

Office of the Superintendent of Schools
MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Rockville, Maryland

July 31, 2019

MEMORANDUM

To: Members of the Board of Education

From: Jack R. Smith, Superintendent of Schools

Subject: English for Speakers of Other Languages Student Performance Data
(SPC-02-05-19-03)

Question

During the Comprehensive Elementary ESOL Instructional Program, Ms. Silvestre requested a 10-year trend data of elementary schools ESOL programs.

Response

Attached for your reference are three reports titled, Descriptive Review of English Speakers of Other Languages Enrollment and Services (Reports 1, 2 and 3), which were prepared in collaboration with the offices of Curriculum and Instructional Programs (OCIP) and Shared Accountability. The data in the reports focus on English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services; curriculum and staff resources; and state assessment data, beginning with the 2006–2007 school year through the 2017–2018 school year.

OCIP staff has shared a vision for fully transitioning upper-level ESOL students into grade level English courses, while also receiving English Language Development instruction and/or supports. Montgomery County Public Schools will develop a transition plan that will include components such as possible instructional models, professional development, school supports, curriculum resources, and communication. The goal is to fully implement this vision by the 2020–2021 school year.

This summer, OCIP staff has been working collaboratively with teachers, resource teachers, elected representatives from the employee associations, principals, students, families, and other stakeholders to develop a comprehensive plan. A Secondary ESOL Multistakeholder Work Group has been formed to help define instructional models that include both sheltered and grade level classes; research instructional models that match ESOL levels; recommend curriculum resources and needs for professional development; examine the role of dual teacher certifications; and develop best practices for master scheduling. Additional instructional models also will be defined.

At its meeting on November 12, 2019, the Board will receive an update on ESOL. In addition, the work group's progress to develop the comprehensive transition plan for school year 2020–2021 will be shared.

If you have questions, please contact Mrs. Niki T. Hazel, associate superintendent for curriculum and instructional programs, Office of the Chief Academic Officer, at 240-740-3970; or Dr. Janet S. Wilson, associate superintendent, Office of Shared Accountability, at 240-740-2930.

JRS:MVN:NTH:llh

Attachments

Copy to:

Executive Staff

Dr. Addison

Mrs. Sampson

Ms. Webb

May 2019

Office of Shared Accountability

MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND



Descriptive Review of English for Speakers of Other Languages Enrollment and Services: Report 1

PREPARED BY:
Kecia L. Addison, Ph.D.
Marcia L. Parilla, Ph.D.
Applied Research

Published in collaboration with the Office of
Curriculum and Instructional Programs



ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20850
240-740-3000

Dr. Jack R. Smith
Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Janet S. Wilson
Associate Superintendent, Office of Shared Accountability

Published for the Office of Shared Accountability
Copyright © 2019 Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland

Descriptive Review of English for Speakers of Other Languages Enrollment and Services: Report 1

This report is the first in a series of three reports developed by the Office of Shared Accountability (OSA) describing initiatives implemented by the Division of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)/Bilingual Programs at Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). Subsequent reports are based on yearly programmatic amendments. The initiatives focused on students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) who participated in services to strengthen academic English language skills. A description of ESOL services, including curriculum and staff resources is presented in this report, in addition to state assessment performance data. This report covers the 2006–2007 through 2009–2010 school years.

Purpose

This descriptive report has two purposes: 1) To determine ESOL program structure and curriculum, including the staffing model and support for ESOL teachers and staff; and 2) To determine students' outcomes on the state-mandated ESOL assessment. The structure and support of the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs, including professional development opportunities, were examined. Student outcomes on the Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) mandated by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) were also examined. This report addresses the following questions:

1. What was the enrollment of ESOL students in MCPS?
2. What was the staffing model for the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs and ESOL Instruction in Schools?
3. How did ESOL students access the curriculum?
4. What professional development opportunities were provided to staff who work with ESOL students?
5. What were the outcomes for ESOL students on state-mandated assessments?

Document Review and Resources

To provide information on the implementation of ESOL in MCPS, existing documents and reports regarding ESOL were reviewed and summarized. This report highlights ESOL services from the 2006–2007 school year through the 2009–2010 school year. These years grouped together as the ratio-based ESOL staffing model at the various school levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high) were the same.

Additional resources that provide more comprehensive information specific to ESOL implementation and outcomes within the time frame examined in this report include:

- [Evaluation of the 2006–2007 Implementation of Conquista Tus Sueños \(Realize Your Dreams\)](#)
- [Evaluation of Elementary ESOL Program in Title I Schools: Survey of Non-ESOL Classroom Teachers](#) – covers the 2007/2008 school year
- [Evaluation of Elementary ESOL Program in Title I Schools: Survey of ESOL Teachers](#) – covers the 2007–2008 school year

- [Implementation Evaluation of the ESOL Program in Elementary Schools](#) – covers the 2008–2009 school year
- [Outcome Evaluation of the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program in Elementary Schools](#) – covers 2005–2006 through 2008–2009 school years
- [Outcome Evaluation of the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program in Secondary Schools](#) – covers school years 2007–2008 through 2009–2010
- [Evaluation of the Implementation of the Latino Education Coalition Recommendations: 2007–2008](#)
- [Evaluation of the Implementation and Outcomes of the Programs and Strategies Developed in Response to the Latino Education Coalition Recommendations: 2008–2009 and 2009–2010](#)

What was the enrollment of ESOL students in MCPS?

