the LTEL phenomena?

Write bullet points to capture your “take-aways.”
Listen to the speaker’s portrayal of the LTEL situation in California (Los Angeles). Do you agree/disagree with her portrayal of the LTEL situation? Is this what it’s like where you are?

- http://www.colorincolorado.org/ell-basics/special-populations/long-term-ells

Video and text at this site

How ELLs Become LTELLs

Which Causes Do You Think Are Your LTELL Population?

- Lack of consistency in ELD programs or services
- As Transitional ELLs did not receive sufficient stand alone support
- Enrolled in weak ENL programs or poorly implemented programs
- Not enough support in content classes to understand; participate; build academic language
- Not enough access to L1 support
- Mobility (Between states, districts, schools)
- Attendance Issues
1. What Information Could You Collect to Understand the Causes for LTEs in your School/District?

2. How Could You Collect the Information (Focus Groups, Interviews, Surveys; Class Visits)?

Making a Plan to Gather Information on Your LTEs In Order to Tailor Programs and Services that Make a Difference
### Long Term English Learner (LTEL) Data Worksheet

List Percent or Number of LTEL Students in Each Cell Below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Characteristics</th>
<th>Data Collection Method/Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of LTEL Students:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Home Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Language Survey</th>
<th>Method/Tool: Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Cultural/Ethnic Backgrounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool/Method:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Tool/Method:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Years in Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Program</th>
<th>Tool/Method:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Overall English Proficiency Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test/Method:</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Transitioning</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Commanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Greatest Language Development Need (Lowest Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test/Method:</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Second Greatest Language Development Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test/Method:</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Levels</td>
<td>Tool/Method:</td>
<td>415-760 (3rd)</td>
<td>635-950 (4th)</td>
<td>770 to 1080 (5th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Needs</td>
<td>Tool/Method:</td>
<td>Decoding</td>
<td>Word Knowledge</td>
<td>Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Needs</td>
<td>Tool/Method:</td>
<td>Idea Development</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Word Choice/ Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Tool/Method:</td>
<td>Consistent No absences</td>
<td>1-4 Absences per Marking Period</td>
<td>5-9 Absences per Marking Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Tool/Method:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Tool/Method:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Will You Gather the Data Requested by the LTEL Data Worksheet?

Steps:
1—Look at each line of the LTEL Data Worksheet
2—Identify a source you could consult to obtain that data
3—If there is no source you can easily consult, identify a method to obtain the data (e.g. interview the students, conduct a survey of teachers of LTEL students, etc.)

Possible Methods
Methods for Getting Information

Qualitative Data
- Interview (students; teacher; EL Director)
- Focus Groups
- Observation
- Writing Activities to Gather Feedback—Impressions, Opinions
- Ranking Activities

Quantitative Data
- Questionnaire (all types of questions)
- Survey (opinions)
- Records (student assessment records, class schedules, curriculum in use)
Gathering Essential Language Proficiency Information to Target Areas to Work on with LTEls

Using the Results of the NYSESLAT to Target Needed Skills for Instruction
What are Students Profiles Showing?

(Parent Report)
MIDDLE SCHOOL 2015-2016 GRADE 6 TEST RESULTS

Dear Parent/Guardian of Monica,

We are pleased to provide you this report about Monica’s performance on the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) that was administered in the spring of 2016 to all English Language Learners (ELLs) designated as Former ELLs. This test was given to determine Michelle’s English language proficiency level.

This year, ELLs were assessed on their proficiency in the areas of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The scores range from 30-90, with 90 being the highest.

**Monica’s English Language Proficiency Level:** Transitioning

**Score:** 224

**Percentile:** 99%

**Listening:** Students must demonstrate the ability to understand spoken text.

**Writing:** Students must produce written text that demonstrates the ability to use the English language to structure thoughts and ideas in writing.

For more information regarding this test, the New York State standards, and how you can help Monica, go to www.p12.nysed.gov/biling/bilinged/parent-information/home.html.

