



**Evaluation of the ELD Practicum
Year 1 Report**

**Gojko Vuckovic, Ph.D.
Katherine G. Hayes, Ph.D.
Jesus Jose Salazar, Ph.D.
Colleen Phelan
Mireya Vela**

**Los Angeles Unified School District
Research and Planning
Publication No. 2008-10**

November, 2008

Acknowledgements

Any research work, data collection, analysis and report writing in education is an art of working together, collaborating, anticipating and taking pride for something that may help us build more promising future for all our students. There are many people who did make this study possible among whom we count teachers who opened the doors of their classroom, administrators who opened the doors of their schools, and policy-makers who recognized the value of research and evaluation. We want to acknowledge all of them and extend our appreciation for their contributions. However, we want to use this opportunity to recognize in particular the contributions of our professional experts who worked tirelessly on this study. There are many of them who contributed to this study. We want in particular to say thank you to *Mireya Vela* and *Colleen Phelan*. Their will, integrity, positive spirit and ability to make contribution to the better future of our students made a difference in our work and hopefully our ability to respond to the needs of staff whose work is dedicated to English learners.

Preface

In July of 2006, Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) began implementing a newly designed English Language Development (ELD) program consisting of the original *Into English!* lessons and the enhanced *Into English!* Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) lessons.¹ Research and Planning launched a study in 2006 to examine the effects of the ELD Program in third and fourth grade as supported by the Title III ELD Practicum Professional Development. Data was collected from 50 third and 50 fourth grade classrooms during the first and second semesters of 2006-07. Observers' field notes and report summaries, along with teacher interviews, chronicled not only what lessons the teachers followed, but also the instructional strategies used during class time. Using this data, the implementation level of the ELD program in each class was determined, and student performance data was compared across implementation levels.

The study found that the majority of sample teachers implemented the ELD program, and that students in classes in which the ELD program was implemented outperformed their peers in classes in which the program was not implemented. The study also concluded that students at higher ELD levels significantly outperformed their peers at lower ELD levels. In the third grade, ELD 1 and 2 students had the weakest performance, while ELD 1, 2, and 3 students had the weakest performance in the fourth grade. Such findings can be used to direct attention to the ELD program curriculum, which doesn't seem to be responsive to the needs of lower level ELD students. The Language Acquisition Branch (LAB) should find ways to incorporate more learning opportunities for lower level ELD students into the curriculum. The Local Districts in partnership with LAB should also continue providing professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators.

Teachers found the Practicum's demonstration lessons to be the most beneficial by far and requested additional follow-up training sessions of this nature. Since we found that success is not just a function of program implementation, but also of the ability of teachers to respond to

¹ The instruction in the enhanced version is founded on the research-based TBLT theory and practice (Wills, 1996; Skehan, 1998; Feez 1998) and is expected to increase the effectiveness of the ELD program.

the needs of students, we recommend that additional steps be made to incorporate high quality teaching strategies across the training programs in our district; in particular, the ELD Institute.

Among Superintendent Brewer's five guiding principles is a focus on life-long learning and professional development for all employees as well as the promotion of innovation and change within the District. The ELD Practicum constitutes elements of both. It was an innovative approach to professional development in building school-based training capacity. The new ELD curriculum, for which the Practicum was designed, contains the latest research-based strategies and methods for teaching ELD. In alignment with the District's mission of providing high quality instruction and a coherent and rigorous curriculum in every classroom to facilitate student learning and achievement, this study sought to determine the success of the Practicum in reaching all teachers by studying how well the ELD program was implemented and how well the program met the needs of ELD students.

Contact Information:

Principal Author: Gojko Vuckovic, Ph.D.
333 S. Beaudry St., 21st floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.241.8265
gojko.vuckovic@lausd.net

Director: Julie Slayton, Ph.D., J.D.
333 S. Beaudry St., 21st floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213-241-5101
julie.slayton@lausd.net

Research and Planning: 333 S. Beaudry Avenue, 21st floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Phone: 213-241-6476
FAX: 213-241-8426
E-mail: research@lausd.net

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	i
Preface.....	ii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Findings.....	4
Chapter 2: Discussion with recommendations and action steps.....	25
Appendix A – Program background.....	27
Appendix B – Key terms.....	30
Appendix C – Methodology.....	32
Appendix D – Demographic overview.....	37
Appendix E - Examples of the use of supplemental materials	39
Appendix F – A closer look at implementation.....	41
Appendix G – Explaining low or no implementation.....	44
Appendix H – CST outcomes.....	45
Appendix I - CST outcomes across ELD levels and program implementation.....	47
Appendix J - Quality of teaching and learning framework.....	53
References.....	58

Introduction

Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) began implementing the newly designed English Language Development (ELD) program in July 2006. A district-wide three-year longitudinal study was launched in 2006 to examine the effects of the ELD Program (the original *Into English!* lessons and the enhanced *Into English!* TBLT lessons) in third and fourth grade as supported by the Title III ELD Practicum Professional Development. This study will document the ELD instruction provided to English Learners (ELs), measure ELD program implementation, and evaluate the program's overall effectiveness for the first year of implementation.

The following introductory section presents the program background (Title III ELD Practicum Professional Development), a brief overview of expected outcomes, and the evaluation design and methodology. The findings are presented in Chapter 1. The report's discussion, as well as our recommendations for future ELD program implementation policies and practices, is presented in Chapter 2.

A. Program Background

Providing timely and effective ELD instruction is considered to be one of the major factors in helping English learners transition to fluent English proficient status. District policy¹ dictates that ELD instruction be delivered in all elementary programs serving English learners including: Structured English Immersion, Waiver to Basic Bilingual, Dual Language Immersion, and Mainstream English Program classes. The evaluation of the Structured English Immersion Program, a five-year study conducted from 1999 to 2004, called attention to the low implementation of ELD. In 2003-04, the fifth and final year of the study, 70% (116) of a sample of 166 teachers did not teach an ELD lesson on the day they were observed. An additional 8% provided only a little ELD instruction. The remaining 22% provided high levels of ELD instruction.² Similar results were found in Year 4 (2002-03). Only one-in-five teachers provided 30 minutes or more of ELD instruction. In Year 4, we found a relationship between ELD

¹LAUSD Master Plan for English learners for 1996.

²Hayes, K., Salazar J., & Vuckovic G. (2005). *Evaluation of the Structured English Immersion Program - Year 5 Final Report*. LAUSD, PAR Division Publication No. 241.

instruction, student achievement and ELD gains.³ More specifically, English learners in Grade 2 and Grade 3 who received more ELD instruction made greater gains in language and math.