The official enrollment data produced in October of each school year was used to provide information on ESOL enrollment across the four years highlighted in this report. During 2006–2007, 10.4% of overall MCPS enrollment was ESOL students. For the remaining three years, overall percent of ESOL enrollment was 11.7% in 2007–2009, 11.2% in 2008–2009, and 29.3% in 2009–2010. As detailed below, overall ESOL increased from 13,038 to 16,531—a 27% increase. Across the four years examined for this report, the largest proportion of ESOL students were at the elementary level (see Table 1). From 2006–2007 to 2009–2010, there was a 45% increase in enrollment at the elementary school level, a 13% decrease in enrollment at the middle school level, and a 10% decrease at the high school level.

Table 1: ESOL Enrollment by Grade and School Year

Grade	2006–2007	2007–2008	2008–2009	2009–2010
Kindergarten	2,493	2,947	3,279	3,355
Grade 1	2,071	2,322	2,684	3,128
Grade 2	1,499	1,777	1,991	2,363
Grade 3	1,051	1,288	1,529	1,794
Grade 4	886	961	1,132	1,283
Grade 5	761	863	714	802
Total Elementary	8,761	10,158	11,329	12,725
Grade 6	685	671	605	512
Grade 7	483	579	589	486
Grade 8	477	510	476	433
Total Middle	1,645	1,760	1,670	1,431
Grade 9	811	773	751	676
Grade 10	731	793	740	721
Grade 11	644	626	702	607
Grade 12	446	421	403	371
Total High	2,632	2,613	2,596	2,375
Total	13,038	14,531	15,595	16,531

* Enrollment does not include pre-K.

What was the staffing model of the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs and ESOL Instruction in Schools?

The ratio-based staffing was 1:41 in elementary schools, 1:36 in middle schools, and 1:31 at high schools across all four years examined in this report. Across the years examined in this report, the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs had an ESOL director, an ESOL supervisor, and two ESOL coordinators. The two ESOL coordinators oversaw: Multidisciplinary Educational Training and Support (METS) program, Language Assistance Services Unit, American Indian Education Program, and the ESOL Testing and Accountability Center (ETAC). ESOL counselors were also used as support services to ease students' transition into a new social and cultural environment while simultaneously providing academic support.

Specialists also worked on the ESOL team. Some specialists supported parent outreach functions. In 2006–2007, there were 3 ESOL transition teachers who provided support to schools—one assigned to elementary schools, one to middle schools, and one to high schools. During the 2007–2008 school year, intermittent support was provided to schools as specialists were developing curriculum resources and assessments. In the 2008–2009 and 2009–2010 school years, ESOL instructional support staff, parent community coordinators, and counseling supports were strategically assigned to schools based on AMAO 1, 2, and 3 data.

During 2006–2007, an additional specialist position was added. In 2007–2008, two additional specialists were hired to work with the Office of Organizational Development to support professional learning related to English language learners (ELL). During the 2009–2010 school year, three ESOL transition teacher positions and the Office of Organizational Development positions established during Fiscal Year 2008 were eliminated.

The METS program was for students who had limited or no previous formal schooling or those that have had a lengthy period between their formal schooling experiences. The METS program was available for students who had at least two years of interrupted formal education. The METS program used an all-day, self-contained curriculum for English and reading/language arts. Math, social studies, and science were taught using sheltered instruction. The middle and high school METS programs used a Milestone program to accelerate students' English development. While receiving METS services students had access to academic and social schooling support.

In addition to METS, the Language Assistance Services Unit provided assistance to students and their families with translation and interpretation of materials to facilitate a successful academic experience. As such, the LASU also promoted parental involvement by removing cultural and linguistic barriers.

The American Indian Education Program was an enrichment program offered to American Indian/Alaska Native students to complement the curriculum.

The ESOL Testing and Accountability Center (ETAC) was responsible for providing ESOL students state-mandated English assessments in an appropriate testing environment in their native language.

How did ESOL students access the curriculum?

Below is a table that highlights essential aspects of curriculum implementation across the four years examined in this report.

