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The purpose of this document is to outline how Eugene School District, 4J complies with Title III requirements and meets the educational needs of our English Language Learners. Goals under Title III include:

- Assist English Learners (ELs) in attaining English proficiency.
- Assist ELs in meeting the state’s academic standards.
- Develop high quality English language instruction programs for ELs.
- Develop and enhance high quality instructional programs designed to prepare ELs to enter all-English instruction settings.
- Build capacity to establish, implement and sustain language instructional programs and programs of English Language development for ELs.
- Promote parental and community participation in language instruction for the parents and communities of English Learners.

This plan was created with input from the following participants:

- ELL Program Coordinator, Abby Lane (lead)
- ELL Program Assistant, Debi Starr
- Federal Grants Coordinator, Tasha Katsuda
- Secondary Director, Randy Bernstein
- Elementary Director, Sara Green
- Evaluation Specialist, Oscar Loureiro
- Family, Parent and Community Coordinator, Carmen Urbina
- Staff development Specialists: Marlee Litten, Greta Sagolla and Reid Sheppard
Section 1: District Demographics

1. The size of the district, including number of schools.

| Student Population: 15,773 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 elementary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Charter Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 middle schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 high schools, 1 Alternative High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The enrollment of the district, please include the data date (i.e., spring membership)

- 15,773 - Spring 2015

3. The district’s ethnic diversity (could be percent or number).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>% IN STUDENT BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%Asian</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Black</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Hispanic</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Multiracial</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The number and percentage of English learners (EL students enrolled in district) could include number per school. 467 (2.7%) (The chart below shows the number of ELs by grade and school.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>KG</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams Elementary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Technology Academy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awbrey Park Elementary School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Elementary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Young Middle School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas Ridge Community Elem</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlemagne/Fox Hollow Elem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavez Elementary School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Elementary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Community School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Elementary School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Education Options</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family School Elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilham Elementary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Elementary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Elementary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Middle School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Middle School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormack Elementary School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Middle School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eugene High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Rd El Camino del Rio Elm</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Middle School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eugene High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Creek Elementary Schh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Oaks Elementary School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willigillespie Elementary Schh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winston Churchill High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yujin Gakuen Elementary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The number of ELSWDs (have an IEP) – provide this information by primary disability. Include number of ELs with a 504 Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPED Designation</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 - Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - Communication Disorder</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 - Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82 - Autism Spectrum Disorder</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in Sped</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The number of English learners in the Talented and Gifted program.

1-ELL
5- Monitored
7. A list of the schools, identified by Title I-A Targeted Assisted, School-Wide, Focus, Priority, or Model (districts could choose buildings with specific programs for English learners - i.e., bilingual, two-way, etc.).

Schools identified as “Title 1 School-wide Programs” are:
Arts & Technology Middle School
Awbrey Park Elementary
Bertha Holt Elementary
Cesar Chavez Elementary
Family Elementary School
Howard Elementary
McCornack Elementary
River Road/El Camino del Rio Elementary
Spring Creek Elementary
Twin Oaks Elementary
Village Charter School

Schools identified as “Targeted Assistance Programs” are:
Eugene Waldorf
Kelly Middle School
O’Hara Catholic School
Willagillespie Elementary

Priority School- River Road/ Camino del Rio Elementary - School-wide Title I, Two-Way Spanish bilingual

Focus School- Spring Creek- Targeted Title I

8. The number and percentage of English learners showing progress towards proficiency (AMAO 1). 53%

9. The number and percentage of students identified fewer than 5 years exited from an English language development (ELD) program (AMAO 2A). 17%

10. The number and percentage of students identified as EL for five or more years exited from an ELD program (AMAO 2B). 45%

11. The number of students in monitoring year 1 status. 93

12. The number of students in monitoring year 2 status. 66

13. The number of former ELs (not in current EL or monitoring status). 210

14. The number of students who have re-entered the ELD program after exiting for proficiency. 1
15. The number and percentage of the district English learners who have a waiver for ELD services. 19 (.04%)

16. The district AMAO 3 Oregon State Assessment Status for the limited English proficient (LEP) Sub group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>ACADEMIC GROWTH</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>ACADEMIC GROWTH</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>LEVEL 4</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: School District Information on Program Goals

17. Describe the district’s educational approach (es) (ESL, Bilingual, etc.) for educating ELs. Include a description for each educational approach used within the district. This information could be placed in a chart listing each school and the educational approach (es) for English language acquisition and core content.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT:

The English Language Learner Program in Eugene School District 4J provides English language instruction to students whose limited experience with the English language interferes with their ability to participate fully in the regular classroom and in becoming academically successful. Our ESOL endorsed teachers provide explicit and sequential English language development that supports students' acquisition of the English language and the teaching of state ELP standards. Our instruction focuses on building academic vocabulary needed to access content instruction and on supporting students in developing proficiency in all four language domains (i.e., speaking, listening, reading and writing).

We use a specialized ELD curriculum that provides standards-based language and literacy instruction. Our instructional approach is guided by the following ODE description of Forms and Functions:
“While there are many opportunities during the course of a day in a language-rich classroom environment for language learning, merely being exposed to, even engaged in, activities in English is not sufficient to assure the development of full academic language proficiency. Limited English proficient students must receive explicit instruction in language that is differentiated based on their English proficiency level. Effective English language development actively develops competence in the functions, forms and vocabulary of English and provides many opportunities to develop oral and written fluency.”

ACCESS TO CORE

Bilingual Programs:
Our district has several partial and full immersion programs. Following is a brief description of each.

➢ Camino del Rio - Spanish “Two-Way” Dual-Language Program (50/50)

This program is a K-5 program. Students in K-1st receive literacy instruction in their native language. 2nd-5th grades receive literacy instruction in both. They receive exposure to and instruction in their non-native language through math, science, social studies. We strive for a 50/50 balance of Spanish/English each day. This program is being planned as a K-12 grade program. Currently the program is at 6th grade in Kelly Middle school and will be growing into 7th grade in 15/16. It will eventually grow into North Eugene High school once it reaches 9th grade.

➢ Buena Vista- Spanish Dual-language program 90% Sp.-10% Eng. (K-3) 50/50 (4th-5th)

This program was created as a one-way immersion and has been in existence for over 30 years. However, a recent change in enrollment and transportation has provided the opportunity for more native Spanish speakers to attend. This is intentional and the goal is to create a “two-way” program model as time goes on. This is a K-12 program across 3 schools (Buena Vista K-5, Monroe M.S. 6th-8th and Sheldon H.S 9th-12th)

➢ Yujin Gakuen- Japanese 50/50 Partial Immersion K-12 (Across three schools: Yujin Gakuen K-5th, Kelly M.S. 6th-8th and North High school 9th-12th)

➢ Charlemagne at Fox Hollow- French 50/50 Partial Immersion K-12 (Across three schools, Charlemagne K-5th, Roosevelt M.S. 6th-8th and South 9th-12th.)
Sheltered-Instruction- All other schools

Teachers using this method understand that they are teaching content and language simultaneously and engage students in specific learning strategies that support comprehensibility and language practice. As part of our staff development plan over the years, we have provided “SIOP” and “GLAD” training to many of our teachers. Our staff development specialists support our classroom teachers in integrating Sheltered-Instruction techniques. Following are a few key strategies that we encourage our teachers to implement in their teaching. (See Genzuk, M. (2011).)

- Simplify teacher language.
- Don’t force oral production
- Demonstrate, use visuals and manipulatives.
- Make lessons sensory activities.
- Pair or group students with native speakers.
- Adapt the materials to student’s language level, but maintain content integrity.
- Build on the student’s prior knowledge.
- Support the student’s home language and culture; bring it into the classroom.
- Increase wait time, be patient.
- Respond to the student’s message; don’t correct errors (Expansion of language).

18. Include the relevant research that supports the district’s educational approach (es) for educating ELLs.


19. Describe the district’s educational goal for English language proficiency. This could be a specific goal for each educational program or an overall district goal for all programs.

- English Language Learners will become proficient in English.
- English Language Learners will meet the same academic content and achievement standards expected of all.
- English Language Learners will be provided meaningful access to the curriculum and equal educational opportunity.

Guiding Principles of Instruction for English Learners

- Effective ELL instruction uses quality curriculum which reflects best practices in the field of second language acquisition, supports the teaching of ELL standards, and is provided by well trained teachers. In addition, when designing effective educational opportunities for ELLs, we consider the following guiding principles:
  - To provide instruction that builds on students’ previous education, cognitive abilities, and English language proficiency.
  - To teach challenging content that enables students to meet performance standards in content areas that are consistent with expectations for all students.
  - To evaluate English Language Learners with appropriate and valid assessments which are aligned with state and local standards and take into account language proficiency and students’ cultural background.
  - To recognize that students come with their own language and culture that is an asset, not a detriment to their academic achievement.
  - The entire school community is responsible for the education of English Language Learners.
  - To provide instruction and school activities that reflect respect for diversity and show understanding of students’ varied cultural backgrounds.
  - To provide opportunities which build and strengthen the home-school connection.
20. Describe the district’s educational goal for core content knowledge

Goal: Increase achievement for every student and close the achievement gap.

Eugene, 4J is committed to ensuring that all students graduate and are college and career ready. Every school must improve teaching and learning with a focus on the Common Core State Standards. Our expectation is that every student will make at least one year of academic growth in each school year. In addition, we use specific measures to track students’ progress as they move through the grades. We track progress by student subgroups as well as by individual student. All staff shall provide the support needed to actively engage students in their learning. We are aware that some schools require additional resources to achieve district and state academic goals and close the achievement gap. (For further info. See school board goals and key results on Eugene 4J webpage: http://www.4j.lane.edu/board/goals/).

21. What measure(s) will be used to determine the effectiveness of the English language proficiency goal? This could include district formative assessments.

Eugene School District, 4J uses the Oregon Department of Education’s AMAOs to measure English language proficiency growth. Each spring all English Language Learners in grades K-12 are given the ELPA. This online English language proficiency assessment measures language proficiency in Speaking, reading, writing and listening. School and individual student analyze the scores received. In addition, teachers use curriculum-based assessments, the “ADEPT” and or “Gap Finder” to document on-going progress and to target instruction.

22. What measure(s) will be used to determine the effectiveness of the core content knowledge goal? This could include district progress monitoring assessments.