Due to the lack of implementation of the ELD curriculum and the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act⁴, on September 28, 2004, the LAUSD Board of Education agreed to utilize Title III funds to provide English Language Development (ELD) professional development to all teachers and administrators serving ELs. In response to the Board's resolution, the Language Acquisition Branch (LAB) initiated the Title III ELD Practicum Initiative for all K-5 schools in the district.

LAB contracted with LitConn Inc. to assist with the ELD Practicum training. LitConn's theory of action is "whole district reform," building capacity by training school site trainers, site administrators, and district administrators on the same educational initiatives and implementation protocols as teachers receive. The effort requires a short and long-term commitment to accomplish results in student achievement, particularly in the achievement of ELs and students who have traditionally struggled in school.⁵

According to the plan developed jointly by LAB and LitConn, different intensity levels of professional development are required for different groups. Initially, school ELD trainers are required to attend eight days of training, teachers are required to attend a three-day training, and administrators a one-day training. The specific professional development design is built around the enhanced *Into English!* TBLT lessons ELD curriculum developed by LAB in collaboration with LitConn (as enhanced from Hampton Brown's *Into English!*). Further information about the theoretical underpinnings of the enhanced ELD curriculum can be seen in Appendix A. Appendix B contains a list of key terms and strategies included in the curriculum.

³Hayes, K., Salazar J. & Vuckovic G. (2004). *Evaluation of the Structured English Immersion Program - Year 4 Report*. LAUSD, Planning Assessment and Research Division Publication No. 179.

⁴The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 Title III program addresses English Language Acquisition through the following goals: (1) Improve English Learner Programs, (2) Provide quality professional development, (3) Strengthen programs for immigrant students, and (4) Support accountability for EL achievement. Providing quality professional development is further operationalized as providing professional development in: (1) English Language Development, (2) Access to grade level standards, and (3) Culturally responsive pedagogy.

⁵[Http://www.litconn.com/our_history.htm](http://www.litconn.com/our_history.htm).

B. Expected Outcomes

The ELD Practicum aims to increase teacher capability and accelerate student ELD progress through professional development, a rigorous ELD program (*Into English!* + strategies), and a strong commitment to teaching ELD daily (30-45 min.). Measurements of such progress are embedded into Practicum's goals, including the following: increase the percentage of ELs advancing one ELD level per year, improve student performance on the English Language Arts California Standards Tests (ELA CST), and increase reclassification rates overall.

C. Evaluation Design and Methodology

In responding to the needs of the District, Research and Planning developed an evaluation to study the implementation and effectiveness of ELD instruction provided in blocks of 30 to 45 minutes. The evaluation documents:

- The capacity of the schools to support the *ELD Program* implementation as measured by the provision of ELD Practicum professional development and access to curriculum materials.
- The nature and extent of *ELD Program* implementation in third and fourth grade classes serving English learners.
- The effectiveness of ELD instruction as measured by student progress in English language acquisition (student CELDT scores and ELD levels) and ELA (ELA CST performance level gains).

In order to investigate these research questions, we observed 100 randomly selected classes from the third and fourth grades during the first and second semesters. A multi-stage stratified procedure was used to determine our sample. Data collection was conducted by trained field workers who observed classes and interviewed teachers. Both quantitative and qualitative analyses were performed to determine whether or not the ELD program was implemented during the observation as well as the impact of implementation on student performance. For a detailed explanation of the methodology used in this study, see Appendix C. A demographic overview of our sample is provided in Appendix D.

Chapter 1:
Findings

This chapter focuses on the capacity of the schools to support the *ELD Program* implementation as measured by the provision of ELD Practicum professional development and access to curriculum materials, the nature and extent of *ELD Program* implementation, and the impact of implementation on student performance as measured by the CST ELA & CELDT scores. It also provides an analysis of ELD strategies associated with implementation.

A. The Capacity of Schools to Support the *ELD Program* Implementation: *The majority of schools provided adequate training and materials to sample teachers.*

Eighty-one teachers told us that they had completed the mandatory ELD Practicum training for third or fourth/fifth grade teachers. Exhibit 1 shows the number and percentage of teachers from our sample who completed ELD Practicum training or any other ELD professional development. Seventeen teachers did not have the mandatory training completed by the time of our interview. However, 10 teachers reported that they had attended the ELD Institute (5-days), and 3 teachers told us that they had received some training from their EL coordinator at the school site. Four teachers stated that they didn't have any ELD training. We have no training data for two teachers in the sample.

EXHIBIT 1
The majority of teachers completed the ELD Practicum

ELD Training	# of teachers	Percentage
ELD Practicum for teachers	81	83%
ELD 5 day Institute	10	10%
Trained by EL Coordinator	3	3%
None	4	4%
Total	98	100

We asked the teachers to tell us if they had all the materials for ELD instruction, which includes the following: a complete *Into English!* kit including the teacher’s guide, student books, CD or tapes, posters; and ELD Practicum materials including a Seminar Guide, Practicum Guide, five blue posters, and ELD Portfolios. As Exhibit 2 displays, the majority of teachers (82%) said that they had all of the ELD materials. Of the 18% who said that they didn’t have all the ELD materials, most were missing auxiliary components such as ballparking forms, Language Logs, lesson posters, picture cards, CDs, pacing plans, and student books, while 6% of teachers were missing TBLT lessons, and 5% were missing TBLT posters. Also, 6% of teachers reported that they had to share ELD kits with teachers in their schools.

EXHIBIT 2
The majority of teachers had all of the materials

ELD materials	# of teachers	Percentage
Had all the materials	80	82%
Missing some materials	18	18%
Total	98	100%

1. Most teachers used supplemental materials.

When asked if they used supplemental materials, the majority of teachers in both grades (74%) stated that they did, while 26% stated that they did not. When responding, most teachers said that they used a variety of materials to supplement the ELD program, commonly mentioning the use of realia, visuals, different types of literature, and the internet. Some teachers said that they used *Open Court Reading* supplements, science books or science aids, social studies books or aids, and/or spelling and grammar aids. A few teachers also mentioned using the following supplements: music, magazines and newspapers, videos and movies, and/or worksheets. A few teachers said that their supplemental materials were drawn from an alternative ELD program. Although teachers used different supplemental materials from various sources, the purpose for using them was the same: to aid in comprehension and re-enforce the ELD lessons. Examples are provided in Appendix E.