School Year	ESOL Curriculum
2006–2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented Pre-K to Grade 5 curriculum developed by the ESOL team and ESOL teachers • Implemented curriculum for middle school ESOL level 5 students and high school ESOL levels 4 and 5 were being implemented • High school final exams were in place for ESOL 5 students that measured listening, speaking, reading, and writing
2007–2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented Pre-K to Grade 5 curriculum developed by the ESOL team and ESOL teachers • Developed curriculum for high school ESOL level 3 students • Began developing curriculum for middle school ESOL level 2 students, but shifted to decision to purchase curriculum resources • Developed formative assessments for elementary schools aligned to Standards-based Grading and Reporting and Measurement Topics
2008–2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed the Pre-K to 12 MCPS ESOL Framework aligned to the content standards in the Maryland English Language Proficiency State Curriculum • Implemented ESOL curriculum resources for beginning, intermediate, and advanced ESOL students in Grades pre-K–Grade 5, as well as intermediate and advanced ESOL students in Grades 6–12 • Implemented the Milestones program to accelerate the development of academic English for beginning level students at the secondary level • Authored and implemented a newcomer English language development curriculum for ESOL students who were new arrivals to the United States
2009–2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The curriculum office began exploring what an integrated curriculum might look like in elementary schools • Worked on formative assessments aligned to Measurement topics across different content areas, including ESOL

The most frequently implemented instructional models in MCPS were pull-out and plug-in with some schools using multiple instructional models to meet the needs of ESOL students (Addison-Scott, 2010). The Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs provided guidelines to schools for scheduling ESOL instruction for ESOL level 1–3 students at the elementary level:

- ESOL Level 1 students (beginners) must receive a minimum of 50 minutes of ESOL instruction from the ESOL teacher using the ESOL curriculum four to five days per week.
- ESOL Level 2 students (intermediate) must receive a minimum of 40 minutes of ESOL instruction from the ESOL teacher using the ESOL curriculum four to five days per week.
- ESOL Level 3 students (advanced) must receive a minimum of 40 minutes of ESOL instruction from the ESOL teacher using the ESOL curriculum two to three days per week.

Guidelines for scheduling ESOL instruction for ESOL Levels 1–3 students in middle school were:

- ESOL Level 1 students must receive two 45-minute classes per day, five days a week, or its equivalent amount of time per day.
- ESOL Level 2 students must receive one 45-minute class per day, five days a week or its equivalent amount of time per day.
- ESOL Level 3 students must receive one 45-minute class per day, five days a week or its equivalent amount of time per day.

At the high school level, guidance was provided indicating that beginning students (ESOL Levels 1 and 2) should receive two ESOL classes daily. Intermediate (Levels 3 and 4) students and Advanced (Level 5) students should receive one ESOL class daily.

What professional development opportunities were provided to staff who worked with ESOL students?

ESOL teachers and school-based administrators were provided multiple professional development opportunities across the four years examined. Highlights of professional development are included in the table below.

School Year	Professional Development
2006–2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1 professional development provided for ESOL teachers across elementary, middle, and high schools four times per year • ESOL Professional Learning Communities were embedded in meetings at the middle and high school levels
2007–2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online professional development provided for elementary, middle, and high school principals • Professional learning sessions provided to ESOL teachers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Three days for elementary ESOL teachers ○ Two days for secondary ESOL teachers
2008–2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interactive resources were recorded by ESOL content specialists and made accessible via a staff development website
2009–2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional development for all ESOL teachers, select staff development teachers, select school administrators, and some classroom teachers was provided

In addition to individual professional development opportunities facilitated by the ESOL office, collaborative approaches were also used to strengthen ESOL services. The Division of ESOL/Bilingual programs worked with the Center for Applied Linguistics, the MCPS Office of Organizational Development, and the University of Maryland to development content specific professional development for teachers. Additionally, during the 2009–2010 school year, a pilot of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) professional development model was offered to support content teachers in three middle schools.

What were the outcomes for ESOL students on state-mandated assessments?

No Child Left Behind required each state have evaluation measures for ELL designed to meet AMAO. There were three AMAOs:

- a. AMAO I measures at a minimum, annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English;
- b. AMAO II measures at a minimum, annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency by the end of each school year, as determined by a valid and reliable assessment of English proficiency; and
- c. AMAO III measures making adequate yearly progress for limited English proficient children.

Students were administered the Language Assessment System Links (LAS-Links) to determine progress on the AMAO targets. AMAO I and AMAO II data in the table below was obtained from historic MCPS Annual Reports.

School Year	Percent Meeting AMAO I	MSDE AMAO I Target	Percent Meeting AMAO II	MSDE AMAO II Target
2006–2007	69.2	40.0	55.1	20.0
2007–2008	77.2	48.0	69.1	30.0
2008–2009	67.0	56.0	14.9	15.0
2009–2010	75.9	58.0	19.8	16.0

The next report in this series will provide information on ESOL enrollment, staffing, professional development and outcomes across the 2010–2011 through 2013–2014 school years.



Descriptive Review of English for Speakers of Other Languages Enrollment and Services: Report 2

PREPARED BY:
Kecia L. Addison, Ph.D.
Marcia L. Parilla, Ph.D.
Applied Research

Published in collaboration with the Office of
Curriculum and Instructional Programs



ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20850
240-740-3000

Dr. Jack R. Smith
Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Janet S. Wilson
Associate Superintendent, Office of Shared Accountability

Published for the Office of Shared Accountability
Copyright © 2019 Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland

Descriptive Review of English for Speakers of Other Languages Enrollment and Services: Report 2

This descriptive report is the second in a series of three reports developed by the Office of Shared Accountability (OSA) on the implementation of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services in Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). Data in this report focuses on ESOL services, curriculum and staff resources, and state assessment performance data across the 2010–2011 through 2013–2014 school years.