- Easy CBM in Math and Reading K-8
- The proportion of ninth graders earning six credits (on track to graduate)
- The percentage of students fully scheduled at each grade level attendance rates by grade level and sub groups
- EXPLORE college and career readiness results for eighth grade students
- PLAN college and career readiness results for tenth grade students
- OAKS (Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills) and essential skills performance for all students and for subgroups
- Graduation rates for four-year and five-year
23. Describe how the district will measure these goals over time.

Our district evaluation specialist helps track all this information and presents it annually to district leadership, the school board and our equity committee. This information is tracked in a variety of ways (e.g. Synergy, Data Warehouse, Indistar, etc.) This information is also available to administrators and instructional staff and can be reviewed by school and individual student.

24. Describe how these goals compare to the district’s educational goals for non-EL students. How are the goals for ELs different from district goals for non-EL students?

In Eugene School District 4J, we believe that every student in every school can excel and that it is our responsibility to ensure that every student has equitable access and opportunity to do so. We have the same goals for all our students and we believe by monitoring the growth of the measures listed above (#22), we can better ensure the academic success of our English Learners and target interventions where needed.

25. Describe how these goals will prepare ELs to meet the district goals for its overall educational program and the college/career ready standards.

Keeping track of how well our students do in the various measures listed in #22 will better ensure that we are aware of the progress students are making towards graduation and our College/Career Ready standards. This information will help us see trends or gaps in student populations so we are better able to see where we need to improve and to dig deeper into possible solutions. In addition, we use an early warning system which provides a “risk score” from a compilation of academic scores and various risk factors such as Special Education, mobility, and poverty.

Section 3: Identification of Potential English Learners

26. Describe the district’s procedure for identifying ELs (include the information requested for the following questions in detail).

- **Each spring** a copy of the district’s Home language Survey is included in the district’s enrollment packets (Spanish/English- Other languages versions available through Transact). **Person responsible**- School Secretary with assistance from ELL Program Assistant as necessary.

**First week back to school:**

- There is a K-12 ELL program meeting where our identification procedures are reviewed with all the ELD teachers.
  **Person(s) responsible**- ELL Program Coordinator and ELL Program Assistant.
• **Each ELD teacher is responsible** for checking in daily with the secretary at their assigned school to retrieve completed Home Language surveys and to ensure that all possible English Learners have a Home Language Survey (HLS). (This survey is part of the enrollment packet given to all students.)

**When students arrive:**

• If the HLS shows that a student speaks another language other than English, Students are assessed for English language proficiency using the “Online IPT” within 2 weeks of their arrival. (If a student has transferred from another School District, teachers are asked to contact ELL office before testing.)
  
  **Person responsible- ELD teacher**
  
  • All students will be given the oral portion of the assessment first. If a student scores “NES” they qualify for ELD instruction
  
  • Students in grades 2nd-12th who score “LES” or “FES” on oral assessment will be given the reading / writing portions of the IPT to determine if they qualify for ELD due to limited reading and writing ability. Students who are NER “Non-English Reading” or LER- “Limited-English Reading” qualify for services.
  
  **Person responsible- ELD teacher**
  
  **Timeline**: Within three weeks of student’s arrival in fall or two weeks throughout the school year.

• The ELD teacher emails names of tested students to ELL Program Assistant at the end of each day. The email is titled “Tested Students” and states whether each student qualifies or not. The ELL Program Assistant also has access to these test scores and can check which students were assessed that day.

**Person responsible- ELD teacher**

• The ELD teacher fills out and sends home the white copy of the Parent Letter that states if a student does or does not qualify for ELD instruction. A translation of this letter is sent home in the home language along with the English version. Parents are informed of their right to waive ELD instructional services within this letter. Colored copies of the parent letter are sent to ELL office. **Person responsible- ELD teacher** within two weeks of completing assessment.

• The ELL Program Assistant creates a green ELL folder with a copy of the parent letter and IPT assessment report. This folder will be sent to the ELD teacher to be filed in the student cum file at the school. Another folder is created and kept at the ELL Program Office. **Person Responsible**: ELL Program Coordinator **Timeline**: Within two weeks of receiving documents from ELD teacher.

• Give classroom teachers a copy of the ELL program informational letter along with their student IPT Score report (or ELPA report). **Person responsible- ELD teacher**. **Timeline**: Once information has been received from ELL office.
• **ELL program assistant** is responsible for entering appropriate LEP/ELL Program information into Synergy and creating an individual student file kept at the ELL office. **Timeline:** On-going throughout the school year.

### 27. Describe the district’s procedure which includes a step to administer the Home Language Survey to all students.

As part of the district’s enrollment process, all parents are asked to fill out a Home Language Survey. If the Home Language Survey indicates that a language other than English is spoken in the home, a copy is given to the ELL instructor assigned to the school, or if there is no ELL instructor assigned, the form is sent directly to the ELL Program Office. The ELL program assistant will then give the HLS to the appropriate teacher or Program Coordinator. All school secretaries and registrars are informed/reminded of this procedure at the beginning of each school year. Each ELD teacher is responsible for checking in daily with the secretary at their assigned school to retrieve completed Home Language Surveys and to ensure that all possible English learners have filed out a Home Language Survey.

### 28. Describe the district’s procedure to include a timeline for each step or the identification process and the name/title of the person responsible for each step. With in 2 weeks of enrollment. (See response #26)

### 29. Describe the district’s procedure to include a process to identify Native American students who may be English Learners.

Native American or Alaska Native students are identified as part of our enrollment process. Students identified as Native American or Alaska Native qualify for Title III instructional services and will be identified and served as outlined in #26.

### 30. Describe the district’s procedure to include steps for special circumstances (i.e., interpreter, special education, how does the district address students with Family Service plans who do not demonstrate receptive or productive language).

If special circumstances present themselves during the identification process, the ELD teacher will work with the ELL Program Assistant and/or Program Coordinator to gather further information about the student. Either the Latino Family Liaison or another language interpreter will be made available if needed to gather additional information from the student or family. If a special need such as hard of hearing or a visual impairment is involved, the ELD program staff will confer with the SPED department to request special assistance as needed (i.e. sign interpreter, visual specialist, autism specialist, etc.)
31. Describe the district’s plan using one of the State’s approved assessments for identifying ELs; include what sections are used to ensure all domains of the English language are assessed.

We use the “Online IPT” as our identification assessment.

- All students are given the oral portion of the assessment first. If a student scores “NES” they qualify for ELD instruction.

- Students in grades 2nd-12th who score “LES” or “FES” on oral assessment will be given the reading / writing portions of the IPT to determine if they qualify for ELD due to limited reading and writing ability.

- Students who are NER “Non-English reading” or LER- “Limited-English reading” qualify for services.

- We will be using the “ELPA” intake assessment when that is made available.

32. Describe the district’s plan for having students assessed by trainer assessor.

An IPT Ballard&Tighe assessment trainer has formally trained all ELL Program staff. If a new staff member joins the staff and needs training, the ELL program coordinator will provide the necessary training. This training has 3 steps:

1) Explanation of assessment, (i.e., What it assesses, how it’s given, and reports it provides).
2) Watching the ELL Program Coordinator give the assessment.
3) ELL Program Coordinator observes the teacher giving the assessment to a student.

33. Describe the district’s plan to include the procedures for collecting the assessment data, and sharing the results with teachers.

Intake Assessment:

After the IPT is given, the ELL Program Assistant is notified via email. (She also checks the IPT site daily to see who has been tested.)

ELL Program Assistant makes copies of the on-line IPT score reports and creates an ELL folder to be sent back to the school.

The ELL folder will have two copies. One copy is for the classroom teacher and one for the ELL folder to be filed away in the student cum folder at the school. The
assessment information is to be provided to each classroom teacher. The ELD teacher is responsible for providing each classroom teacher with this information along with an ELL program letter describing the instructional services.

At the secondary level, the ELL teacher is responsible for emailing this information to the student’s core teachers. The ELL program assistant also inputs assessment information into the “Reports” page on Synergy.

ELPA Assessment:

ELD Teachers receive copies of individual student ELPA reports to send home and one copy is also given to the classroom teacher (ODE ELPA Parent letter).

34. Describe the district’s plan to include a description of where and how the assessment data will be stored.

Copies of this assessment data will be at the school in the student’s cum folder as well as in a file at the ELL office. This information will also be available in Synergy.

35. Describe the district’s plan to include a timeline, person responsible, and template for the required parent notification letters for eligibility as an English learner.

The ELD teacher is responsible for sending home the parent letter within two weeks of identifying/assessing the student for ELL services. This is stated as part of our intake procedures as outlined in #26 of this document. The parent letters are in triplicate. One copy is sent home, one copy is in the ELL folder kept in the student’s school cum, and one copy is kept on file at the ELL office.

36. Include the process for ensuring parent notification letters are provided in a language parents can understand.

We currently have copies of letters in Korean and Spanish and are working on creating copies in Arabic and Mandarin. (We use Transact as well.) These are in triplicate and are sent home along with the English copy as needed.

Section 4: Program of Service for English Learners

37. Describe the district program of services for ELs. Include how and where the services will be provided and by whom for each program of language instruction available to ELs in the district. Consider putting this information in a chart – by school, grade level.

English Language Development Instructional Model:
At the elementary level our ELL instructional model is a “pull-out“ model. Students receive small group instruction for 30-40 minutes 3-5 days a week depending on their language proficiency level.
At the secondary level, English language development (ELD) is provided as a daily class period of from 55-60 minutes.

At all grade levels, the student’s language proficiency level is considered when placing students in groups and/or in class periods of ELD. The Ideas Proficiency Test (IPT) scores are used for initial placement and Oregon’s English Language Proficiency Scores (ELPA) scores are used as students move through the program.

Our English Language Development instruction is provided by ESOL Endorsed teachers. In the three elementary schools with the highest numbers of ELs, the teacher is assisted by a bilingual I.A. who has been trained in every aspect of the program. Our instructional assistants provide follow-up instruction and are not the primary instructors. The teacher provides the planning of instruction and evaluation of learning.

38. Describe the methods and services the district will use to teach English language.

Our ELD instructional planning is guided by Oregon’s English Proficiency Standards. Our teachers have been trained in Systematic ELD and integrate this approach as part of their instruction. They also use state adopted materials such as Avenues, High Point and Shinning Starr curriculum materials. (However, we are currently piloting new ELD adoption materials.)