2. Teachers found demonstration lessons to be the most beneficial aspect of the professional development.

Exhibit 3 reveals that teachers found observations of demonstration lessons to be most beneficial learning experience by far.⁷ In fact, 58% of teachers determined this to be the most beneficial. Although teachers considered the implementation of Unit 5 and peer coaching to be less beneficial than observing demonstration lessons, they still considered those sections to be beneficial at moderate levels. The experience teachers gained through the implementation of the program unit as designed by the training was ranked by 30% of teachers as beneficial, while peer coaching was considered by 23% of teachers to be beneficial or moderately beneficial. Many teachers perceived grade level meetings as being less beneficial than observing demonstration lessons, unit implementation and peer coaching. Notably, 32% of teachers chose not to rank the six seminars. Of those who ranked them, 17% considered them the least beneficial.

EXHIBIT 3

Teachers felt that observing demonstration lessons was the most beneficial aspect of the professional development

Section of the ELD Practicum	Rank					
	5	4	3	2	1	n/a
Six seminars	10%	14%	14%	11%	17%	32%
Peer Coaching	12%	23%	23%	21%	10%	9%
Observing Demonstration Lessons	58%	14%	12%	4%	5%	7%
Implementation of Unit 5 (30 ELD lessons)	14%	30%	23%	11%	11%	7%
Grade level meetings	12%	18%	13%	24%	21%	10%

3. Teachers felt that the ELD Practicum had a positive impact on their classroom practice.

During the interview, teachers were asked if the ELD Practicum professional development experience benefitted their classroom practices. Most teachers provided more than one response. Thirty percent of teachers stated that the Practicum training had helped them gain a better understanding of the ELD Program, while 11% said that the training had helped them obtain a better understanding of ELD. One teacher stated, “It made me aware of the students’ ELD levels and how to meet their needs based on that. The scaffolding is great. I really like the way it lets me support my lower level ELD kids.” Another teacher expressed how the training

⁷ Although we asked teachers to rank the five sections from 1 to 5, with 1 being the least beneficial and 5 being the most beneficial, many teachers applied the same rank to more than one section.

helped him better understand the ELD program itself, “They showed me the proper way to use the ELD program. It’s more effective. I like the strategies. I’m applying the strategies to other areas, like Think Pair Share, and I’m more aware to make them restate sentences and vocabulary. I want them to practice, like in math. I repeat a full sentence and they repeat.”

Twenty-seven percent of teachers stated that the training has encouraged them to implement the strategies, 15% thought it helped them with writing, and 13% stated that the ELD strategies were spilling into other curriculum subjects, such as one teacher expressed, “I also use these [TBLT] strategies for other curriculum like *Open Court Reading* and even math, especially TPS [Total Physical Response]. I like it a lot.” Nine percent of teachers stated that because of the Practicum training, they felt more compelled to implement ELD. As one teacher stated, “It has forced me to teach ESL every day and to find the time to teach it.” We also learned that teachers felt they could use additional training. Only 4% of the teachers interviewed did not think that the ELD Practicum had changed their classroom experiences.

4. More than half of the teachers felt that the professional development could be improved.

When asked if there is anything that they would have liked to change in the professional development, 65% of teachers made comments that related not only to professional development, but also aspects of the curriculum. Twenty percent of teachers explicitly stated that they wanted more demonstration lessons. Some teachers wanted simple things such as a change in the time of training, as one teacher stated, “The only change [is] I think we should have the training prior to school starting.” Four percent of teachers suggested follow-up training. Some teachers didn’t see a need for any changes in the training, as one teacher expressed, “I thought it was good training. I watched a lesson being taught. I thought that was the most helpful parts of the training, and we learned that the folders have changed, so I learned how to fill in the folders, which also helped me a great deal.”

Some teachers made suggestions including changes to lessons, a reduction in workload, and changes in pacing. Regarding changes to the lessons, one teacher stated, “Maybe they need to look at TBLT lessons for length. Sometimes I’m splitting it into two lessons. And when it says, ‘Today we’re going to input,’ I don’t think that means anything to the kids.” One teacher who felt burdened by the work load commented, “I like the whole program, but I always complain about the charting that we have to do ahead of time, like writing the objectives and

tasks. You have to write all those out ahead of time. I wish they could be included and then I could make transparency copies or something.”

B. The Nature and Extent of ELD Program Implementation in Third and Fourth Grades: *The majority of sample teachers implemented the program, teaching ELD for an average of 39 minutes per day.*

During Semester 1, the majority of classes we observed (80%) implemented the program, while 20% did not. During semester 2, the number of implementing classes dropped from 80% to 77%. Classes deemed not implementing were rated as such because observers only saw evidence of attempted ELD lessons; for example, the use of a story or the use of a strategy; but the teacher did not do enough to meet implementation criteria. In a few cases, the teachers told the observer that they were not teaching ELD.

Exhibit 4 displays time ranges dedicated to ELD instruction. The majority of classes (60%) taught between 30 and 45 minutes of ELD per day, while 16% of classes taught less than 30 minutes per day and 19% of classes taught more than 45 minutes per day. Most classes (80%) taught ELD on all three days of observations. Three classrooms taught ELD only one day, while 12 classrooms taught ELD for two days. In 5 classes, ELD was not taught at all. A closer look at implementation is provided in Appendix F.

EXHIBIT 4
The majority of teachers averaged 30 to 45 minutes of ELD per day, Semester 2

Average minutes per day	# of classrooms	%
30 to 45	60	60%
More than 45	19	19%
Less than 30	16	16%
No ELD taught	5	5%

We also looked at ELD time according to specific lesson type (regular *IE!* or enhanced *IE!*) and implementation (See Exhibit 5). In order to implement the enhanced lessons, it took teachers an average of 39 minutes per class. It should be noted that teachers in 4-track and single track schools are supposed to teach ELD for 30 minutes per day, while teachers in 3-track schools are supposed to teach it for 45 minutes. Since only 8 classes we observed required 45

minutes per day, and 92 classes required 30 minutes, an overall average time of 31 to 32 minutes would have been expected. Thus, the average time it took teachers to implement the lessons is greater than that for which the program is designed. One reason for this may be because some TBLT strategies are new and it takes longer to execute newly learned strategies.

EXHIBIT 5

Teachers who implemented the program taught ELD for more minutes than did non-implementing teachers

ELD Lesson Type	Time in minutes	
	Implemented	Not Implemented
Enhanced	39	23
Regular	35	33
Regular and Enhanced	37	n.a.
Special Cases	44	38
Average	39	26

1. Less than half of the sample teachers felt that the program was being implemented well at their schools

When teachers were asked if they thought that the ELD Program was implemented effectively at their schools, 38% of teachers agreed that it was being well implemented. Twenty-eight percent disagreed, mostly because the program was not being taught as designed. In some cases, they felt that there was no time to teach it, or, in a few cases, they did not have all the materials. About 18% of teachers thought that the program was being implemented only somewhat effectively at their schools. Fifteen percent said that they did not know (1% of teachers did not respond to this question).