Purpose

This report has two purposes: 1) To determine ESOL program structure and curriculum, including the staffing model and support for ESOL teachers and staff; and 2) To determine students' outcomes on the state-mandated ESOL assessment. The structure and support of the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs, including professional development opportunities are provided. Student outcomes on the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO), mandated by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), are summarized in this document. Answers to the following questions are included in this report:

1. What was the enrollment of ESOL students in MCPS?
2. What was the staffing model for the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs and ESOL Instruction in Schools?
3. How did ESOL students access the curriculum?
4. What professional development opportunities were provided to staff who work with ESOL students?
5. What were the outcomes for ESOL students on state-mandated assessments?

Additional Reports

The following linked reports provide more comprehensive information of examination of ESOL as implemented in MCPS across the years covered in this report.

- [Implementation Evaluation of the English for Speakers of Other Languages Program in Secondary Schools](#) – covers the 2010–2011 school year
- [Evaluation of English Language Proficiency and Progress: Students Receiving English for Speakers of Other Languages Services from 2012 to 2014](#) – covers 2011–2012 through 2013–2014
- [Supporting the Academic Excellence, Engagement, and College Readiness of High School ESOL Students Through ESOL Student Service Learning Clubs](#) – covers the 2012–2013 school year
- [U.S. History and Modern World History Courses for English Speakers of Other Languages in Montgomery County Public Schools](#) – covers the 2012–2013 school year

What was the enrollment of ESOL students in MCPS?

Between the 2010–2011 and 2013–2014 school years, ESOL enrollment increased in the district by 20%. From 2010–2011 to 2013–2014, enrollment at the elementary level increased 13%, an 87% increase occurred at middle school level, and a 20% increase occurred at the high school level. It should be noted that beginning with the 2012–2013 school year, larger proportions of English language learners (ELL) were entering Grade 9 (see Table 1). More specifically, the number of ELLs in Grade 9 increased from 740 in 2010–2011 to 1,284 in 2013–2014—a 74% increase.

Table 1: MCPS ESOL Enrollment by Grade Level for 2012 School Year.

Grade	2010–2011	2011–2012	2012–2013	2013–2014
Kindergarten	3,444	3,955	3,824	3,854
Grade 1	3,061	3,617	3,410	3,459
Grade 2	2,514	3,014	3,415	3,139
Grade 3	1,930	2,441	2,705	2,540
Grade 4	1,436	1,835	1,584	1,166
Grade 5	967	1,296	1,419	946
Total Elementary	13,352	16,158	16,357	15,104
Grade 6	576	816	1,107	871
Grade 7	452	609	808	1,050
Grade 8	429	466	649	806
Total Middle	1,457	1,891	2,564	2,727
Grade 9	740	890	1,026	1,284
Grade 10	678	740	677	731
Grade 11	500	529	433	352
Grade 12	272	373	310	268
Total High	2,190	2,532	2,446	2,635
Total	16,999	20,581	21,367	20,466

* Enrollment does not include pre-K.

What was the staffing model for the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs and ESOL Instruction in Schools?

The Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs had one ESOL director, one ESOL supervisor, and two ESOL coordinators. During the 2011–2012 school year, an additional ESOL instructional specialist and additional ESOL support staff were hired to address the growing needs of ELL at all levels. For the years examined in this report, ESOL instructional support staff, parent community coordinators (PCC), and counseling supports were strategically assigned to schools based on AMAO 1, 2, and 3 data. The table below details budget additions and/or reductions by school year.

Table 2. ESOL Position Additions and Reductions by School Year

School Year	Additions/Reductions
2010–2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hired an ESOL instructional specialist • Hired additional ESOL support staff
2011–2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hired one additional ESOL instructional specialist to support curriculum development and professional development work for newcomer ELL • Hired additional PCCs and counselors for all school levels
2012–2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An ESOL specialist position was moved to work with the Elementary Integrated Curriculum team, but the position was later eliminated • The school-based ESOL counseling team was transition from the office to the counseling team

Staffing in schools was ratio based. Across the four years covered in this report, staffing at the elementary level and the middle school level was constant, with 1:41 and 1:36, respectively. Staffing at the high school level increased each year, from 1:32 in 2010–2011 to 1:35 in 2013–2014.

How did ESOL students access the curriculum?

The MCPS ESOL curricula was implemented for beginning, intermediate, and advanced ESOL students in Grades pre-K–Grade 5, as well as intermediate and advanced ESOL students in Grades 6–12. With the adoption of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) English Language Proficiency Standards by to the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2011, the ESOL team began collaborating with the EIC team and worked on revisions to the secondary ESOL curriculum resources in FY 2012. This revision was to ensure alignment to WIDA standards. Additionally, in 2013–2014, formative language assessments for the elementary level and revised final exams for ESOL Levels 3–5 courses at the high school level were developed for ESOL teachers to help them monitor their students’ language development needs throughout the school year.