Our instructors use a variety of research-based teaching strategies that support students’ acquisition of English. Examples of these strategies include the following: use of language experience activities, total physical response, dialogues, sentence frames, songs, anchor charts, chants, guided-reading activities, story-telling, hands-on projects, and cooperative learning activities. In terms of technology, our teachers have access to ipads, document cameras and Smart Boards. We also use web-based ELD programs to support our instruction including “Rosetta Stone” in grades 6th-12th and “Brain-Pop ESL” in grades K-5. “Grammar Gallery” is used K-12 to support the teaching of language forms and functions. We have also begun to use “Imagine Learning” as a supplement for K-2nd and newcomer 3th-5th graders.

39. Describe the methods and services the district will use to ensure that English learners can meaningfully participate in core instruction and special programs (music, career, and technical, etc.).

As outlined in our IIPM- “Instructional Interventions Progress Monitoring” process, all students must have access to core reading and math instruction. To ensure that ELD instruction is not scheduled during a time that core instruction is being offered, many schools have created a “Workshop” time where all students who receive additional instructional support can receive it without it interfering with core instructional time. If a “workshop” type schedule does not exist at a specific school (typically schools with a very small EL population), the ELD teacher works
very closely with classroom teachers to ensure that ELs are able to receive ELD instruction without missing out on direct core instruction or specialist time such as P.E. and music. At the secondary level, the ELD class is within the student schedule and replaces one elective. Students would still have access to P.E., band or art electives. (See IIPM Process described in #56.)

40. Describe the professional development support for core content teachers that ensure ELLs ability to participate meaningfully in core instruction.

Our district provides staff development and support to content teachers in a variety of ways including trainings and on-going coaching and consultation. Below is a list of our staff development opportunities. It’s also important to note that we are making a concerted effort to highlight in any instructional staff development the key areas that support English Learners. For example we highlight the importance of teaching academic language, providing comprehensibility through use of visuals and demonstrations, a focus on key vocabulary (academic as well as content vocabulary), scaffolding/chunking new information and providing opportunities for students to practice language while applying new content knowledge.

At the elementary level, literacy staff development specialists are assigned to each school. These specialists are SIOP trained and support teachers not only regarding specific teaching strategies and interventions, but also in analyzing student academic data.

The ELL Program coordinator provides trainings at staff meetings and at district-wide Title I meetings. She also consults with individual teachers and teams to provide coaching and consultation.

We have math staff development specialists (1 elementary and 1 secondary) that support teachers in improving math instruction for all students. Specific attention has been placed on ensuring that English Learners have access to our math curriculum.

Our district has hired John Saphier, founder of “Research for Better Teaching” to provide training to teachers across the district. The work of Jon Saphier emphasizes strategies that support high expertise teaching and focus on what he calls the “Big Rocks” of teaching. The big rocks are what he considers the top ten strategies that have the biggest impact on student achievement.

Several science and math secondary teachers have been involved in a Pacific University ESOL STEM grant. These teachers will be receiving their ESOL endorsement after completing the program within a year. Several more teachers will be participating again next school year.

On-going SIOP and GLAD trainings provided through Lane ESD.

At our Spanish Immersion programs (River Road/Camino del Rio and Buena Vista), there have been on-going staff development presentations by University
of Oregon Bilingual Education professors. During our staff development days, staff from these two programs come together for trainings focusing on such topics as the importance of language and content objectives, teaching academic language, assessment and bi-literacy.

Individual schools have created Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) where they focus on a specific topic and read a book or participate in a staff development activity together (e.g., effective dual language programs, teaching academic language, building background knowledge, etc.)

41. Describe the standards and/or criteria the district uses to determine the amount and type of language development services provided. Include the process to determine the appropriate amount and type of services.

At the elementary level, students receive from 90 to 150 minutes a week of instruction over 3-5 days depending on their language proficiency level. More instructional time is provided to students at the lower proficiency levels (150 minutes weekly).

At the secondary level, ELD is provided as a class period that is approximately 55 to 60 minutes daily.

At all grade levels, the student’s language proficiency level is considered when placing students in groups and/or in class periods of ELD. Ideas Proficiency scores are used for initial placement and ELPA scores will be used as students move through the program.

42. Describe the process used by the district when an EL student needs an educational program that is a deviation from the district’s plan. What process is used to determine this student’s educational needs?

Each school has a data team that meets on a regular basis to discuss the academic needs of students. When an English Learner is discussed the ELD teacher is part of the team. Teams use our district “IIPM” process, (“Instructional Interventions Progress Monitoring”) to determine the interventions needed to support the student. This process provides assessment information needed to determine a student’s academic need as well as a timeline for progress monitoring a student’s progress. (See #56 for further description.)

If a student is on an IEP, then the ELD teacher is also included in the goal setting and annual review of the IEP.
Section 5: Staffing and Resources

43. Describe the number and categories of instructional staff implementing the district’s language development program. This information could be included in a chart – name of school, program, number and type of staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing plan 14/15</th>
<th># Of ELs</th>
<th>Certified FTE</th>
<th>Classified Hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Churchill-Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill High School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Tech Academy K-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Chavez</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McCornack</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Oaks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHS REGION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH REGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eugene High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly M.S.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison M.S.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awbrey Park</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Creek</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yujin Gakuen/Corridor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHELDON REGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Young M.S.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe M.S.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilham</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willagillespie</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH REGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eugene High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt M.S.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Butte M.S.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas Ridge</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlemagne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCO Altern. High.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ELL Program Staff**        |     |      |      |
| ELL Program Coordinator      |     | 0.80 |      |
| ELL Program Assistant        |     | 1.0  |      |
| **ELL Office-Total**         |     | 0.80 | 1.0  |
| **District TOTAL**           | 450 | 12.45| 4.315|

44. Describe the qualifications used by the district to assign instructional staff to the district’s language development program (include teacher, instructional assistant, etc.). Include how the instructional staff meets the requirements of Oregon’s OARs.

All our ELD teachers have an ESOL endorsement. Any teacher hired to fill an ELD position must be endorsed. (Job description available in Human Resources Department.)

Our ELL instructional assistants who work alongside an ESOL certified teacher, have taken workshops or classes related to improving instruction for second language students and are involved in all training provided to the ELL program staff. In addition, we provide specialized training just for instructional assistants in Monthly Title I trainings. All our ELL I.A.’s have met the criteria as “highly qualified” under NCLB. The ELL staff meets monthly to discuss curriculum, instruction and to ensure that all ELL procedures outlined in our ELL district plan are understood and followed. The ELL program staff is very stable and there are very few changes that occur from year to year. Most members have been with the program for 5 to 10 years.
45. Describe what methods and criteria the district will use to determine the qualifications of instructional staff assigned to the language development program.

Our H.R. Department follows TSPC guidelines for any hire we make. An ESOL endorsement and appropriate teaching license is required for a teacher hired to teach as part of the ELL program. (Job description available in Human Resources Dept.)

46. Describe how the district’s plan has a contingency for having to use temporary staff, who does not meet the district’s qualifications for the district’s language development plan. Include plan for training, schedule of training, plan for recruiting qualified staff, and schedule to have qualified staff in place.

When hiring temporary staff to step in for an emergency or long-term leave, we would look at ESOL endorsed substitutes first. We have a list of substitutes with ESOL endorsements and have had little difficulty in finding a substitute with this endorsement. (Graduates from University of Oregon’s ESOL Program are a primary source for our district.) Once that person is brought on board, it’s the ELL program Coordinator’s responsibility to support that teacher (e.g., curriculum used, program procedures, etc.) This consultation is provided in a timely and consistent manner. The coordinator checks in via email and on-site as needed.

47. Describe the district’s selected instructional materials and resources available for the district’s language development program.

We use *ODE approved instructional materials.

Systematic ELD K-12  
Avenues K-5  
High Point 6-8  
Shining Star 9-12

*We are in the process of investigating new ELD curriculum as part of our adoption process. No decisions have been made and we will continue using these instructional materials until a formal decision is made. (We expect to make this decision during the 15/16 school year.)

Our curriculum materials support our instructional approach. They incorporate the teaching of all language skills while integrating content-area concepts and literacy development. In addition to the scope and sequence presented in our core curricula, instructors use the ODE ELP grade level standards and language forms and functions from “Systematic ELD” to guide instruction and to ensure that we are providing comprehensive and systematic English language development.
We also use several web-based ELD programs to supplement our program. We use “Rosetta Stone” in grades 6th-12th, “Brain-Pop ESL” and “Imagine Learning” in grades K-5th. In addition, we use “Grammar Gallery” to support our teaching of Language “Forms and Functions” K-12th. Our teachers also have ipads, document cameras and Smart Boards to support their instruction. Additional curriculum and hardware is housed at the ELL program office and checked out as needed.

48. Describe the district’s plan for regular and on-going review of district materials and the timeline associated with the review.

Each spring, the ELL program coordinator and assistant meet with ELL program staff to discuss what is needed for the following year. We discuss how the curriculum is being used and what is missing or needed to ensure that we have all we need to support our instruction. This includes core instructional materials as well as supplemental, web-based programs or hardware. Any purchases needed are made by June to ensure that materials are available by fall. Our ELL program assistant is responsible for making and receiving curriculum purchases. We also replenish materials as needed throughout the school year. Teachers check out materials to keep at their schools. Extra materials are kept at the ELL office for teachers to check out as needed.

49. Describe the district’s contingency plan when the district does not currently have all the resources necessary to implement the district language development program and the plan for obtaining necessary items.

We are very fortunate in this regard. The ELL program has its own discretionary budget which allows us to replenish needed materials annually. If additional materials or technology are needed, then there is a process for making supplemental budget requests to the district budget committee.

Section 6: Transition from English Language Development Program

50. Describe the district’s procedures for exiting (reclassification); promoting, and retaining EL students (include any special considerations for ELs with additional academic needs [IEP] etc.).

All English Learners are assessed with the ELPA during the ELPA Testing window (January-April).

The ELL program assistant is responsible for downloading ELPA testing results and distributing these results to individual ELD teachers as they become available.

ELD Teachers are ultimately responsible for making the decision to reclassify an English Learner to monitor status or to continue services. However, the classroom teacher and parents in addition to any other instructional staff that works with the student provides input. They must use the following criteria for
making this determination:

A. “Reclassified” to Monitor Status: Students who score a “5” in Composite will be reclassified to “monitor 1” status.

B. “Early Promoted”: Students who score a “4” in Composite and have other 4’s and 5’s in the remaining domains are eligible for Early Promotion to “Monitor 1” status. The decision to “Early Promote” a student must be justified and documented on the “Early-Promotion” form. Below are a few points to consider:

• Student has state and district Testing results and/or other classroom success that would support this change (passing grades in classes, work products showing success, language proficiency rubrics, etc.).