2. Teachers who did not implement the program expressed a lack of support from the school's administration

We observed multiple classrooms at each of the 25 school sites in the study. At seven schools in the study, we found that two or more teachers were not implementing the program. During Semester 2, a total of 23 classes were implementing the program at a very low level, or not at all. In the majority of cases, the reason for not implementing the program seemed to extend beyond an individual classroom and reached the school site level. Upon examining the

teacher interviews at those schools, we found that, in most cases, the program did not have the support of the administration. At a few schools, teachers commented that they needed additional in-depth training, while other teachers had not been trained at all. At another school, lack of materials seemed to be the issue. In fact, one teacher told us that he had only received one enhanced unit all year long. Teachers at another school said that administrators told them that teaching ELD was optional. At this particular school, three teachers complained about the program, one stating that, “it’s not rigorous enough and it’s too easy for the kids.” The general factors contributing to very low or no implementation are shown in Exhibit 6.

EXHIBIT 6

Teachers perceived a lack of support from their school’s administrators, Semester 2 (23 Classes)

Reason given for low - no implementation	Number
School site issues	17
Substitute teacher (some overlap with school site issues)	6
Professional development (some overlap with school site issues)	4

In addition to school site issues, we found two other general factors contributing to very low or no implementation: the presence of a substitute teacher, and/or lack of professional development. Both of these factors were present in some schools mentioned above. In five classes, a substitute taught for one of the three days of observation. In another class, there was a substitute for two out of three days. The presence of a substitute teacher seemed to derail any possibility of implementing the program for two reasons: the teachers did not leave instructions to teach ELD, or if the teacher did leave instructions, the substitute had not been trained to provide adequate ELD instruction.

In four cases, the lack of professional development seemed to be the main cause for such a low level of implementation of the ELD program. While two teachers attempted to do an ELD lesson during the three days of observation, the other two teachers did not teach any ELD, both stating that they rarely, if ever, do. Three teachers in this group reported during their interviews that they had never received TBLT training. Two of the teachers in this group were also teaching at schools where there did not seem to be strong administrative support for the program. For further information about the specific factors contributing to very low or no implementation, see Appendix G.

3. *Think–Pair–Share, Pull Out and Talk/Write, Vocalized Reading Text, and Thinking Map* were much more evident than *Backward Buildup and RASP*.

We observed 43 enhanced *Into English* classes during semester 1 and 51 during semester 2. In semester 1, we found more instances of Corrective Recasting and RASP than in semester 2. Exhibit 7 displays the results.

EXHIBIT 7

Thinking Maps, Think-Pair-Share, and Pull Out and Talk/Write were the most frequently used strategies during enhanced *IE!* lessons

ELD Strategies	Semester 1		Semester 2	
	N (of 43 classes)		N (of 51 classes)	
Backward Buildup	0	0%	1	2%
Ballparking	12	28%	8	16%
Corrective Recasting	19	44%	10	20%
Pull Out and Talk/Write	38	88%	45	88%
RASP	6	14%	2	4%
Think-Pair-Share	41	95%	48	94%
Thinking Maps	42	98%	50	98%
Vocalized Reading Text	33	77%	35	69%

4. Teachers used the strategies with which they felt most comfortable.

When teachers were asked about which ELD strategies embedded in the lessons they were most comfortable using, their responses indicated the more comfortable that they were with a particular strategy, the more likely it was that they used it in their practice. The strategies most frequently utilized (displayed in Exhibit 7) were the same strategies that teachers said they were more comfortable using. Ninety-four percent of teachers said that they were comfortable using Think-Pair-Share, 91% of teachers said that they were comfortable with Thinking Maps, 83% of teachers stated that they were comfortable with Pull Out Talk/Write, 64% of teachers were comfortable with Vocalized Reading, 37% of teachers stated that they were comfortable with Corrective Recast, 38% of teachers said they were comfortable with RASP, and 20% of teachers said that they were comfortable with Backwards Buildup. Even though some teachers said that they were comfortable using RASP and Backwards Buildup, we did not observe these strategies being utilized frequently. Since the RASP strategy is particularly effective for ELD 1 and 2 students, we expected to see it more frequently.

We also found the converse to be true: the less comfortable those teachers were with a particular strategy; the less likely it was that they would use it. As expected, most of the teachers told us that they needed help with the strategies they were least comfortable with. Seventy-seven percent of teachers stated that they needed help with Backwards Build-up, 61% of teachers said they needed help with Corrective Recast, and 60% of teachers stated they need help with RASP.

As Exhibit 7 shows, these were the strategies least utilized by teachers. Only 4% of teachers said they needed help with Think-Pair-Share, 7% of teachers needed help with Thinking Maps, and 15% of teachers said they needed support with Pull Out Talk/write. In addition, 32% of teachers said they needed help with Vocalized Reading.

5. *During regular IE! lessons, teachers used visual illustrations and demonstrating strategies most often, followed by graphs/charts and think-pair-share. Prior knowledge and audio were used in half of the classes.*

Exhibit 8 shows the results of the *IE! lessons*.

EXHIBIT 8

Use of Visual Illustrations was the most commonly used strategy during regular *IE!* lessons⁹

ELD Strategies	Semester 1		Semester 2	
	N (of 26 classes)	%	N (of 14 classes)	%
Audio	14	54%	7	50%
Chant	11	42%	4	29%
Choral Reading	15	58%	6	43%
Collaborative Reading	1	4%	1	7%
Demonstrating	14	54%	12	86%
Echo Reading	4	15%	1	7%
Games	2	8%	1	7%
Graphs/Charts	16	62%	8	57%
Prior Knowledge	11	42%	7	50%
Realia	9	35%	2	14%
Think-Pair-Share	17	65%	7	50%
TPR	6	23%	2	14%
Visual/Illustrations	23	88%	13	93%

We observed twice as many regular *IE!* classes during the fall semester compared to spring semester (26 classes vs. 14 classes). In semester 1, a higher percentage of classes were employing choral reading and think-pair-share, compared to semester 2.

⁹The background data on the effectiveness of ELD instruction evaluation are provided in Appendix F. Operational definitions for strategies used in regular *IE!* are provided in Appendix B.

C. Effectiveness of ELD Instruction: *Implementation of the ELD program generated stronger student performance as measured by ELA CST and CELDT reading scores.*

Our analysis of the adjusted standardized gains scores revealed an association between program implementation and student performance in both third and fourth grades. More specifically, it showed that program implementation generates stronger student performance in ELA, while no implementation produces much weaker student performance in ELA (see Exhibit 9). Student progress as measured by performance levels in CST ELA is provided in Appendix H.