All curriculum materials were translated for beginning, intermediate, and advanced ESOL students. During ESOL instruction, students were instructed using whole group, small group, direct instruction, guided practice, and independent practice. The curriculum implementation for ESOL services utilized the pull-out and plug-in during general education curriculum, and sheltered instructional models. Students who were beginning ESOL level were on the pull-out instructional model. Students at the intermediate or advanced ESOL levels received the plug-in instructional model. Sheltered models were utilized when a student was with the same ESOL teacher and in the classroom for an instructional block.

What professional development opportunities were provided to staff who work with ESOL students?

The table below includes highlights of professional development opportunities offered across the four years examined in this report.

Table 3. ESOL Professional Development Opportunities by School Year

School Year	Professional Development
2010–2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development provided for both ESOL and non-ESOL staff The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model professional development pilot was expanded to more middle and high schools (5 schools total)
2011–2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development provided to all ESOL teachers, all principals, select assistant principals, and select classroom teachers Collaborated with the WIDA Consortium to provide professional development to staff and leaders
2012–2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitated collaboration and co-teaching professional development session for ESOL teachers and staff development teachers across all levels SIOP Model professional development was implemented in over 25 elementary, middle, and high schools
2013–2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professional development provided by ESOL instructional staff to all ESOL teachers, select school administrators, and school testing coordinators Professional development provided to middle school ESOL teachers on customization of formative language assessments and use of an online system to provide interventions for ESOL students Collaborated with the WIDA Consortium on a WIDA data workshop

In addition to individual professional development opportunities, collaborations were also a resource to strengthen ESOL services. In addition to collaborating with WIDA professionals, the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs collaborated with schools, offices, and community stakeholders to outline and implement a communication plan for WIDA standards and resources.

What were the outcomes for ESOL students on state-mandated assessments?

School districts were accountable for meeting Annual Measurable Objectives for students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP). AMAO I measures progress toward proficiency of ESOL students; AMAO II measures whether ESOL students attained proficiency in English; and AMAO III measures LEP subgroup progress in reading, mathematics, and graduation rate. This section includes a summary of the performance in MCPS for AMAO I and AMAO II. AMAO results for

MCPS was confirmed by MSDE. As seen in Table 4, MCPS missed the AMAO I target by 0.7 percentage points. However, AMAO II target was met, indicating that at least 10% of students met English proficiency standards.

Table 4. AMAO I and AMAO II Results for Select School Years

School Year	MCPS Percent Met AMAO I	MSDE AMAO I Target	MCPS Percent Met AMAO II	MSDE AMAO Target II
2010–2011	70.4	60.0	19.3	17.0
2011–2012	51.3	52.0	18.97	10.0

At the conclusion of FY 2011, MSDE adopted the WIDA English Limited Proficiency Standards. With this shift, the English Language Proficiency assessment of students changed from the Language Assessment System Links (LAS-Links) to Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State to State (ACCESS for ELLs). Test items on ACCESS for ELLs correspond to the social and academic language demands within school settings represented in WIDA’s five ELP standards: social and instructional language, and the language of language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies (WIDA, 2014 a–b). MCPS began using ACCESS for ELLs in 2011–2012.

Six language proficiency levels, based on ACCESS for ELLs assessment scores, can be obtained for students.

1–Entering—A student requires significant visual cues to support comprehension and responds in single words or set phrases using the words that are most common and frequent in English.

2–Emerging—A student understands general language in a familiar context and responds using phrases or short sentences, making frequent errors that interfere with communication.

3–Developing—A student understands and uses specific language related to various topics and uses expanded sentences in expanded discourse and makes some errors that can confuse communication.

4–Expanding—A student understands and uses more complex language including some technical vocabulary and makes errors that do not impede communication.

5–Bridging—A student is using language to communicate at a level approaching the proficiency of English-proficient peers.

6–Reaching—A student is using language to communicate at a level comparable to that of English-proficient peers.

As displayed in Table 5, across schools, the majority of ESOL students performed at the “bridging” proficiency level or higher. Eighty-nine percent of students were at the “bridging” proficiency level or higher in 2011–2012, with similar a similar percent at that level in 2012–2013 (87%) and 84% at that proficiency level in 2013–2014. Even still, slightly more than half of ESOL students scored at the “expanding” proficiency level across the three years—63%, 61%, and 54%, respectively.

Table 5. Percent of ESOL Students Scoring by ACCESS for ELLs Proficiency Levels by School Year

	%	%	%	%	%	%
	Entering	Emerging	Developing	Expanding	Bridging	Reaching
2011–2012	2.9	8.0	26.1	37.1	19.5	6.5
2012–2013	3.7	9.6	26.1	26.5	24.8	9.3
2013–2014	4.7	10.9	30.0	26.9	21.0	6.5

The next report in this series will highlight ESOL enrollment, staffing, services, and performance for the 2014–2015 through 2017–2018 school years.