**What do you notice?**

---

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 2015-2016 GRADE 11 TEST RESULTS

Dear Parent/Guardian of Jessica,

We are pleased to provide you this report about Jessica’s performance on the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) that was administered in the spring of 2016 to all English Language Learners (ELLs). This test assesses students’ English language proficiency in the areas of reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

This year, ELLs were assessed on their proficiency in the areas of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The scores range from 30-90, with 90 being the highest.

**Jessica’s English Language Proficiency Level:** Transitioning

**Score:** 224

**Percentile:** 99%

**Listening:** Students must demonstrate the ability to understand spoken text.

**Writing:** Students must produce written text that demonstrates the ability to use the English language to structure thoughts and ideas in writing.

For more information regarding this test, the New York State standards, and how you can help Jessica, go to www.p12.nysed.gov/biling/bilinged/parent-information/home.html.

**What do you notice?**
### Potential Proficiency Bands for Individual Skill Area Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scaled Scores</th>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-42</td>
<td>Entering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-54</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-66</td>
<td>Transitioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-78</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-90</td>
<td>Commanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are not confirmed ranges; they are very rough estimates, just breaking the total point spread from 30-90 into regular intervals for the 5 proficiency levels—**USE WITH EXTREME CAUTION!**
Transitioning Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Entering</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Transitioning</th>
<th>Expanding</th>
<th>Commanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>120-212</td>
<td>213-244</td>
<td>245-263</td>
<td>264-315</td>
<td>316-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>120-170</td>
<td>171-215</td>
<td>216-251</td>
<td>252-295</td>
<td>296-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>120-180</td>
<td>181-227</td>
<td>228-264</td>
<td>265-307</td>
<td>308-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>120-170</td>
<td>171-216</td>
<td>217-258</td>
<td>259-303</td>
<td>304-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>120-181</td>
<td>182-228</td>
<td>229-265</td>
<td>266-310</td>
<td>311-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>120-172</td>
<td>173-214</td>
<td>215-257</td>
<td>258-300</td>
<td>301-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>120-180</td>
<td>181-219</td>
<td>220-258</td>
<td>259-300</td>
<td>301-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>120-169</td>
<td>170-212</td>
<td>213-249</td>
<td>250-299</td>
<td>300-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>120-169</td>
<td>170-212</td>
<td>213-249</td>
<td>250-305</td>
<td>306-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>120-175</td>
<td>176-220</td>
<td>221-262</td>
<td>263-317</td>
<td>318-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>120-175</td>
<td>176-220</td>
<td>221-262</td>
<td>263-317</td>
<td>318-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>120-178</td>
<td>179-220</td>
<td>221-262</td>
<td>263-317</td>
<td>318-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>120-178</td>
<td>179-220</td>
<td>221-262</td>
<td>263-317</td>
<td>318-360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine a student’s overall proficiency level, find the student’s total scale score in the scale score ranges on this chart.
Look at all the skills that may need work and prioritize your work!

According to Saunders, Goldenberg and Marcelletti (2013) “ELD Instruction Should Incorporate Reading and Writing but Should Emphasize Listening and Speaking”

Don’t forget to work on academic listening!

What Information Will You Collect on Your LTEs Proficiency? How will you support teachers to understand their students’ proficiency profiles?
Gathering and Reviewing High School Completion Rates for Students Identified as LTEL in NYC, Your District and Your School

Before We Watch the Video Clip:

Anticipation Guide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Opinion</th>
<th>My Partner's VideoClip</th>
<th>What Do YOU think?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. If you improve the English Language Learners Program, you’ll improve a district’s overall graduation rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Persistently low achieving schools have more than their fair share of English Learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. When urban schools enroll 10% or more students with a primary language other than English, graduation rates are below 50%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

√ Agree
X Disagree
News Report from 2011 On Urban ELLs and Drop Out Rate/Low Achieving Schools:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BJ1hQ9iA7O1