EXHIBIT 9

Students from implementing classrooms outperformed peers in non-implementing classrooms in ELA

Grade	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	Gain*	N**	Gain*	N**
3 rd grade	.00	379	-.32	118
4 th grade	-.06	505	-.35	118

*Adjusted Standardized Gains

**Number of students

The data in Exhibit 9 was used to calculate the effect size between the two groups, that is, between the implementing and non-implementing classes. Such calculations helped us determine how meaningful the differences were. We compared the two groups in ELA. In third grade, the effect size for implementing vs. non-implementing classes was .32. Thus, differences in student gains were educationally meaningful in favor of students in classes implementing the ELD program. The same is true for the fourth grade. The effect size for the implementing vs. non-implementing classes was .29.

Exhibit 10 shows the CELDT reading gains. These findings mirror those of the CST ELA. Both third and fourth graders in implementing classes outperformed their classmates in non-implementing classes. In the third grade, the effect size was .22, and in the fourth grade the effect size was .27. As the CST ELA scores revealed the benefit of implementation, the CELDT reading scores strengthened this finding.

EXHIBIT 10

Students from implementing classrooms outperformed peers in non-implementing classrooms on the CELDT

Grade	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	Gain*	N**	Gain*	N**

3 rd grade	.03	361	-.19	112
4 th grade	.25	483	-.02	124

*Adjusted Standardized Gains

**Number of students

1. Higher-level ELD students outperform lower-level ELD students.

Students at higher ELD levels outperformed those students at lower ELD levels. In third grade, this applies to students at ELD levels 1 and 2, while in fourth grade; this applies to students with ELD levels 1, 2, and 3 (See Appendix K).

2. Teachers did not use the suggested differentiation practices.

In order to identify possible causes of the weak performance by ELD 1, 2, and 3 students, we further explored the instructional practices in ten classrooms where students at higher ELD levels significantly outperformed students at lower ELD levels. Exhibit 11 shows CST ELA adjusted standardized gain scores by ELD level in the selected classrooms. As one can see, the gains scores for students at ELD levels 1, 2, and 3 are low (as low as -.77 for ELD 1, -2.01 for ELD 2, and -.84 for ELD 3) while the gains scores for their classmates at ELD levels 4 and 5 are much higher (as high as .81 for ELD 4 and 1.01 for ELD 5). This data underscores what we learned in the overall analysis of adjusted gains scores. Students at higher ELD levels outperform their peers at lower ELD levels.

EXHIBIT 11

Classes in which students at ELD levels 4 and 5 significantly outperformed their classmates at ELD levels 2 and 3 (Gains by ELD level in selected classrooms)

Classroom and implementation level (I, NI)*	ELD 1		ELD 2		ELD 3		ELD 4		ELD 5	
	Gains ¹⁰	N	Gains	N	Gains	N	Gains	N	Gains	N
Classroom # 1(I)	/	/	-.63	6	.35	4	.57	4	.77	2
Classroom # 2(I)	/	/	/	/	-.70	6	.81	4	.16	6
Classroom # 3(NI)	/	/	-.45	4	-.48	3	.47	5	.27	2
Classroom # 4(I)	/	/	-.34	8	-.80	6	.02	5	/	/
Classroom # 5(I)	/	/	-2.01	1	-.78	6	.03	6	.03	1
Classroom # 6(I)	/	/	/	/	-.70	3	.40	2	1.01	2
Classroom # 7(I)	/	/	-1.66	2	-.84	2	.67	1	.84	8
Classroom # 8(NI)	-.77	1	/	/	-.45	3	.30	4	/	/
Classroom # 9(I)	/	/	/	/	-.38	2	/	/	.40	3
Classroom # 10(NI)	/	/	/	/	-.28	9	.29	5	/	/

*I=Implemented, NI=Not implemented¹¹

These ten classrooms, containing low scoring ELD 1, 2 and 3 students, and higher scoring ELD 4 and 5 students, were analyzed to determine why low level ELD students were not as successful. Drawing on six days of observation data for each class, we focused our analysis on differentiation. From this data we learned not only what lessons and objectives the teachers intended to implement, but also the instructional strategies they used during class time. Next, we examined the ELD program curriculum itself to determine what types of activities and differentiation practices were suggested for different ELD levels during each lesson. Finally, we compared what the curriculum suggested to what the teachers actually did.

When analyzing the teachers' level of differentiation, it was important to learn if the teacher differentiated for all of the ELD levels recognized in each class. Upon thorough

¹⁰CST ELA adjusted standardized gain scores.

¹¹Determination made based on the second semester observations.

examination, we found that the teachers did not make much effort to differentiate instruction. Exhibit 12 demonstrates that not all suggested activities were similarly implemented.

EXHIBIT 12
Differentiation was rarely used during ELD lessons

Differentiation	Classroom									
	# 1	# 2	# 3	# 4	# 5	# 6	# 7	# 8	# 9	# 10
Suggested number	8	1	6	7	6	3	4	6	6	4
Completed number	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Percent	38%	100%	17%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	25%

Exhibit 12 shows that only 7 out of 51 suggested differentiation practices were used in the selected classrooms. Overall, the curriculum suggested that teachers generate different student responses by *facilitating simple*,¹² *elaborate*,¹³ and *complex*¹⁴ sentences for the pull out and talk activity ten times. This differentiation practice was employed only four out of ten times. We also observed practices such as teacher assigning different *roles for cooperative groups* where students fulfill their roles based on their ELD levels, and the use of *simile* targeting ELD levels 4 and 5.

Although the curriculum suggested differentiation practices for the lessons we observed, the teachers did not use them. The following differentiation practices were not observed even though they were suggested: *questioning techniques* (the teacher asks students questions based on their ELD understanding), *mapping* (The teacher point to pictures and asks questions based on ELD abilities), *discussion prompts* (the students respond based on their ELD level), *activity (or writing) options by level* (students can do a different activity depending on the ELD level – draw pictures, draw pictures and label them, or write complete sentences), *different grouping for reading* (small group choral reading vs. partner choral reading), and *other* multilevel differentiation practices.

In conclusion, the lower level ELD students may be struggling because teachers aimed their teaching to the higher level ELD students, and followed few, if any, of the suggested

¹²Students use basic vocabulary from Thinking Maps® to complete the communication guide.

¹³Students use basic vocabulary from Thinking Maps® and add descriptive words to complete the communication guide.

¹⁴Students use vivid and precise vocabulary from Thinking Maps® to complete the guide or create own complex sentences.

differentiation activities. Teachers used a “one style fits all” practice and failed to differentiate instruction for students at various ELD levels. Students at lower ELD levels struggled to achieve.