Descriptive Review of English for Speakers of Other Languages Enrollment and Services: Report 3

PREPARED BY:
Kecia L. Addison, Ph.D.
Applied Research

Published in collaboration with the Office of
Curriculum and Instructional Programs



ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

850 Hungerford Drive
Rockville, Maryland 20850
240-740-3000

Dr. Jack R. Smith
Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Janet S. Wilson
Associate Superintendent, Office of Shared Accountability

Published for the Office of Shared Accountability
Copyright © 2019 Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland

Descriptive Review of English for Speakers of Other Languages Enrollment and Services: Report 3

This report is the third in a series of three reports developed by the Office of Shared Accountability (OSA) on the implementation of English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) services in Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS). Data in this report focuses on ESOL services, curriculum and staff resources, is and state assessment data across the 2014–2015 through 2017–2018 school years.

Purpose

This report has two purposes 1) To determine ESOL program structure and curriculum, including the staffing model and support for ESOL teachers and staff; and 2) To determine students' outcomes on the state-mandated ESOL assessment. The structure and support of the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs, including professional development opportunities are provided. Student outcomes on the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO), mandated by the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), are summarized in this document. Answers to the following questions are included in this report:

1. What was the enrollment of ESOL students in MCPS?
2. What was the staffing model for the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs and ESOL Instruction in Schools?
3. How did ESOL students access the curriculum?
4. What professional development opportunities were provided to staff who work with ESOL students?
5. What were the outcomes for ESOL students on state-mandated assessments?

What was the enrollment of ESOL students in MCPS?

ESOL enrollment continued increase in MCPS from the 2014–2015 school year through the 2017–2018 school years. Overall, ESOL enrollment in the district increased by 20%. At the elementary level, ESOL enrollment increased 12%. At the middle school level, a 10% increase occurred, and at the high school level a 65% increase occurred. There were increasing numbers of English Language Learners (ELL) enrolled in Grade 10 (see Table 1). More specifically, the number of ELL in Grade 10 increased from 807 in 2014–2015 to 1,866 in 2017–2018—a 131% increase.

Table 1: MCPS ESOL Enrollment by Grade Level by School Year.

Grade	2014– 2015	2015– 2016	2016– 2017	2017– 2018
Kindergarten	3,894	3,776	3,549	3,406
Grade 1	3,560	3,749	3,472	3,365
Grade 2	3,216	3,409	3,300	3,309
Grade 3	2,737	2,835	2,813	3,225
Grade 4	1,390	1,499	1,712	2,723
Grade 5	894	1,168	1,081	1,598
Total Elementary	15,691	16,436	15,927	17,626

Grade	2014– 2015	2015– 2016	2016– 2017	2017– 2018
Grade 6	875	1,002	903	1,091
Grade 7	973	1,093	945	1,054
Grade 8	1,060	1,078	961	1,067
Total Middle	2,908	3,173	2,809	3,212
Grade 9	1,874	2,289	2,301	2,054
Grade 10	807	1,454	1,380	1,866
Grade 11	397	646	589	917
Grade 12	217	403	310	614
Total High	3,295	4,792	4,580	5,451
Total	21,894	24,401	23,316	26,289

* Enrollment does not include pre-K.

What was the staffing model for the Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs and ESOL Instruction in Schools?

Beginning with the 2014–2015 school year, staffing at schools was proficiency-based, whereas in prior years it was ratio-based. Table 2 below details the proficiency-based allocations across the four years covered in this report.

Table 2. Proficiency-based Staffing Allocations by School Level and School Year

School Year	Elementary	Middle	High
2014– 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .20 for ESOL Level 1 for every 6 students .18 for ESOL Level 2 for every 6 students .16 for ESOL Level 3 for every 6 students .14 for ESOL Level 4 for every 8 students .10 for ESOL Level 5 for every 8 students METS teacher allocations based on pupil/ teacher ratio of 15:1. METS students were not included in the ESOL teacher formula. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .7 for ESOL Level 1 for every 10 students .5 for ESOL Level 2 for every 10 students .3 for ESOL Levels 3 through 5 for every 15 students METS teacher allocations based on pupil/ teacher ratio of 15:1. METS students were not included in the ESOL teacher formula. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .7 for ESOL Level 1 for every 10 students .5 for ESOL Level 2 for every 10 students .3 for ESOL Levels 3 through 5 for every 15 students METS teacher positions allocated to schools with METS students according to the following guidelines: .4 FTE (4–10 students); .6 FTE (11–17 students); .8 FTE (18 or more students)
2015– 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .2 for ESOL Level 1 for every 7 students .18 for ESOL Level 2 for every 7 students .16 for ESOL Level 3 for every 7 students .14 for ESOL Level 4 for every 9 students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .7 for ESOL Level 1 and for every 13 students .5 for ESOL Level 2 and for every 13 students .3 for ESOL Levels 3 through 5 for every 18 students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .7 for ESOL Level 1 and for every 13 students .5 for ESOL Level 2 and for every 13 students 0.3 for ESOL Levels 3 through 5 for every 18 students