Anticipation Guide:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Opinion</th>
<th>My Partner's</th>
<th>VideoClip</th>
<th>What Do YOU think?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. If you improve the English Language Learners Program, you’ll improve a district’s overall graduation rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Persistently low achieving schools have more than their fair share of English Learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. When urban schools enroll 10% or more students with a primary language other than English, graduation rates are below 50%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

√ Agree
X Disagree

Other Points You Want to Make
Long-Term ELLs More Likely to Drop Out, Study Finds

The longer students are classified as English-language learners, the greater the likelihood that they will drop out of school. And English-language learners who are reclassified as English proficient in earlier grades tend to be similar to non-English learners when it comes to achievement and dropout rates.

Findings:
The longer students are classified as English-language learners, the greater the likelihood that they will drop out of school.

And English language learners who are reclassified as English proficient in earlier grades tend to be similar to non-English learners when it comes to achievement and dropout rates.

By Lesli A. Maxwell

The researchers examined how a student’s ELL status and the timing of when they are reclassified as being fluent in English impacts their persistence in school.

The report looks at many factors that contribute to how ELLs fare in school. The findings of the report build on research on ELLs from researchers at the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, based at the University of California, Los Angeles. Using three years of statewide, student-level data, the report examines enrollment history, achievement, reclassification rates, and dropout rates.
• Dropout rates for ELL students were 25 percent, compared to 15 percent for non-English learners.
• English learners who were reclassified in later grades had higher dropout rates than those who were reclassified in the early grades:
• 33 percent dropped out if they were still classified as ELLs in high school, 22 percent of those reclassified in grade 5 or sooner dropped out, while 15 percent of students who got reclassified in grade 2 or earlier dropped out.

• LTEL and ELL students currently represent the fastest growing segment of school-age population in the U.S. Yet, the numbers are showing that many of them are struggling in the classroom today.
• 60% of high school LTELs have spent 6 or more years in our public school systems
• 25%, or one out of four LTELs, drop out of school
• 33% of LTELs never graduate from high school

The following numbers illustrate how other key states are faring relative to one another.
• California, largest LTEL student population, 65% grad rate
• Texas, 2nd largest LTEL student population, 71 % grad rate
• Arizona, 11th highest LTEL student population, 18% grad rate
• Nevada, LTEL student population grad rate less than 33%

The inability of educators to meet the needs of their LTEL populations has created disproportionate outcomes. Taking steps to ensure this underserved population is equipped with the tools it needs to succeed should be a critical part of every school district’s master plan for promoting student achievement and education excellence.
Graduation outcomes of students who entered New York City public schools in grade 5 or 6 as English learner students

Michael J. Kieffer
New York University
Caroline E. Parker
Education Development Center

Graduation rates differed across subgroups that had different times to reclassification. Specifically, 55 percent of long-term English learner students graduated from high school on time, compared with 76 percent of short-term English learner students (see figure 1). The 21 percentage point difference was statistically significant (p < .001). When student background characteristics were controlled for, the difference was similar.

Figure 1. The on-time cohort graduation rate was lower among students who were ever English learner students than among all students in New York City public schools, and the rate was lower among long-term English learner students than among short-term English learner students.

- Graduation rate (percent)
- 0%
- 25%
- 50%
- 75%
- 100%

- Ever English learner student
- All students in New York City public schools
- Long-term English learner student
- Short-term English learner student

a. Refers to students who entered New York City public schools in grade 4 or 5 during the 2000/01 school year as English learner students and were expected to graduate in 2009/10 or 2010/11 or were retained prior to grade 9 and thus expected to graduate later.

b. Refers to all students in New York City public schools who were expected to graduate in 2009/10 or 2010/11 (that is, first-time grade 9 students in fall 2006 or fall 2007).

Source: Authors' analysis based on 2002/03-2012/13 data from the New York City Department of Education.
Delayed Graduation:

Approximately 15 percent of students who entered New York City public schools in grade 5 or 6 as English learner students graduated one or two years after their expected graduation year, yielding a six-year cohort graduation rate of 79 percent.