3. Poor instructional practice contributed to lower gains for lower-level ELD students.

As indicated in previous section, in 10 of the 100 classrooms we observed during the 1st year of the ELD Practicum study, we found that there was a discrepancy between the gain scores of higher ELD students and the gain scores of lower ELD students in the CST ELA. In this section we use the Quality of Teaching and Learning (QTL) framework (see Appendix J) to analyze the quality of pedagogy in these classrooms. The analysis covered five dimensions of teaching quality: (1) Intellectual Challenge; (2) Learning Environment; (3) Discourse; (4) Assessment, Data-Driven Instruction, and Accountability; and (5) Instructional Cycle. In order to analyze the above dimensions in each classroom, we used teacher interviews, observational summaries, and classroom field notes for both first and second semesters. Our analysis produced the following findings for each of the dimensions studied:

Intellectual challenge. Overall, the findings show that five teachers taught a lesson that had optimal Intellectual Challenge. The other half of this sub-sample taught lessons that showed minimal Intellectual Challenge.

Learning environment. In this study, learning environment focuses on student centered lessons, teacher adapting the pacing plan, and providing extra oral opportunities. Two teachers taught lessons that were student centered. There was no evidence of teachers adapting the pacing plan and only one teacher taught lessons in which students had extra oral opportunities.

Discourse consists of evidence of: volunteer/oral speaking opportunities, vocabulary in context, complete sentences, and primary language (L1). Eight teachers offered many oral opportunities. Three taught vocabulary in context. Most of the time, the teachers did not cover all vocabulary that may have been helpful to better understand the lessons. Six teachers encouraged students to speak in complete sentences. This was often done through the use of communication guides. Four teachers used L1 with their classrooms to explain the material.

Assessment, Data-Driven Instruction, and Accountability. This dimension consists of the use of Student Progress Forms (SPF) and Ballparking. There are no instances of teacher using assessments.

Instructional Cycle. In the ELD Practicum study, Total Physical Response (TPR), visuals/charts, Thinking Maps®, prior knowledge, differentiation, and teacher listening to the students were examined as part of the Instructional Cycle. Seven teachers used TPR in their classrooms. This was often done in the form of gestures done during chants. Eight teachers taught using visuals. Usually, teachers used picture cards, graphic organizers, and ELD posters. Eight teachers taught using Thinking Maps®. Although use of Thinking Maps® often equates to optimal Intellectual Challenge scores, this was not the case in many of these classrooms because teachers often had poor classroom management skills and low student engagement. Two teachers accessed prior knowledge and two teachers taught using differentiation. There are no instances of teachers listening to students to help inform their teachings.

In addition, other practices that may have had a negative impact on the performance of students at lower ELD levels are provided below. In two of the ten classrooms we looked at, the teachers misinformed students. In three of the ten classrooms, the teachers did not confirm whether the students were right or wrong in their answers. This was such a severe problem in one classroom, that the students left the lesson believing that whales have gills and that animals become warm blooded when they drink milk.

Of the third grade classrooms, two of the three teachers had difficulty managing their classrooms. One of the three classrooms was a classroom for “gifted” students. Two of the three teachers did not teach ELD consistently. One of the teachers taught ELD so rarely that the observer had to keep trying before an observation was possible. In one class, the teacher appeared to have not taught ELD at all since the last time we were there during the semester 1. The observer noticed that the class was on the same exact lesson as the first observation with the same poster, “To the River,” displayed.

One of the teachers created an uncomfortable environment. She made the students wear labels with their ELD levels. The students clearly disliked this stigmatization.

T: When you're in ELD level two, you're behind. You should be in pink [referring to level 3]. White means you're in second grade level.

T: This will affect you when you go to middle school—you'll be in remedial classes. I'm helping you and you don't wanna learn.

This teacher had a difficult time keeping her students engaged in ELD. She severely agitated the class with her method of teaching – not only because of her poor pacing, but because she pushed the students through reprimands and punishments.

In the fourth grade, more than one teacher made it clear to the students that only elaborated sentences were permissible. The ELD students received little to no support from their teachers. Very few of the ELD level 2 and 3 children appeared to be volunteering answers. In one classroom, the teacher called an ELD 2 student, but when the student was unable to deliver a response, the teacher did nothing to help her. In all the classrooms involved, there were few instances of teachers providing one-on-one to the students.

A few teachers did not seem to know how to teach *Into English!* lessons. It was very clear that they had either not been teaching it at all or that they were completely new to teaching the program. One teacher taught the regular version of the program and did so resentfully. In the teacher interview, this teacher made it clear that she was unhappy about having to teach the program at all. Two other teachers complained that the program was too time consuming. Fifty percent of the teachers skipped at least one day of ELD. Two of these teachers skipped more than one lesson. Three teachers did not complete the lessons they were teaching. They left at least one lesson unfinished. One teacher did not finish any of her lessons, but continued to move onto the next lesson the next day. Students of ELD levels 2 and 3 may find it crucial to have effective ELD in order to be successful. ELD levels 4 and 5 may be benefitting from *Open Court Reading* to help their test scores, while lower ELD levels are not even getting the benefit of differentiation from their teachers.

4. High quality instructional practices contributed to the overall gains for all students.

In 15 of the 100 classrooms we observed, all the students had high scores on the CST ELA and the CELDT (Exhibit 13). Observational data from these classes were analyzed to discover the factors contributing to high performance of all students. In this section, as in previous one, we used the QTL framework to analyze the quality of pedagogy in these classrooms.¹⁵

EXHIBIT 13

¹⁵ Instances were marked by whether or not strategies occurred. The data does not reflect to what degree or how many times the teachers used the strategies.

High performing classrooms

Classroom and implementation level (I*, NI**)	Grade	ELD Levels	Number of ELs	CST ELA ¹⁶ Gains	CELDT ¹⁷ Gains
Classroom # 1(I)	3	1,2,3,4,5	17	.66	.31
Classroom # 2(I)	3	1,2,3,4,5	11	.37	.44
Classroom # 3(I)	4	1,2,3,4,5	17	.38	.76
Classroom # 4(I)	4	1,2,3,4,5	23	.56	.09
Classroom # 5(I)	3	3,4,5	6	.42	.25
Classroom # 6(I)	3	1,2,3,4,5	12	.65	.23
Classroom # 7(I)	3	3,4,5	6	.50	.70
Classroom # 8(I)	4	3,4,5	12	.61	.17
Classroom # 9(I)	4	1,2,3,4,5	13	.60	.28
Classroom # 10(NI)	4	1,2,3,4,5	25	.30	.41
Classroom # 11(NI)	3	1,2,3	11	.53	.33
Classroom # 12(I)	3	4,5	5	1.40	.26
Classroom #13(I)	4	4,5	16	.44	.71
Classroom # 14(I)	4	4,5	13	.85	.27
Classroom # 15(I)	3	4,5	4	.48	.39

*I=Implemented, **NI=Not implemented¹⁸

Most of the classrooms had relatively high student engagement and a positive classroom environment. All 15 teachers had fair-to-excellent classroom management skills. They maintained a classroom environment where students participated readily and weren't afraid to share answers. Students appeared enthusiastic and eager to learn.