School Year	Elementary	Middle	High
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .10 for ESOL Level 5 for every 9 students METS teacher allocations based on pupil/ teacher ratio of 15:1. METS students were not included in the ESOL teacher formula. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> METS teacher allocations based on pupil/ teacher ratio of 15:1. METS students were not included in the ESOL teacher formula 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> METS teacher positions allocated to schools with METS students according to the following guidelines: .4 FTE (4–10 students); .6 FTE (11–17 students); .8 FTE (18 or more students)
2016–2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .2 for ESOL Level 1 for every 7 students .18 for ESOL Level 2 for every 7 students .16 for ESOL Level 3 for every 7 students .14 for ESOL Level 4 for every 9 students .10 for ESOL Level 5 for every 9 students METS teacher allocations based on pupil/ teacher ratio of 15:1 and .75 FTE paraeducator. METS students were not included in the ESOL teacher formula. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .7 for ESOL Level 1 for every 13 students .5 for ESOL Level 2 for every 13 students .3 for ESOL Levels 3 through 5 for every 18 students METS teacher allocations based on pupil/ teacher ratio of 15:1. METS students were not included in the ESOL teacher formula. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .7 for ESOL Level 1 for every 13 students .5 for ESOL Level 2 for every 13 students .3 for ESOL Levels 3 through 5 for every 18 students No information provided for higher ESOL levels METS teacher positions allocated to schools based on METS enrollment
2017–2018*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .2 for ESOL Level 1 for every 7 students .18 for ESOL Level 2 for every 7 students .16 for ESOL Level 3 for every 7 students .14 for ESOL Level 4 for every 9 students .10 for ESOL Level 5 for every 9 students METS teacher allocations based on pupil/ teacher ratio of 15:1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .7 for ESOL Level 1 for every 13 students .5 for ESOL Level 2 for every 13 students .3 for ESOL Levels 3 through 5 for every 8 students METS teacher allocations based on pupil/ teacher ratio of 15:1. METS students were not included in the ESOL teacher formula. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> .7 for ESOL Level 1 for every 13 students .5 for ESOL Level 2 for every 13 students .3 for ESOL Levels 3 through for every 18 students METS teacher positions allocated to schools based on METS enrollment

* ESOL staffing formula was different for Title I elementary schools. Staffing provided in the table represents staffing at non-Title I schools.

The Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs had one ESOL director, an ESOL supervisor for secondary instruction and METS, an Elementary Integrated Curriculum (EIC) supervisor who oversaw elementary school ESOL and science, and two ESOL coordinators. During the 2016–2017 school year, several realignments occurred in the office. There was realignment of elementary school ESOL instruction to the Department of Elementary Curriculum and

Districtwide Programs. Additionally, secondary ESOL instruction was realigned to the Department of Secondary Curriculum and Districtwide Programs. Additional realignments were made for the ESOL supervisor position and ESOL programs to the Department of Elementary Curriculum and Districtwide Programs. The Multidisciplinary Educational Training and Support (METS) program and the Students Engaged in Pathways to Achievement (SEPA) Program continued to be aligned to the ESOL programs. The instructional specialist position connected to the SEPA program was realigned to the Department of Career Readiness and Innovative Programs. Also during 2016–2017, four ESOL instructional specialist positions were aligned to the secondary ESOL team and two were aligned to the elementary team. Ten English Language Development (ELD) teacher coach positions were aligned to the secondary ESOL team.

In the 2017–2018 school year, the ESOL coordinator position that was with the METS program and the ESOL Testing Center was eliminated. The METS program and the specialist position assigned to it was realigned under the secondary ESOL supervisor. The parent community coordinator positions were realigned to the Parent Outreach Office. Additionally, the ESOL coordinator position and ESOL counselor positions were realigned to the International Admissions Office. The ESOL Testing Center and METS intake were also realigned to the International Admissions Office. The ESOL director position was eliminated and an ESOL supervisor position was recreated.

An ESOL Program Accountability/Two-Way Immersion supervisor position was hired during the 2018–2019 school year. In addition, the ELD teacher coach positions were eliminated and the acting METS instructional specialist position was eliminated.

How did ESOL students access the curriculum?

The amount of ESOL instruction students received varied based on ESOL level of students. At the elementary level, students identified as ESOL Level 1 receive the most time in ESOL instruction with 250 minutes per week (50 minutes x 5 days). Those identified as ESOL 2 receive 225 minutes per week (50 minutes x 4.5 days), ESOL 3 receives 200 minutes per week (40 minutes x 5 days), ESOL 4 receives 180 minutes per week (40 minutes x 4.5 days), and ESOL 5 receives 120 minutes of ESOL instruction per week (40 minutes x 3 days).