• Student has had successive “4’s” in the ELPA Composite for more than two years. (Secondary students specifically)

• Student is a 12 Grader and will be Graduating

• Student who have been in the program for 5 years or more

C. “Continuing Status”: Students who score less than a “5” in “Composite” will continue with the ELL Program. (Unless “Early Promoted”.)

Parent Letters and ELL Program Record Keeping:
ELD teachers send parent notification letters home in June. These letters include the child’s most current ELPA scores and show whether or not their child will be continuing in the ELL program or has met the criteria to “Exit” the program.

A copy of this parent letter is sent to ELL Program office for student files and the program assistant inputs this information into Synergy.

A copy is also placed in the student’s ELL file in the school cum folder.

For students who also have an IEP:
The ELD teacher confers with the SPED team at the annual IEP meeting to share any language proficiency information and to determine any changes in the student’s academic support for the new school year.

51. Describe the district’s criteria used to determine that an English learner is proficient.

ELPA scores are used to determine if a student is proficient. “5” Advanced is our criteria for reclassifying a student to monitor status. In some cases, as described above, we will exit a student if they have a “4” Early Advanced. This occurs more often at the secondary level (6th-12th). In addition, other criteria such as grades or successful work samples are used to further confirm decision. (See #50.)
52. Describe the staff responsible and their role in the exiting process.

The ELD teacher is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the district exit/reclassification procedures are followed. The ELL program coordinator and assistant double check with teachers to ensure that exiting procedures are followed.

53. Describe how and where the documentation of the district’s exiting procedures will be maintained, and who is responsible for maintaining the documentation.

As described above, our procedures are in writing in the staff ELL Program handbook and are reviewed at our May staff meeting. The ELL Program Coordinator and Program Assistant work with the ELD staff to ensure that paperwork is completed accurately and all procedures are followed. Student files both at the ELL office and in the school cum files contain the paperwork documenting the student’s ELL status. The ELL program assistant is responsible for documenting this information in our student data system (Synergy).

54. Describe the district’s monitoring plan (who is responsible, what is the frequency, what documentation is reviewed, how and where is the documentation collected and stored).

At grading periods, classroom teachers are given a “Monitor Reporting Survey”. The ELL Instructor at each school is responsible for providing the monitor survey form to the regular classroom teacher. At high school or middle school the survey is given to core subject teachers. Classroom teachers are asked to return this form directly to the ELD teacher assigned to their school.

Once the survey is completed, the ELD teacher reviews it. A copy is kept in the ELL folder in the student’s cum file. If a survey indicates a concern and it’s suspected to be language based, then the student will be reassessed with the IPT. If the concern is not language based, the ELD teacher works with the student’s teachers to discuss other possible interventions. (Our “IIPM” process supports this discussion. See details in #55 & #56.) Monitoring is ended after two years if the results of the monitoring indicate that the student is having success in the mainstream and demonstrates English proficiency.

55. Describe the district’s procedures for determining whether a lack of student success is due to academic needs or language needs when considering returning an EL to the district ELD program for the monitored students.

If the Monitor survey form indicates that a student is having academic difficulties, the ELD teacher follows-up with the teacher that indicated a concern. If the academic concerns are linguistic in nature, the child will be reassessed
with our intake assessment (IPT) to determine if they would qualify for ELL instruction. Further discussion will determine if reentry into the ELL program is appropriate.

This discussion often occurs as part of the school’s “Data Team”. These teams consist of staff that provides instructional services (including the ELD teacher), and often includes an administrator and one of our staff development specialists as well. Data Teams are collaborative, structured, scheduled meetings that focus on the effectiveness of teaching and learning. Additional data that is reviewed are the student’s Easy CBM reading and math scores. These assessments are given each term. Student progress is monitored at regular intervals and instruction is adjusted accordingly. This process is outlined in our “Instructional Intervention Progress Monitoring” (IIPM) process. (See #56 for details.)

56. Describe the district’s plan to provide additional academic and/or language support for monitor students not succeeding in core instruction.

All students including current English Learners receive instruction in the comprehensive core reading and mathematics programs. The District’s “IIPM” Model includes procedures and guidance for instruction, instructional interventions, progress monitoring, and supports for Culturally Linguistically Diverse (CLD) students whether they are currently in the ELD program or reclassified as Fluent English Proficient (FEP). The following explanation of the IIPM Model Tiers I-III describes the model for reading. A similar process with variation for instructional time is utilized for a student receiving instruction in mathematics.

**Tier I – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction**

All students receive instruction in the comprehensive core reading curriculum (Tier I and II) for a minimum of 40-90 minutes daily. Tier I instruction focuses on the five essential components of reading. Students are assessed periodically using the District’s Reading Assessments and other CBM measures (EasyCBM or DIBELS).

If a student scores below the 20th percentile s/he may be recommended by the IIPM Team for Tier II – Instructional Differentiation with progress monitoring. If a Culturally Linguistically Diverse (CLD) student, including a student on monitoring status or who is receiving instruction in the ELD curriculum (in addition to the core reading curriculum), scores below the 20th percentile, the IIPM Team must consult with the District CLD/SPED Team before recommending Tier II Instructional Differentiation with progress monitoring.

**Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation**

All students receive instruction in the Tier II Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation. Tier II instruction is more differentiated and skill focused than in Tier I and allows the general education teacher, with collaborative support from Title 1, reading specialist, ELD teacher, and/or special
education teacher, to address the instructional, learning, and cultural/linguistic needs of individuals and/or group of students (on, below, language support, or challenge level) in the core curriculum. Teachers may also use supplemental instructional materials.

Only students recommended from Tier I for progress monitoring receive a minimum of six weeks of differentiated instruction with three progress monitoring data measures in Tier II. The District’s IIPM Pre/Referral Process begins with the student's recommendation for Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation and progress monitoring. The IIPM Pre/Referral Process may continue through Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions. Written Parent Notification is required for progress monitoring in Tier II and Tier III as part of the IIPM Pre/Referral Process. Consultation with the CLD/SPED Team is required for CLD students recommended from Tier I for Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation and progress monitoring.

CLD students receiving instruction in the ELD curriculum and recommended from Tier I for Tier II – Instructional Differentiation with progress monitoring – will:

- Continue to receive progress monitoring in the ELD curriculum using appropriate curriculum based assessments;
- Receive instructional differentiation with progress monitoring in the ELD curriculum for 12 weeks; and
- Receive Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation in the general education classroom.

A student may be recommended by the IIPM Team from Tier II for Tier III – Targeted Instructional Intervention when:

- After receiving a minimum of six weeks (twelve weeks for students receiving instruction in the ELD curriculum) of Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation and progress monitoring;
- After collection of three sets of data (six sets of data for students receiving instruction in the ELD curriculum); and
- Measured achievement falls below the projected aim line or produces a flat progress trend.

The IIPM Team may discontinue or extend Tier II progress monitoring if interventions are successful based on progress monitoring data.

**Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions with Progress Monitoring**

A student receiving instruction in Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring will have a minimum of an additional 60 minutes per
week of small group instruction using targeted, direct and explicit instructional interventions that are matched to the student’s academic, learning, and cultural/linguistics needs. These interventions may be provided by the general education teacher, Title 1, reading specialist, ELD curriculum teacher, facilitating teacher, and/or SPED teacher depending on the resources available at each building.

Students in Tier III will receive a minimum of six weeks of targeted instructional interventions and additional progress monitoring assessments every two weeks. The District’s IIPM Pre/Referral Process continues through Tier III.

Consultation with the CLD/SPED Team is required for CLD students recommended for Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring. A CLD student currently receiving instruction in the ELD curriculum and recommended from Tier II to Tier III will:

• Also receive targeted instructional interventions in the ELD curriculum for six weeks with progress monitoring using appropriate CBM assessments in the ELD program every two weeks; and

• May also receive targeted instructional interventions for six weeks in the general education classroom with progress monitoring every two weeks.

Written Parent Notification is required for progress monitoring in Tiers II and III as part of the IIPM Pre/Referral Process. In addition, parent consent is required for ELL students in Tier III to complete information collection and assessments.

The decision rules for the IIPM Pre/Referral Process in Tier III require the IIPM team review and analyze the six – twelve weeks (twelve – eighteen weeks for students receiving instruction in the ELD curriculum) of Tier II and Tier III targeted instructional interventions progress monitoring data points, as well as other assessment or background information -- i.e., classroom performance, exclusionary factors, and CLD information. The IIPM Team may discontinue Tier III Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring if the student’s data suggests interventions have been effective. The team may also determine the need for additional data and extend the Tier III interventions for an additional six weeks. If the student is not making adequate progress -- i.e., continues to perform at a level below the academic aim line or measurements of progress produce a flat trend line and the IIPM Team suspects the student may have a disability -- the team will refer the student for a CLD/SPED Comprehensive Evaluation.

If a student is referred for a CLD/SPED Comprehensive Evaluation, Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions will be reviewed at the evaluation-planning meeting and continued through the evaluation period with progress monitoring weekly. A checklist is part of this process and is used at Data Team meetings to guide the various steps of this process. (See # 58 for these steps.)
57. Describe the district’s plan for monitoring the academic and linguistic progress of EL students with a waiver for service. Include how the district notifies parents of ELs with waivers for services about their student’s progress and opportunities for support through the ELD program.

English Learner on waivers are assessed during the ELPA testing window and a parent letter is sent home each June notifying parents of the scores and their child’s ELL program status. This letter also states their right to continue to waive ELL instructional services. Students on waiver are monitored academically as outlined in our IIPM process. (See# 56)

Section 7: Equal Access to Other School District Programs

58. Describe the district’s procedures for identifying ELs as having additional academic needs (pre-referral and IEP process). Include the steps, assessments, timeline, and person(s) responsible.