¹⁶CST ELA adjusted standardized gains.

¹⁷CELDT reading adjusted standardized gains.

¹⁸Determination made based on the second semester observations.

Intellectual challenge. Overall, 12 teachers taught optimally intellectually challenging lessons. This means that the majority of the teachers taught lessons that were rigorous and challenging to the students. In most instances, the teachers used Thinking Maps® to provide the necessary rigor to move the discourse to a higher level. Depending on what lesson they were on, teachers used the Thinking Maps® to organize information, or as part of the pull out and talk strategy. Three teachers did not teach optimal intellectually challenging lessons. Two of these cases occurred in magnet schools where the students scored high on the tests, but the students were not challenged enough by teachers. The third teacher did not have good management skills. This affected the way the students absorbed the lesson.

Learning environment. Ten teachers adapted the pacing plan and seven teachers gave students extra oral opportunities. There were many instances in which the students had a difficult time expressing their thoughts or pronouncing words. The teacher took the time to appropriately help these struggling students. Ten teachers taught lessons that were student centered in which instruction centered on the needs and abilities of the students. The classroom topics were relevant to the students' lives, needs, and interests. The teacher was not afraid to share control of the lessons.

Discourse. All successful teachers (100%) taught lessons with many oral speaking opportunities. Six teachers used L1 in their instruction, 11 taught vocabulary in context and 13 teachers encouraged students to speak in complete sentences. Oftentimes the teachers directly requested that the students use a cloze sentence or corrected the students when they spoke in broken phrases.

Assessment, Data-Driven Instruction, and Accountability. Only four teachers used SPF or ballparking.

Instructional Cycle. All teachers (100%) used visuals and prior knowledge. We observed the used of Thinking Maps® in 13 classrooms. Among the high performing classrooms, 13 teachers used differentiation. Fourteen teachers used TPR. The majority of the time, the teacher was following an ELD lesson that suggested the teacher use gestures, but there were also times when the teacher made up their own gestures or explained parts of the lesson to the students by adding gestures. Ten teachers listened to their students. In some instances the teacher asked the students to share the answers of their work out loud and the teacher gave the feedback aloud on how to improve their work. This was a particularly important finding because

most of the teachers in the study did not do this – oftentimes the teachers never provided feedback on the work produced by the students, thus rendering the learning cycle incomplete.

Teachers did not attribute the success of their students to the ELD program. In fact, more than one teacher from the 15 high performing classes specifically stated in his/her teacher interview that s/he did not believe ELD was important. Another teacher specified that she thought the success of her students was a result of *Open Court*. Of the 15 classrooms in which EL gains were high, 13 teachers implemented the *Into English!* Program. Two did not. The level of fidelity to the ELD program did not appear to impact the degree to which these students were successful. Among the reasons why program fidelity was compromised had to do with timing and the pacing plan. Successful teachers gave up fidelity to the lesson in order to adjust the instruction to meet the needs of the students. In spite of the fact that these teachers may not have had fidelity to the lessons, they still managed to teach lessons that were intellectually challenging and filled with differentiation strategies, instances of TPR, and visuals.

Some teachers were spectacular in their pedagogy. One teacher created an environment rich in imaginative learning. She pretended to be a waitress at a restaurant, handed out menus, and took the students' orders. The students were enthusiastic and engaged. They asked many questions during this lesson. Once the teacher was done being 'the waitress,' she gave students in the class a chance to take their peers' orders.

Another teacher had an equally rich teaching environment. The teacher took the time to help a student say the word 'bud.' She drew a picture of a flower on the board. The teacher put together a brace map on the flower for the students and let them come up with a title. She went into detail explaining things and had the students give a lot of feedback. In her lesson, she covered idioms that related to the subject even though they were not a part of the lesson. In doing this, the teacher took advantage of a "teachable moment." The teacher also took the time to connect the lesson to things the students had learned earlier. Even though the teacher was supposed to be doing the enhanced lesson, she gave the students the freedom to ask questions about plants and trees. This was obviously not a part of the lesson, but she took the time to answer them anyway.

While the teachers made many different choices in how they decided to teach their classes, each managed to help their students succeed on the standardized testing, using varied techniques that often had little to do with *Into English!*. What they all seemed to have in common

was that they did what they believed best worked for their students. They adapted lessons as they saw fit and were not overly mindful of the pacing plan. In summary, they each provided high quality pedagogy to their students.

Chapter 2:

Discussion and Recommendations with Action Steps

Our one-year evaluation suggests that implementation of the ELD program has had a positive effect on student performance in English language arts. In fact, students in implementing classes performed significantly better than their peers in classes with no implementation. Thus, the District must make a greater effort to ensure that the ELD program is being implemented and that teachers have the necessary support to do so. Local District superintendents and directors of

school services should plan for professional development of school administrators and monitor the capacity of schools to implement and support the ELD program. They should ensure that all schools have trained principals, assistant principals, staff, and teachers. Then, principals and assistant principals in partnership with school site leadership bodies should: develop detailed plans for the implementation of the ELD program, provide the necessary support, and closely monitor program implementation in each classroom with English learners. Administrators must pay regular visits to the classrooms, observe instructional practices, and provide directions when necessary to ensure implementation. In order to be able to do this, principals and assistant principals should take responsibility for personal development and training in ELD programs and practices, as well as the professional development of school staff and teachers.

Furthermore, our findings revealed that students at ELD levels 4 and 5 are significantly outperforming their classmates at lower ELD levels. The ELD strategies being utilized by teachers primarily target high level ELD students. Therefore, we recommend re-visiting professional development design, curriculum, and the way the program is implemented for practices that target ELD levels 1, 2 and 3. More emphasis should be given to differentiation practices since many of our classes contain more than two consecutive ELD levels per class. The Language Acquisition Branch should find ways to strengthen the professional development design, curriculum, and the way the program is implemented in order to address the needs of students at lower ELD levels.

Through the course of this study, we observed many classes that contained all five ELD levels. Schools need to make a greater effort to ensure that there are no more than two consecutive levels per class, as per District policy. Principals, local district superintendents and directors of school services should take a lead in creating conditions to enable and enforce this policy.