Similar to the elementary level, the amount of ESOL instruction at the secondary level (i.e., middle and high) varied based on ESOL level. Students identified as ESOL Level 1 were recommended to receive three classes per day, and ESOL Level 2 were recommended to receive 2 classes per day. Students at ESOL Level 3 or higher were recommended to receive 1 class per day.

What professional development opportunities were provided to staff who work with ESOL students?

The table below includes highlights of professional development opportunities offered across the four years examined in this report.

Table 3. ESOL Professional Development Opportunities by School Year

School Year	Professional Development
2014–2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided two Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) professional learning sessions for administrators and content teachers in over 49 elementary schools (280 attendees) • Provided professional development to secondary ESOL teachers on the connects between the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) and Common Core State Standards
2015–2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided ESOL teacher professional learning to all elementary ESOL teachers—first year ESOL Teacher Cohort (400 ESOL teachers) • Provided professional development to secondary ESOL teachers on the connects between the WIDA and Common Core State Standards
2016–2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implemented a collaborative professional learning series at the elementary level on the English Language Enhancements, Academic Language in Math, and Oral Language Development (700 elementary classroom teachers, staff development teachers, reading specialists, and ESOL teachers across six sessions) • Implemented the second year ESOL teacher cohort at the elementary level • Provided professional learning to high school ESOL resource teachers about the implementation of WIDA standards in the context of the ESOL classroom • Provided professional learning to English language development teacher coaches about the planning and implementation integrating the WIDA standards into content instruction in English, social studies, science, and mathematics • Provided professional learning to secondary level ESOL teachers on the development and use of the formative language assessments
2017–2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted three, all-elementary ESOL teacher trainings (450 teachers) • Conducted three, first-year elementary ESOL teacher trainings (50 teachers) • Conducted three, second-year elementary ESOL teacher trainings (50 teachers) • Conducted select school training at the elementary level on topics such as iLit Implementation Essentials, coaching, data analysis (10 ESOL teachers), and Nearpod (90 teachers) • Provided professional development to help middle and high school ESOL teachers understand how to support ELLs as they engage with grade-level texts

What were the outcomes for ESOL students on state-mandated assessments?

School districts were accountable for meeting Annual Measurable Objectives for students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP). AMAO I measures progress toward proficiency of ESOL students; AMAO II measures whether ESOL students attained proficiency in English; and AMAO III measures LEP subgroup progress in reading, mathematics, and graduation rate. This section includes a summary of the performance in MCPS for AMAO I and AMAO II. AMAO results for MCPS were reported by MSDE on the Maryland Report Card for only the 2014–2015 and 2015–2016 school years.

Table 4. AMAO I and AMAO II Results for Select School Years

School Year	MCPS Percent Met AMAO I	MSDE AMAO I Target	MCPS Percent Met AMAO II	MSDE AMAO Target II
2014–2015	66.62	56.0	21.63	14.0
2015–2016	60.3	57.0	21.86	15.0

The English Language Proficiency assessment for students was ACCESS for ELLs. Test items on Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners Assessment (ACCESS for ELLs) correspond to the social and academic language demands within school settings represented in WIDAs five ELP standards: social and instructional language, and the language of language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies (WIDA, 2014 a–b). Six language proficiency levels, based on ACCESS for ELLs assessment scores, can be obtained for students.

1–Entering—A student requires significant visual cues to support comprehension and responds in single words or set phrases using the words that are most common and frequent in English.

2–Emerging—A student understands general language in a familiar context and responds using phrases or short sentences, making frequent errors that interfere with communication.

3–Developing—A student understands and uses specific language related to various topics and uses expanded sentences in expanded discourse and makes some errors that can confuse communication.

4–Expanding—A student understands and uses more complex language including some technical vocabulary and makes errors that do not impede communication.

5–Bridging—A student is using language to communicate at a level approaching the proficiency of English-proficient peers.

6–Reaching—A student is using language to communicate at a level comparable to that of English-proficient peers.

In July/August 2016, new ACCESS scale score and proficiency levels were established by WIDA. With this, it was indicated that the proficiency levels from 2016 to 2017 were not comparable. This is important to note as there was a shift in the percent of students within the proficiency level bands beginning with the 2016–2017 school year. In the previous two school years the majority of ELLs were between the ‘emerging’ and ‘bridging’ levels (proficiency levels 2 through 5), but

beginning with the 2016–2017 school year, most students were in the ‘expanding’ category or lower (proficiency level 4 or lower).

Table 5. Percent of ESOL Students Scoring by ACCESS for ELLs
Proficiency Levels by School Year

	% Entering	% Emerging	% Developing	% Expanding	% Bridging	% Reaching
2014–2015	5.7	12.8	28.7	26.1	20.6	6.2
2015–2016	11.7	15.4	25.7	24.6	17.5	5.0
2016–2017	17.0	22.0	37.9	20.0	2.9	0.2
2017–2018	13.4	19.9	38.2	23.9	4.4	0.3