The IIPM Model and the IIPM Pre/Referral Process are essential procedural components of the District’s SPED Comprehensive Evaluation Model. These components provide instructional interventions, progress monitoring, and cultural and linguistic information to rule out exclusionary factors, i.e., inadequate instruction, linguistic/cultural, socioeconomic and/or ecological/environmental differences, as the primary reasons for a student’s academic failure. The IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process provides a thorough investigation of a student’s academic performance in response to receiving instruction in a comprehensive core reading or mathematics curriculum as well as an analysis of the effectiveness of instructional interventions. Research continues to support the effectiveness of pre/referral procedures, including instructional interventions and RTI methodology, that may resolve 70% or more of the special education referrals of CLD students (Collier, 1998; Ortiz, 1999) and reduce the number of students inappropriately considered for special education eligibility and services (Fuchs, 2008). Following is information about who is part of the IIPM Team, the steps that they should take to follow the process, and considerations they need to consider as part of their decision making process. For further detailed information see our website: http://www.4j.lane.edu/instruction/ess/compliance/

Instructional Intervention/Progress Monitoring Team (IIPM Team)

The Instructional Intervention/Progress Monitoring (IIPM) Model is an essential component of the District’s adoption and implementation of the language arts and mathematics curricula, tiered instructional delivery, and progress monitoring of student academic performance. Each building in the District is required to identify a team of teachers and specialists to be
members of a team to support the IIPM Model. The IIPM Team may include general education, special education, Title 1, and ELD teachers, specialists (school psychologists, SLP, facilitating teachers, etc.), and building principal. In practice, the composition of the IIPM Team is fluid, often beginning with grade level instructional teams or cross-level teams with other staff members and parents added, when appropriate throughout the IIPM Pre/Referral Process.

The IIPM Team will:

1. Review all information, including District assessments and other CBM measures, when considering recommending a student for Tier II - Instructional Differentiation with progress monitoring and Tier III - Targeted Instructional Intervention with progress monitoring;

2. Plan and review appropriate instructional interventions and progress monitoring in Tier II and Tier III;

3. Apply decision rules for extending, moving or exiting a student within the IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process with progress monitoring;

4. Collect additional information in Tier III;

5. Address exclusionary factors;

6. Refer a student for a SPED Comprehensive Evaluation, if a student is suspecting of having a disability;

7. Develop a working hypothesis to guide the IEP – Evaluation Planning (see page 14); and

8. Review and continue the Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions through the evaluation period with progress monitoring weekly.

The IIPM Team works collaboratively with the District’s CLD/SPED Team to ensure:

1. The IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process for CLD students includes culturally and linguistically responsive instruction in the core and ELD program curriculum;

2. Differentiated and targeted instruction meets individual learner needs; and

3. Progress monitoring occurs in the general education classroom and, if needed, in the ELD program.
Considerations for Implementing the IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process

The IIPM Team should have sufficient instructional, progress monitoring data, and language/cultural information to determine if a student’s learning difficulties can be attributed to:

- An inadequate match between student characteristics, e.g., language and cultural background, and the implemented instruction, interventions, and learning environment;

- A lack of appropriate instruction or opportunity for instruction and learning; and/or

- A suspected disability (Ortiz, 1999).

Special consideration should be given to the following four areas:

1. **Instruction**

   - Consider previous instructional programs and the quality of the learning experiences or opportunity to learn for the student;

   - Review existing programs and services, e.g., curricular accommodations in the classroom, bilingual services, ELD program, and Title I instruction;

   - Determine if the current instruction and instructional interventions are culturally and linguistically responsive and designed to meet the students needs; and

   - Review differentiated (Tier II) and targeted (Tier III) instructional interventions for SBR quality and integrity of implementation.

2. **Progress Monitoring**

   - Review the progress monitoring data for the student to determine if standardized assessment procedures were followed (i.e., external validity and measurement reliability of the progress monitoring assessments); and

   - Analyze RtInst methodology to ensure that the student’s progress monitoring results can be linked directly to instructional interventions and student learning experiences, e.g., ecological and treatment validity of the methodology.
3 **Student Information**
- Utilize a member of the CLD/SPED Team or an IIPM Team member who is knowledgeable about the student’s culture and acculturation experience to ensure that appropriate information is obtained during the IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process; and
- Utilize parents as members of the IIPM Team to obtain background information and family history.

4 **Exclusionary Factors**
- The IIPM Team apply the District’s decision rules and consider exclusionary factors for students who are in Tiers I, II and III of the IIPM Pre/Referral Process. The following are exclusionary factors (adapted from Figueroa & Newsome, 2006) to consider when reviewing a student’s performance:
  - Socio-cultural differences, e.g., world view, low level of acculturation;
  - Economic disadvantage;
  - Lack of instruction as a result of inconsistent schooling or attendance;
  - Inappropriate instruction and instructional interventions;
  - Ecological/environmental issues in the classroom; and
  - Typical second language acquisition/development stages.

This IIPM Pre/Referral Process Checklist provides the IIPM Team with a format to ensure the appropriate steps are followed and information is collected.

**Tier I – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction**

- Review District Reading Assessment (or CBM measures) scores for all students;
- Identify student with scores below the 20th percentile;
- Consider recommending the student for Tier II – Differentiated Instruction with progress monitoring;
- Initiate (start) the building’s data form for the student; and
- Determine if the student is a CLD or CLD/English Language Learner. (Check Program page on ESIS to determine if the student is in the ELD program, on
monitoring status or has been reclassified as FEP). Consult with the CLD/SPED Team.

**Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instructional Differentiation with Progress Monitoring**

- Provide appropriate instructional differentiation for the referred student for at least six weeks;
- Consult (when appropriate) with the District CLD/SPED Team to design instructional differentiation;
- Assess the student using progress monitoring measures a minimum of every two weeks;
- Document three progress monitoring data points;
- Review the student’s progress after six weeks of instructional differentiation and progress monitoring;
- Apply decision rules; and Continue (extend) Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation and progress monitoring, if progress monitoring data indicates the student is making adequate progress;
- Discontinue Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation and progress monitoring, if progress monitoring data indicates that the instructional differentiation is successful; or
- Move to Tier III - Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring, if the student is not making adequate progress.

**Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions with Progress Monitoring**

- Provide targeted instructional interventions for at least six weeks;
- Provide a minimum of 60 minutes per/week of small group instruction;
- Consult with the District CLD/SPED Team when designing targeted interventions;
- Assess the student using progress monitoring measures a minimum of every two weeks;
- Document three progress monitoring data points;
Review the student’s progress after six weeks of targeted instructional intervention and progress monitoring;

Apply decision rules, and determine the next step;

Continue (extend) Tier III - Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring, if progress monitoring data indicates that the student is making adequate progress;

Discontinue Tier III - Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring, if progress monitoring data indicates that targeted instructional intervention is successful;

Consider any apparent exclusionary factors and/or factors that must be further explored; or

If the student is not making adequate progress and the IIPM Team suspects the student has a disability, the team will refer the student for a SPED Comprehensive Evaluation; and

Develop a working hypothesis to guide the IEP – Evaluation Planning; and

Review and continue the Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions through the evaluation period with progress monitoring.

59. Describe how ELD teachers are included in the IEP process during pre-referral and IEP team meetings for ELSWD

The student’s ELD teacher is always a part of any meeting concerning an English Learner. If for some reason the teacher is not able to attend, the expectation is that she/he meets with a member of the IEP or pre-referral team before the meeting to provide input.

60. Describe the process for determining the best ELD educational program is selected for each ELSWD

The IEP team including the ELD teacher and parents work together to determine if it’s appropriate for the English Learner to received ELD instruction as part of the pull-out model or class period, or if this instruction is best provided in the student’s SPED setting. If it’s decided that the ELD instruction should be in SPED setting, then the ELD coordinator or ELD teacher at that school consults with the SPED teacher to ensure the instruction is provided and all guidelines and procedures are followed.
61. Describe the district’s procedures for identifying ELs as Talented and Gifted. Include the steps, assessments, timeline, and person(s) responsible.

Our TAG Coordinator, Kerri Sage, is responsible for our District’s TAG program including staff development. Below is a description of our identification process. All schools in the 4J District designate Talented and Gifted (TAG) testing windows. Parents are informed of this opportunity and encouraged to refer their student if appropriate. Teachers and other school staff can also refer students for TAG evaluation at this time. This includes classroom, ELL, and music teachers, counselors, instructional assistants and administrators, for example.

The Naglieri Non-verbal Ability Test (NNAT) is used as a screener for referred students in grades K-2 all district schools. A school psychologist refers students who receive a stanine score of 9 on the NNAT for further evaluation. Students in grades 3-12 may qualify with a score at or above the 97th%ile on the NNAT without further evaluation. An important goal of the 4J District is to ensure that culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students who are intellectually gifted may be identified utilizing an assessment that is less language and culturally biased. The NNAT has proven to be effective instrument for under-identified populations (ELL/CLD, SPED) and one component of the District’s culturally responsive practices.

In addition, the TAG training we do with ELL staff is designed to help teachers identify who their potentially gifted students are. The district process for referral, evaluation and identification is discussed. We also cover common characteristics of ELL gifted students to foster increased awareness for staff who work with this population. We will be using Working With Gifted English Language Learners by Michael S. Matthews, Ph.D during our training sessions starting in the 2015-16 school year.

62. Describe the district’s plan for ensuring all ELs have equal access to the core instructional program offered by the district for all students. Include person(s) responsible if appropriate.

Our IIPM model guarantees that all students have access to core instruction in reading and math. In addition, it is district policy that all students are enrolled in core content classes needed towards graduation. At the secondary level, school counselors, registrars and administrators are responsible for setting student schedules. Student’s schedules are available on Synergy and can be reviewed at any time. It’s important to note that one of our district goals is to ensure students are fully scheduled in courses needed for graduation. The ELL coordinator also works with individual schools as needed to ensure that students receiving ELL program services are also enrolled in core content classes needed for graduation. At the elementary level, ELD teachers work with individual teachers or grade level teams to develop a schedule for ELD instruction to ensure ELs are not missing core instruction.
63. Describe the district’s procedures for identifying ELs who also qualify for support from Title I-A (targeted assisted programs).

A targeted assistance school is required to identify participants in the Title I program using educationally related, objective, and uniformly applied criteria. For students in grades K-2, teacher judgments, interviews with parents and other developmentally appropriate criteria may be used. In addition, K-2 students receive “points” toward eligibility if they are previously served in Title I, Head Start, Migrant, or Homeless. Student identification is made that renders them eligible, or ineligible, for services. Students identified as most at risk of not meeting State academic standards (based on established criteria) are served.

Section 8: Parent and Community Involvement

64. Describe the district’s procedure, timeline, and the person(s) responsible for the dissemination of the parent program placement letters (both initial and continuing letters).

The ELD teacher is responsible for sending out all parent letters as outlined in both our identification and reclassification/continuing services procedures. (#26 & #35) **Timeline:** For “identification” - within two weeks for “reclassification/continuing” by June.

65. Describe the district’s procedure, timeline, and the person(s) responsible for the dissemination of the AMAO letters (if the district does not meet the AMAOs).