Data Used: 2002/3 to 2012/13

Delayed Graduation:

Some 19 percent of long-term English learner students and 12 percent of short-term English learner students graduated one or two years after their expected graduation year. That is, a higher percentage of long-term English learner students than of short-term English learner students stayed in school another year or two and successfully met graduation requirements.

Nonetheless, the cumulative six-year graduation rate was lower among long-term English learner students (74 percent) than among short-term English learner students (87 percent). This difference was statistically significant ($p < .001$).
The percentage of students who earned a **Local diploma** was higher among long-term English learner students (33 percent) than among short-term English learner students (11 percent), and the percentage of students who earned an **Advanced Regents diploma** was higher among short-term English learner students (31 percent) than among long-term English learner students (4 percent; figure 5). Both differences were statistically significant ($p < .001$).

The percentage of students who earned a **Regents diploma** was also higher among short-term English learner students (45 percent) than among long-term English learner students (37 percent), a statistically significant difference ($p = .011$).

The percentage of students who **did not earn a diploma** was higher among long-term English learner students (26 percent) than among short-term English learner students (13 percent). These differences remained statistically significant.
Person 1: Read Growing Population of LTEL Students

Person 2: Read What are Factors that May Impede EL Students Academic Literacy Development

Person 3: Read What are Some Promising Practices That May Improve Academic Outcomes for LTEL Students

Share!
Measuring Student Proficiency in Grades 3-8
English Language Arts and Mathematics

September 26, 2018
Statewide English Language Learner Performance in ELA

Ever ELLs increased their performance over Never ELLs and Total Public in ELA.

*Due to the new two-session test design and performance standards, the 2018 Grades 3-8 ELA and Math results cannot be compared with prior-year results.

NYC English Language Learners Performance in ELA

Due to the new two-session test design and performance standards, the 2018 Grades 3-8 ELA and Math results cannot be compared with prior-year results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current ELLs</th>
<th>Ever ELLs</th>
<th>Never ELLs</th>
<th>Total Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students identified as ELL during the reported year.
*Students identified as ELL any year prior to the reported year but not including the reported year.
*Students never reported to have received ELL services.
Statewide English Language Learner Performance in Math

Ever ELLs increased their performance over Never ELLs and Total Public in Math.

*Due to the new two-session test design and performance standards, the 2018 Grades 3-8 ELA and Math results cannot be compared with prior-year results.

NYC English Language Learner Performance in Math

*Due to the new two-session test design and performance standards, the 2018 Grades 3-8 ELA and Math results cannot be compared with prior-year results.
Federal Reporting Requirements:

ESSA requires states and districts to report on the number of ELLs who attended schools in districts for five years or more without being reclassified as proficient in English.
How Will You Get the Information You Need on Graduation Rates of LTELs for your School or District?

Conducting an Environmental Scan of the Types of Programs and Services you Currently Have and Need
What Does Your Program Look Like Now For LTELs?

Current Services Received by LTELs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENL Stand-Alone Classes</th>
<th>ENL Integrated Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are your LTELs in any Stand-Alone ENL Classes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they mixed in with other EL students? Or do you have an LTEL ENL Stand-Alone class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are they taught by seasoned and highly skilled teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do they have individualized goals for instruction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are your LTELs placed together in the same ENL Integrated classes (at each grade level)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the Integrated ENL classes into which LTEL students are placed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much coordination time is given to the collaborating teachers to prepare tailored lessons for LTELs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the language and literacy goals clear and an equal focus to the content objectives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LTELL Students Need:

Critical Literacy Skills Needed by LTELLs

To develop sufficient English proficiency to achieve, need:

- To acquire a rich vocabulary in both languages
- To build speaking, reading and writing skills to support school success
- To build academic knowledge and skills
- To engage in school

Current Services Received by LTELLs:

- Academic Support (mathematics, etc.)
- Tutoring
- Study and Test Taking Skills Preparation
- After-School Programs
- Reading Intervention
- Counseling
- Library Services
- Other:
3 strategies outlined by the Research Institute for the Study of Language in Urban Society at the City University of New York to support Long-term ELLs:

- Maintaining the consistency of students' programs and services is important. Students who move in and out of bilingual, ESL, and mainstream programs from year to year had a harder time acquiring English. This may mean that parents need to be informed about the importance of keeping their children in similar programs, even when switching schools.

- Schools should create, implement, and adhere to clear and coherent school-wide policies and programming to be able to provide Long-term ELLs with consistent support.

- Secondary schools must be prepared to explicitly teach literacy to Long-term ELLs and cannot assume that such students have prior literacy instruction (either in their home language or in English). This can include infusing literacy instruction across the curriculum.

http://blog.edmentum.com/long-term-english-language-learners-helping-them-finish-line

How Can We Find Out What Services and Supports Our LTELs Might Need That Are Not Currently Available?
Identifying Existing Personnel Delivering Instruction to LTELs or Providing Support Services in Order to Offer the Professional Development Needed to Support Effective Service Delivery

Who Serves Our LTELs Now?
- ENL/Bilingual Teachers Providing Services
- Content Area Teachers Providing Services
- Counselors
- Librarian
- Nurse
- Tutoring Program Staff
- Reading Specialists
- Mathematics Specialists

Others?
What PD Might Be Needed? To What Groups of Teachers/Support Personnel?

- How to Advance Second Language Acquisition?
- How To Advance Language Complexity?
- Motivating/Engaging Passive Learners?
- Literacy Needs of Second Language Learners? (Not remedial instruction; Developmental process)
- Sheltered Instruction Methods for Content Area Instruction? Scaffolds to Use; Gradual Release Model of Instruction
- Vocabulary Development Tactics?
- Study Skills Instruction? Test Taking Skill Instruction?
- Other Topics?

**LTEL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group of Professionals</th>
<th>PD Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Think Carefully!
Key Resource Document:

Framework and Recommendations
Here we offer a CUNY-NYSIEB framework for LTEs that address: (1) Programmatic Structures, (2) Curricular Structures, (3) Classroom Structures and Resources (4) Pedagogical Strategies, and (5) Assessment Strategies that should be adapted with flexibility to meet the specific needs and strengths of the students, the educators, and the school.

1. Programmatic Structures
   Appropriate, yet Demanding!

2. Curricular Structures
   A curriculum with cultural connections and language and literacy supports.

3. Classroom Structures and Resources
   Make the how’s of learning and language explicit while providing high interest materials.

4. Pedagogical Strategies
   Work together to leverage and extend students’ bilingualism!

5. Assessment strategies
   Intentional and adapted.
Session 2: December 17, 2018: Planning Responsive Programs for LTELs: Building Comprehensive Programs and Services for LTELs at a School or District Level
Presenter: Nancy Cloud, Ed.D.
Location: Lincoln Center, Fordham

At this session, you will:
• Jointly Outline the Full Range of Services LTELs Need (Including Counseling and Support Services)
• Appreciate the Academic Skills Students Need to Be Successful in Secondary Classrooms (Academic Listening and Note-taking Skills, Study and Test-Taking Skills) and Ways of Developing These Skills in Integrated and Stand Alone Classes
• Plan Ways to Assist LTELs in Setting Learning Goals and Directing Their Own Learning to Meet Personalized Targets
• Explore Key Strategies that Promote Student Engagement and Investment in Learning
• Plan Activities that Will Ensure Collaborative Relationships at a Building Level (Among Language/Literacy Teachers and Content Teachers; Support Personnel, Librarians/Media Specialists; Technology Specialists) and with Community Based Organizations
• Identify Counseling and Academic Support Needed by LTELs, Who Will Provide It and Where It Will Happen in the Program to Ensure Accountability

Thank You!
Nancy Cloud
ncloud@ric.edu
nancycloud2@gmail.com