The annual AMAO letters are sent out to parents within 30 days of receiving the AMAO data results. The ELL coordinator creates the letter and has it translated into Korean and Spanish. These letters are then distributed to ELL program staff at our monthly staff meeting.

66. Describe the district’s methods used to notify parents and students of available programs and services.

Our district and the ELL program follow all state and federal guidelines pertaining to parent notification of Title programs and services. In addition, we have setup several systems for improving and guaranteeing that parents for whom English are a barrier is provided information regarding their child’s education. (Please see #67 for details.)

67. Describe the district’s methods used to notify parents of ELs regarding school activities communicated in language parents can understand (i.e., progress reports, parent teacher conferences, handbooks, fund raising, extracurricular activities, etc.). What is the process the district uses to determine which documents need to be translated? How does the district provide interpreters for parent to be able to participate in their student’s education?
Eugene School District 4J strongly believes that parent involvement and understanding of our educational system is key to a child’s academic success. We also understand that linguistic and cultural barriers prevent many parents from having equal access to information about their child’s education.

We have established a district-wide interpretation/translation system that is coordinated through the district’s “Parent, Family and Community” district office and ELL office. We keep an updated list of interpreters who speak a variety of languages. Our sources for interpreters/translators are school district personnel, local organizations such as Holt Adoption Agency, Centro Latino Americano, University of Oregon language departments and members of the community. We also use “TransAct” in addition to our own translation and interpreting services to download NCLB parent letters or information that we do not have in a language needed.

We have several translation headsets to improve the quality of our interpreting during larger group meetings. Our “Latino Family Liaison” is available to set up bilingual messages as part of our auto-dialer system. This works through information provided by Synergy which shows which families have requested translation services. (As gathered from our home language survey.)

District information is translated into Spanish and is available on our website. To ensure that parents are involved in school decision-making and understand our school system, our “Parent, Family and Community” Coordinator provides regional meetings for our families.

The presentations include information addressing the following questions and topics:

- What is parent involvement in Eugene, 4J?
- What are the needs of the Latino families in 4J?
- What is the achievement gap?
- What is the Smarter- Balance assessment?

We also coordinate with Lane County’s Migrant Education program to provide Migrant families with information about the benefits associated with the Migrant program. We work with Migrant Education to involve migrant families in parent meetings, trainings and summer school opportunities.

**Eugene 4J personnel responsible for parent support and education are as follows:**

District level “Parent, Family and Community” Coordinator helps schools address the needs of low-income and culturally/linguistically diverse families. This staff member works with individual schools in designing ways in which parents can become more actively involved in the school decision-making. She works directly with administrators and also conducts leadership/advocacy training meetings for parents.
At our schools with the highest Spanish-speaking population, we have a bilingual/bicultural staff member that provides outreach to Latino families through phone calls, translations (written and verbal), attendance at parent meetings/events and serves as a liaison between school and home.

Our “Latino Family Liaison” position was created to focus on parent involvement in the schools with a special emphasis on schools with little support for Spanish-speaking families. The goals of creating this position are to: “provide a link between home and school for Latino families. Typical tasks will include but are not limited to: home visits, attending meetings with families, helping family’s access district and community resources, and facilitating communication between school staff and families.” This person works in conjunction with the ELL Program staff, “Parent Involvement Resource” staff, and the “Parent, Family and Community” Coordinator.

Family Resource Centers are located at several of our schools and offer services and activities that support healthy families and school readiness activities and may include: parent education, home visits and family activity nights in literacy, math and science.

68. Describe the district’s procedure, timeline, and the person(s) responsible for the dissemination of information regarding Title III to local private schools?

In March, a letter is sent to all private schools within our school district’s boundary. This letter asks what Title services the private school would like to participate in. If a school indicates an interest in Title III, the ELL program coordinator contacts the school’s administrator for an initial consultation regarding the type of services we could provide. These services include assessment, instructional consultation and an opportunity to participate Title III staff development. In May, schools who are interested in our Title services, (as indicated by the March letter), are invited to attend a CIP (Continuous Improvement Plan) Input meeting to review our plan and seek input for services and/or improvement for the following year.

Section 9: Program Implementation Evaluation

69. District’s program evaluation process of the implementation of district’s ELL Plan

Scope of Evaluation:
This evaluation covers the following procedural and service requirements as described in our ELL Program plan and addresses the following questions:

a. Are all procedures followed for identification, assessment, monitoring, and parent notification?
b. Is ELD instruction provided as described in our plan (i.e. sufficient time, qualified staff, adequate/appropriate curriculum materials, etc.)?

c. How well are our students progressing in acquiring English?

d. How well are our students progressing academically in acquiring core content knowledge?

e. What program modifications or improvements are needed in any of these areas?

When evaluating these areas, we looked for timeliness, frequency and documentation to determine areas of strength and/or improvement needed. We collected information by reviewing files and electronic records; input from the ELL program staff, mainstream teachers, school administrators, school secretaries, parents and students via surveys and phone calls. It should also be noted that an ODE Title III Desk Monitor and onsite visit was completed in fall (2013) and our procedures were reviewed. No corrections were needed.

In terms of acquiring information to answer c through e (progress in acquiring English, academic content and improvements needed), an “ELL Data Dive” meeting was conducted in February 2015. At this meeting the following information was reviewed:

- **Demographic Characteristics of 4J English Learners (%) / number at each school and grade level, ethnicity/languages, free and reduced lunch, special education rates).**
- AMAO results (2010-2014)
- Attendance 2012-2014
- Dropout and Graduation rates

We discussed the following questions:

- What assumptions might be underneath what we are noticing in the data?
- What patterns /clues help explain why our ELL population is meeting or missing targets?
- What areas in the data stand out as needing further explanation?
- Which of the above observations are most relevant and important in our inquiry?

**Those in attendance at this meeting included:**

- Federal Grants Administrator, Tasha Katsuda
- ELL Program Coordinator, Abby Lane
- Elementary Director: Sara Green
- Secondary Director: Randy Bernstein
- High School Principal: Cassandra Kamens
- Parent, Family & Diversity Coordinator, Carmen Urbina
As described in section 3 of our district ELL Program Plan, we have written procedures for student identification, initial assessment and placement of students in ELL program services. #70 through #72 have been combined since these steps are linked as part of the decision to place a student in the ELL program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>70. Include the evaluation of the district’s identification process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(See table chart below.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>71. Include the evaluation of the student initial identification assessment process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(See table chart below.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>72. Include the evaluation of the placement in the ELL Program services to all students with identified language needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(See table chart below.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following are the steps taken to ensure ELL Program staff understand and are properly implementing these procedures:

At the beginning of each school year, an ELL program staff meeting is held to review our identification, initial assessment and placement procedures. Each ELL program staff member is presented with written guidelines, copies of forms and parent letters needed. (Our ELL Program Handbook contains all our procedures, forms and parent letters. As does our 4J Wiki: https://swiki.4j.lane.edu/groups/ell4j/wiki/129bc/ELL_Program_Forms_and_Letters.html. These procedures include our assessment criteria for making students eligible for ELD services.

New staff is given a personal orientation by the ELL Program Coordinator and ELL Program Assistant. The ELL Coordinator provides training on how to give the initial assessment. This training includes modeling how to give the IPT assessment and watching the new teacher give an assessment. Placement criteria is carefully reviewed and discussed.

Other School Staff:
Each fall, an email reminder regarding our identification process is sent to all school secretaries and registrars (e.g., “All student must fill out a HLS and copies of home language surveys that show another language is spoken in the home are copied and given to the ELL teacher. Information should be entered in Synergy and double checked by the ELL program assistant.”).
The ELL Program Assistant checks in with all new school secretaries and registrars to ensure they understand their role in our identification process. ELD teachers are also asked to speak to the secretaries/registrars at their assigned schools to ensure they understand the process.

Classroom teachers and school administrators receive a welcome letter each year explaining our identification procedures, purpose for instruction and ELL Program contact information.

**Evaluation Procedures: How do we know that these procedures are being implemented as described in our district plan?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is responsible?</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Timeline and Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Secretaries or Registrars ELL Program Assistant</td>
<td>ELL Coordinator and ELL program Assistant</td>
<td><em>To verify that all forms and parent letters are sent home</em>...Each student has an ELL program file at the school and a duplicate file at the office with copies of forms and parent letters (signed and dated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Coordinator and ELL program Assistant</td>
<td><em>To verify that all forms and parent letters are sent home</em>...Each student has an ELL program file at the school and a duplicate file at the office with copies of forms and parent letters (signed and dated).</td>
<td>Annually, the ELL coordinator spot checks school files to see if the green ELL folder is in the student cum and if it contains all the necessary paperwork. This step is in addition to the ELD teacher checking student files in September and June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Program Coordinator</td>
<td><em>To ensure that students are provided with ELD instruction as stipulated in our plan,</em> the ELL Program coordinator meets with each ELL teacher to review their instructional schedule which includes times/days/grade levels and proficiency levels.</td>
<td>Each September, as soon all the initial assessments are completed. Throughout the school year the ELL Program Coordinator meets with individual teachers to discuss how their schedule is working. (Also as new students are identified.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is responsible?</td>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Timeline and frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Program Assistant</td>
<td>In Synergy, the ELL Program page shows the language information from the home language survey and the program status of each student.</td>
<td>Student lists are generated monthly and teachers are asked to check for accuracy and to notify the ELL Program Assistant of any errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student lists are created for each school and given to the ELD teacher assigned to that school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream Teachers Counselor/ Administrators</td>
<td>A Survey Monkey gathers information regarding understanding of how ELs are identified, assessed and type of instruction provided.</td>
<td>In June.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**73. Include the evaluation of adequate staff and materials that is consistent with the district's ELL program of service.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is responsible?</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Timeline and Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELL Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Human Resources has evidence that all ELL Program teachers have an ESOL endorsement. There is also a job description used when any ELD position is posted.</td>
<td>When hired into an ELL teaching position and/or if there is a change in assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Each ELL teacher has an instructional schedule which includes times/days/grade level groups and student names. (Special consideration for group size and language proficiency is given when ensuring adequate staffing.)</td>
<td>In September before ELD instruction begins, the ELL Program Coordinator meets with each ELL teacher to review her/his instructional schedule and caseload. Ongoing throughout the school year ELL coordinator makes on-site visits to individual schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings/Observations with individual teachers.

Record of ELD curriculum purchases. Extra curriculum kept at ELL Program Office. Inventory of hardware. Survey of teachers regarding instructional materials/hardware.

During Spring term, as part of a staff meeting, we discuss what instructional materials need to be reordered and which web-based subscriptions should be renewed.

Building Administrator

ELD Teacher Evaluations

ELD teachers are observed annually. Formally and informally by their school administrator using an ELD instructional rubric.

74. Include evaluation of the district's exiting/reclassification process for students transitioning from the ELL Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person Responsible?</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Timeline and Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELL Program Coordinator and ELL Program Assistant</td>
<td>Process is in writing as part of our ELL program protocols. All forms and parent letters are in ELL green folders signed and dated. (Teachers and parents are included in the reclassification discussion.)</td>
<td>At the April and May staff meeting, exiting procedures are reviewed. ELL Program Coordinator meets with individual teachers as needed to address questions. (May/June) Files reviewed in June. (By ELD Teacher.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELD Teachers</td>
<td>Paperwork completed and filed in green ELL file housed at the school. Copies are sent to the ELL office.</td>
<td>All paperwork is to be completed by end of the school year in June.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Program Assistant</td>
<td>ELL Program page in Synergy shows student exit date and LEP flag is turned off.</td>
<td>May/June after &quot;Exit&quot; paperwork is completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Program Assistant and District's State Reporter</td>
<td>State reports match district information in Synergy showing each student’s status.</td>
<td>During May and June state reporting periods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
75. Include the evaluation of the district's monitoring practices for students who have transitioned for the ELL program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is responsible?</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Timeline and Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELL Program Coordinator and ELL Program Assistant</td>
<td>ELL Monitor procedures are in writing as part of our ELL Program Handbook.</td>
<td>Procedures are reviewed at October and January staff meetings. Also an email is sent out as a reminder at report card periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synergy will show the exit date and new status &quot;monitor1&quot; or &quot;monitor 2&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copies of the monitor forms are kept in Student's ELL Program file in school cum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Check for date and mainstream teacher's name.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELD Teachers</td>
<td>Copies of Monitor forms sent to ELL office.</td>
<td>At report card periods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Performance Evaluation - English Language**

76. Describe the district's rate of ELs acquiring English Language Skills. Is the pace consistent with the district's ELL program goals and expectations? (See AMAO #1)

77. Describe the district’s rate of language development progress compatible with the district’s objectives for academic (core content) progress. (See AMAO #1 and #2A &B)

78. Describe how the ELs are performing in English language skills compared to the district’s goals and standards? (See AMAO #1 and #2A &B)

79. Describe how the district’s English learners are progressing in English language skills so they will be able to successfully handle regular coursework?
The response to questions #76-#79 are shown below as they relate to meeting Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives. The first chart shows our progress over time in English language growth (AMAO 1 and AMAO 2A & 2B). The second chart shows (AMAO 3) results.

Our district's rate of English Language Learners acquiring English skills has been consistent and meets or surpasses the state's goals. 12/13 was the first year that we have not met AMAO #1. We barely missed it by 1.7%. After reflecting on our individual school data, we noticed three key issues that may have affected our percentage. First, we have a very fluid population of international students that leave unexpectedly during the testing window to return to their home country. Another is that we had a bubble of students at level "3" on ELPA and those students often take an additional year to jump a level. Lastly, we have several English learners on IEPs that struggle to show growth in ELPA as they move up through the grades. We will continue to review our ELPA scores by student and school to monitor language proficiency rate and pace of growth.

Results of AMAO 1 and 2A & 2B:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Years</th>
<th>AMAO #1</th>
<th>AMAO #2A &amp; #2B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>53%-met</td>
<td>2A: 17%-met 2B: 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>59.3%-Did not meet by 1.75%</td>
<td>2A: 23%- Met 2B: 48%- Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>60%-Met</td>
<td>2A: 26%- Met 2B: 68%- Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>51%-Met</td>
<td>2A: 19%- Met 2B: 30%- Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>58%-Met</td>
<td>54%-Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80. Describe how the monitored ELs continue to demonstrate English language skills that enable them to successfully handle regular coursework.

Performance of ELL Monitored Students in the 2014 OAKS

Elementary grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>% Didn't Meet</th>
<th>% Met</th>
<th>% Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Middle grades:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>% Didn't Meet</th>
<th>% Met</th>
<th>% Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Didn't Meet</th>
<th>% Met</th>
<th>% Exceeded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance of ELL Monitored Students in the 2013 OAKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Does not Meet</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our District Evaluation specialist helps gather the following information and presents it to district leadership at “Data Dive” meetings.

- Easy CBM in Math and Reading K-8 (Shown below.)
- The proportion of ninth graders earning six credits: **67.7% of our 9th grade ELs**
- The percentage of students fully scheduled at each grade level: **76.6 % of ELs are fully scheduled as compared to 76.01% (All Students)**
- Attendance rates by grade level: **98.2% ELs attendance rate**
- EXPLORE college and career readiness results for eighth grade students (**Not yet available by sub group.**)
- PLAN college and career readiness results for tenth grade students (**Not yet available by sub group.**)
- OAKS (Oregon Assessment of Knowledge and Skills) and essential skills performance for all students and for subgroups (**Shown above #80.**)
- Graduation rates for four-year: **71.9% all students, 68.0% ELs, 70.8 for Ever ELs.**
- And five-year cohorts: **65.2%- ELs, Ever ELs- 76.5% All students -75.2%**
Describe how the former (not monitored nor current) ELs continue to demonstrate English language skills that enable them to successfully handle coursework.

### Performance in the 2014 OAKS of 4J Ever-ELL Students

- **Math:** “Ever-ELL Students” compared to “ELL Students” and “All Students”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Math OAKS in 2014</th>
<th>Grade Group</th>
<th>Percent Met</th>
<th>Median Growth Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Reading:** “Ever-ELL Students” compared to “ELL Students” and “All Students”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Reading OAKS</th>
<th>Grade Group</th>
<th>Percent Met</th>
<th>Median Growth Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Diploma and Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% Regular Diploma</th>
<th>% Diploma Earned but Not Awarded (4ACTS)</th>
<th>% Modified Diploma</th>
<th>% Adult HS Diploma</th>
<th>% Extended Diploma</th>
<th>% GED</th>
<th>% 4-Year Graduation Rate</th>
<th>% 4-Year Completion Rate</th>
<th>% Alternative Certificate</th>
<th>% Continuing Enrollment in 2014-15</th>
<th>% Drop-Outs and Non-Completers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eugene SD 4J</td>
<td>Ever English Learners</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churchill High School</td>
<td>Ever English Learners</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Eugene High School</td>
<td>Ever English Learners</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon High School</td>
<td>Ever English Learners</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Eugene High School</td>
<td>Ever English Learners</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Describe how the EL students, who are currently receiving English language development services, are progressing academically relative to program goals or expectations for core content.

Results for AMAO 3-2013-2014 results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING</th>
<th>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>ACADEMIC GROWTH</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>LEVEL 4</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MATH</th>
<th>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>ACADEMIC GROWTH</th>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELEMENTARY</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>LEVEL 3</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
<td>NOT RATED</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also look at our local district measures in reading and math. A risk score of 4 or above is a concern. We also look at students' grades and at the secondary level; we review transcripts to see what classes students have taken and their grades.

| Average Easy CBM Reading Risk Score (Scale of 0-6) for Monitored and ELL Students, Spring 2014 |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| KG 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th 6th 7th 8th            |
| Monitored Students 1.00 1.83 0.15 1.82 1.45 1.84 2.00 2.67 3.00  |
| ELL Students 1.00 2.87 2.55 2.71 3.03 4.41 3.69 2.75 3.86 |

| Average Easy CBM Math Percentile for Monitored and ELL Students, Spring 2013 |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Monitored Students 65 64 67 38 49 37 24 20 43 |
| ELL Students 20 27 33 29 30 17 27 49 24   |
83. Describe how the EL and monitored EL students are doing, over time, as compared to the academic performance of all other students.

**OAKS Growth Scores of 4J ELL Students as compared to all students in 2011-12, 2012-2013 and 2013/2014** (OAKS growth scores range from 0 to 100 (The typical Oregon student has a growth score of 50.)

### Reading

#### English Language Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>Growth level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>Not rated</td>
<td>Not rated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>Growth Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Math

#### English Language Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>Growth level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Not Rated</td>
<td>Not Rated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>Growth level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84. Describe what measures are being used to assess the overall performance of EL students in meeting the goals the district has established for its ELL program.

ELPA Results and AMAO targets are used as our guide to determine how well our ELL program is performing in meeting language proficiency goals. If a student is not progressing in meeting our district achievement goals, we not only look at state assessment results, ELPA scores and Easy CBM scores/risk factors, but grades, attendance and examples of student assignments. If a
student has an IEP in a specific area we take that into consideration as well.

85. Describe any identified concern(s) based on this evaluation

Based on the data reviewed during our Leadership “ELL Data Dive” meeting, our primary concern is with our Academic Achievement and Academic Growth targets specifically in reading at the elementary level. We also noticed a trend in our Easy CBM scores in both reading and math that show that as ELs and Monitored students continue into upper grades, their scores show a downward trend. In addition, our Math Easy CBM scores show a discrepancy between how well our English Learners and Monitored students are doing. We believe this is most likely due to the linguistic demands of our new math curriculum.

86. Describe how the district will address the concerns.

To support our efforts in alleviating these concerns, we are focusing on the following areas:

1. Using student achievement data to inform instruction
2. Professional Development
3. Using technology to support learning
4. Extended day or school year opportunities

1. Using student achievement data to inform instruction:

In our school district, we have "Regional Essential Skills" Coordinators (secondary level) and "Staff Development Specialists" (elementary level) that are assigned to work with individual schools to help run "Data Team" meetings, suggest interventions and instructional strategies, and to provide testing support. These meetings will continue to happen bi-monthly at each school. In addition to school site meetings, we will hold an annual “Data Dive” meeting with district leadership to analyze data by student subgroup, specifically ELL, Monitored students and Ever ELs. The data analyzed will be similar to what has been presented in this document (e.g., state assessment, graduation rates, attendance, access to programs, etc.)

2. Professional development:

Currently, our district provides professional development and support to content teachers in a variety of ways including trainings and on-going coaching and consultation. However, it’s important to note that we are in the process of developing our district-wide eCIP with a focus on creating and implementing a more focused professional development plan that targets specific areas of need. Keeping this in mind, below are our current practices.

- As mentioned previously, we have "Regional Essential Skills" Coordinators assigned to each of our high school regions that serve the 2 middle schools and one high school in that region. These
specialists support teachers not only with specific teaching strategies and interventions, but also in analyzing student academic data.

- At the elementary level, our "Staff Development Specialists" work with schools to review and integrate effective teaching strategies to reinforce literacy and math skills. These specialists are also well versed in Sheltered-Instruction strategies and support teachers in incorporating those strategies in their teaching. As a group they will be reading and implementing suggestions from the SIOP “Coaching” text they received this spring in order to further emphasize these strategies.

- The ELL Program Coordinator provides trainings at staff meetings and at district-wide Title I meetings. She also consults with individual teachers and teams to provide coaching and consultation as needed.

- The ELL Program Coordinator has created an observational tool for administrators to use when looking for effective strategies for teaching English Language Learners.

- We have math staff development specialists (1 elementary and one secondary math administrator) that support teachers in improving math instruction for all students. They have been SIOP trained and will incorporate and demonstrate those strategies in their presentations.

- Our district has hired John Saphier, founder of "Research for Better Teaching" to provide training to teachers across the district. The work of Jon Saphier emphasizes strategies that support high expertise teaching and focus on what he calls the "Big Rocks" of teaching. The big rocks are what he considers the top ten strategies that have the biggest impact on student achievement. We have developed a “Trainer of Trainers” model to continue this work.

- Eugene 4J has 5 science and math secondary teachers involved in a Pacific University ESOL STEM grant. These teachers will be receiving their ESOL endorsement after completing the program in June. There will be a new cohort of 4J teachers involved in this program for the 2015/2016 school year.

- We will continue to provide opportunities for teachers to attend SIOP and GLAD trainings either through Eugene 4J or Lane ESD.

- We have adopted a new Language Arts curriculum and there is intensive staff development associated with its implementation. This includes the use ELL supplemental materials that enhance the teaching of this curriculum.
3. Using technology to support learning:

The effective use of technology can not only help to make instruction more visual, comprehensible and interactive, but also supports teachers in targeting and individualizing instruction. This is especially vital in addressing the academic needs of English Learners. We are fortunate as a district to have support not only to access to hardware, but in the effective use of technology to enhance instruction. Following are a few ways this is happening in Eugene, 4J. We will continue to review and assess how these programs support our English Language Learners.

Crossroads Bond Project

Crossroads is an ad hoc team to discuss bond expenditures for instructional technology equipment replacement in alignment with the state 40/40/20 goal, Common Core State Standards, National Educational Technology Standards, College and Career Readiness, and Smarter Balanced Assessment.

Goals:
• Review the current state of instructional technology in each school and establish a baseline level of service;
• Develop guiding principals for replacement of aging student technology equipment;
• Review previous grants, projects, and pilots centered on mobile technology in 4J schools
• Explore alternative ideas for use of instructional technology (e.g. Bring Your Own Device (BYOD), interactive eTextbooks); Discuss professional development, equity, and curriculum for technology access and integration

iT3 iPad Pilot Program

By virtue of many years of ODE EdTech and Title IID funding, the district has provided equipment and professional development to a large majority of teachers. Many of our schools have developed the capacity to support and utilize more immersive technology based learning environments to increase student learning and their attitude towards school.

One-to-one learning environments have the potential to increase the learning density in our schools by providing more personalized learning experiences to every student. Certain groups of schools in our district are ready to support this implementation.

The schools chosen to participate in this pilot are in the North and Sheldon regions.

Other Grants:

As recipients of two separate Oregon Department of Education (ODE) competitive grants, Eugene School District 4J and its partner, the Center for Advanced Technology in Education (CATE) at the University of Oregon, created eight model Technology-Rich Classrooms in two schools that had high needs related to low achievement and high poverty. The grants focused on the English Language Arts (ELA) content areas,
studying the impact technology-rich environments had on reading and writing across the curriculum.

Students in four 3-5 classrooms at Adams and Cesar Chavez Elementary schools were given access to a variety of 21st century technology equipment and multimedia learning centers throughout the year including wireless laptops, podcasting, digital images, and Pro-scopes. This 21st Century environment offered students opportunities for multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement.

A unique feature of the project was the addition of iPod Touches in year 2, providing students ubiquitous access to technology. This portable media device provided an excellent opportunity to engage students with different learning styles and provided ‘anytime-anywhere’ access to curricular content.

The 21st century teaching station, an essential component of the project, featured a laptop computer, wireless slate, projector, document camera, and SMART Board. Each of the eight teachers was given immediate access to online resources and the ability to present information in engaging formats. Additional tools such as student response systems “clickers” and video cameras allowed both teachers and students to share information and engage in learning in a more active and tactile fashion.

**Within the English Language Development Program:**

ELL Program Staff have access to hardware such as laptops, ipads, Smart Boards and projectors at their individual schools. We have sets of ipad mini’s that are allocated for use only in the ELD classroom. We have spent time reviewing and finding effective apps that can be added to these ipad minis. We are also currently evaluating the use of various web-based ELD programs (i.e., Imagine Learning, BrainPop ESL, Word Raider, etc.) to see how well they support our instruction in terms of instructional focus and student engagement.

**4. Extended day or school year:**

We also continue to provide a variety of extended day and school year opportunities. Following is a list of offerings for this coming school year. (These opportunities are for any 4J students although students in need of additional academic support including English language Learners are given preference in these programs.)

**BEST After-School program:** The BEST Afterschool Program, funded in part by a 21st Century Community Learning Center grant is located in five 4J schools. Elementary students in need of additional reading and math support are invited to participate in these school-based programs. The middle school program is open to all students at the middle school site. The school district’s Title 1 program partners with the after school program to provide reading and math interventions, staffing, training and curriculum support.

**Secondary Summer School Academy** - This program is for middle school students with an Easy CBM “risk” factor of 4 or higher in reading, writing and math. It also supports students struggling with passing the OAKs assessments.
**Summer Bridge Program** - The focus in on math and science for incoming 9th graders. Teachers recommend students based on a variety of risk factors including grades, local and state assessment results, and attendance.

**AVID** (Advancement Via Individual Determination)-This college readiness program is designed to help students develop the skills they need to be successful in college. The program places special emphasis on growing writing, critical thinking, teamwork, organization and reading skills. This is now at all our middle and high schools. It is an elective class that students take as part of their schedule.

**Title I summer school**- Our target group is students who have a risk score of 4 or 5 in reading. We also look at students who are at the 30%tile in math, as measured on Easy CBM winter benchmarking. Teachers also consider other factors such as grades and attendance.

**Migrant Education Lane ESD Summer School**- Students who have been identified as Migrant are eligible to attend this 4-week summer school. The focus is on math and reading and providing students with a bilingual/bicultural school experience.

**“KITS” Program**

The KITS Program is a school readiness intervention developed at the Oregon Social Learning Center. The program is designed to provide a boost to children's literacy, self-regulation, and social skills just prior to kindergarten entry via a two-pronged program:

- 24 session school readiness group for children
- 12 session workshop for parents

**School Board and Superintendent's Cabinet**

In addition to the specific tasks and learning opportunities described above, the school board has set top priority goals in the areas of student achievement, staff capacity, stewardship of resources and community engagement.

The superintendent's cabinet has been working collaboratively to identify the strategies and priority investments necessary to address the school board's goals for the remainder of this school year and next year. Following are 4 graphics showing these key areas and supports associated with each area. (This is a draft. For detailed and current information regarding this information see: http://www.4j.lane.edu/board/)
Goal I: Student Achievement

*Increase academic, functional and social-emotional achievement for a productive future for every student.*

**Closing the Achievement Gap**
- Class size reduction
- Cultural proficiency professional development
- Social-emotional learning programs (e.g., Caring for Kids)
- Equity Action Committee
- BEST after-school program
- AVID
- Targeted interventions

**Rigorous & Aligned Curriculum**
- Full-day kindergarten
- Professional development on new standards & assessments
- Educator effectiveness & growth system
- Parent information forums

**Data-Informed Instructional Practice**
- School-based data teams
- Improved data systems
- Staff development specialists & regional essential skills coordinators

**High-Quality Materials & Technology**
- Curriculum upgrades
  - Math
  - Science
  - Reading
  - Writing
  - Interventions
- Instructional technology initiatives
  - Crossroads
  - 1:1
  - IT3

**College & Career Readiness**
- Full schedules for high school students
- AVID
- Accelerated opportunities for college credit
- STEM (science, technology, engineering & math) initiatives
- Career technical education initiatives
- Early College & Career Options
- School-to-work transitions
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Goal II: Staff Capacity Building

Build staff’s instructional capacity to perform at a high level to provide every child an excellent education.

Targeted Professional Development
- Cultural proficiency
- Common Core State Standards
- Skillful Teacher
- Being a Writer
- AVID
- Math instruction
- Technology integration
- Social-emotional learning
- Facing History
- Instructional leadership for administrators

Diverse Workforce
- New recruitment strategies
- Improved staffing process
- New retention strategies

Educator Effectiveness & Growth
- Implementation of educator effectiveness & growth system
- Professional development on coaching for professional feedback on instruction
- Peer observations & instructional rounds
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Goal III: Stewardship of District Resources

Provide prudent stewardship of district resources to best support all students.

Sustainable & Transparent Budget
- Understandable budget materials
- Strategic investment planning process

Equitable Resource Allocation
- Needs index
- Collaborative budget development process

Efficient & Responsive Systems
- New business systems
- New phone system
- Upgraded technology infrastructure

Grants & Partnerships
- Collective impact initiatives (ConneqtEd, Lane County, Early Learning Alliance)
- Planning for career technical education grants
- STEM (science, technology, engineering & math) funding initiatives

Long-Range Facility Plan
- Four new schools
- Key capital projects
- Disposal of surplus property – Civic Stadium – Dunn School
- Co-location of Roosevelt & YMCA
Goal IV: Community Engagement

Engage all community stakeholders, including students, parents, staff, community members and elected officials, in supporting our schools to improve educational outcomes for every student.

- **School Culture**
  - School climate survey
  - Social-emotional learning programs
  - School-based cultural proficiency initiatives
  - Affinity groups for students & staff

- **Family-Centered Communication**
  - Interpretation & translation services
  - Parent & community forums
  - Parent leader network
  - Communications via multiple channels

- **Stakeholder Input**
  - Engagement strategies for key initiatives
  - Surveys
  - Meeting evaluations

- **Legislative Advocacy**
  - Legislation & budget tracking
  - Legislator meetings
  - Editorials
  - Regional & state collaborative advocacy
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