The Local Districts in partnership with the Language Acquisition Branch should continue providing professional development opportunities for teachers and administrators. Teachers found the Practicum's demonstration lessons to be the most beneficial by far and requested additional follow-up training sessions of this nature. We strongly recommend that the Language Acquisition Branch provide additional training in core differentiation practices. For those teachers who have completed the Practicum, differentiation training should be provided as

mandatory follow-up training. Moving forward, the Practicum itself should be augmented to provide training in core differentiation practices.

Since we found that success is not just a function of program implementation, but also of ability of teachers to respond to the needs of students, we recommend that additional steps be made to incorporate high quality teaching strategies across all core content professional developments in our District; including the ELD Practicum. Implementation of such initiatives should be coordinated between the Division of Professional Learning, Development, and Leadership, and the Language Acquisition Branch.

Appendix A: Program background

Into English! is an ELD curriculum that helps English learners acquire English. It is connected to grade-level content with strategies that include students of all levels. Multilevel differentiation addresses the needs of students at the following CELDT levels: (1) *Beginning*-students performing at this level of English language proficiency may demonstrate little or no receptive or productive English skills. They may be able to respond to some communication tasks; (2) *Early intermediate*-students performing at this level of English language proficiency start to respond with increasing ease to more varied communication tasks; (3) *Intermediate*-students performing at this level of English language proficiency begin to tailor the English language skills they have been taught to meet their immediate communication and learning needs; (4) *Early Advanced*-students performing at this level of English language proficiency begin to combine the elements of the English language in complex, cognitively demanding situations and are able to use English as a means for learning in other academic areas; (5) *Advanced*-students performing at this level of English language proficiency communicate effectively with various audiences on a wide range of familiar and new topics to meet social and academic demands. In order to attain the English proficiency level of their native English-speaking peers, further linguistic enhancement and refinement are necessary.

The enhanced *Into English!* Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) lessons provide explicit instruction in ELD by using the TBLT lesson sequence, by incorporating various direct and indirect language learning strategies, and by modeling appropriate language structures. Students are also given many opportunities to practice the target language. About half of the lessons from the original *Into English!* are enhanced. In the enhanced lessons, additional ELD standards are added to the ELD standards already addressed in original lessons. The instruction in the enhanced version is founded on the research-based TBLT theory and practice (Wills, 1996; Skehan, 1998; Feez, 1998). The enhanced *Into English!* TBLT lessons require additional days and rigor in teaching Part A (the language builder section), Part B (the language through literature section), and Part C (the language through content section).

Although some lessons have been enhanced, the major arguments in support of the original curriculum remain the same. *Into English!* was designed by Josefina Villamil Tinajero and Alfredo Schifini. Tinajero stated that children need a safe and nurturing environment where they can participate in non-threatening experiences in the new language until they are ready to express themselves. *Into English!* provided those experiences through the use of multilevel strategies, illustrated posters, and a variety of multisensory strategies for making language comprehensible. Schifini argued that English learners move quickly through the beginning stages of language acquisition and that the natural approach will help facilitate that process. He believed that the

major challenge in teaching English is to provide opportunities that move students from early intermediate levels to native-like fluency in academic language. To meet that challenge, he argued that educators must shift their focus from language learning per se to learning grade-level content along with language. In meeting this challenge, second-language learners also need specialized materials and teaching strategies such as large visuals with graphic organizers, essential to making content comprehensible. Literature is necessary for rich context, but not just any literature will work. Books must be accessible through the kinds of pictures or print that benefit students at all proficiency levels. Finally, Schifini argued that instructional strategies must include contextual support, interaction, hands-on manipulatives, and multilevel options for participation at all proficiency levels.

The enhanced version builds on the original arguments put forth by the authors of the *Into English!*,¹ while incorporating the TBLT lessons into its design. TBLT “refers to an approach based on the use of tasks as the core unit of planning and instruction in language teaching” (Richards & Rogers, 2001). This language teaching approach is a logical next step to the Communicative Language Teaching approach upon which *Into English!* is based. TBLT draws on several of these principles. For example, “Activities that involve real communication are essential for language learning. Activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning. Language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process” (Richards & Rogers, 2001). Although, both approaches share the general assumptions about the nature of language learning, TBLT has some additional learning principles that play a central role. These are: (1) Tasks provide both the input and output processing necessary for language acquisition, (2) Task activity and achievement are motivational, and (3) Learning difficulty can be negotiated and fine-tuned for particular pedagogical purposes (Richards & Rogers, 2001). TBLT key assumptions are:

1. The focus is on the process rather than the product.
2. Basic elements are purposeful activities and tasks that emphasize communication and meaning.
3. Learners learn language by interacting communicatively and purposefully while engaged in the activities and tasks.
4. Activities and tasks can be either those that learners might need to achieve in real life, or those that have pedagogical purpose specific to the classroom.
5. Activities and tasks of a task-based syllabus are sequenced according to difficulty.
6. The difficulty of a task depends on a range of factors including the previous experience of the learner, the complexity of the task, the language required to undertake the task, and the degree of support available (Feez, 1998).

ELD Practicum: Training Program for Teachers

¹Joseffina Villamil Tinajeri and Alfredo Schifini. (1997). *Into English!*. Hampton Brown.

The ELD Practicum for teachers has three major components: (1) Seminars, (2) Practicum, and (3) Peer Coaching. The first component is composed of a three day teacher training session, which consists of six 90 minute seminars followed by observations of enhanced *Into English!* TBLT demonstration lessons conducted by the school ELD trainers.

Upon completion of the initial three day training session, teachers are expected to teach 30 lessons as the part of the Practicum. During that time, they need to teach the ELD curriculum, Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) lessons, and assess ELs by using the *Into English!* Student Progress Form (SPF) and ELD standards. The Practicum includes peer coaching, which is considered to be a powerful component. Peer coaching involves reflection on one's own teaching practices (Costa, A. L. & Garmston, R. J., 1994). During this time, teachers learn to use non-evaluative peer coaching protocols, including at least one round of scripted peer coaching practice. Evered and Selman (1989) assert that coaching should be a non-judgmental process built around a planning conference, a lesson observation, and a post-conference. During the pre-conference exercise, the coach goes through the following questions with the teacher: (1) Tell me what you want to accomplish today (Standards/Objectives). (2) Tell me about the sequence of your lesson (Sequence of the Lesson). (3) What approaches and strategies are you going to use? (4) How will you know if you were successful (Assessment)? (5) What data would you like me to collect? (6) Where would you like me to observe the lesson? The coach remains neutral and avoids giving positive or negative feedback or comments. "To coach means to convey a valued colleague from where he or she is to where he or she wants to be."² During the lesson, the coach gathers data as requested by teacher. After the lesson, the coach meets with the teacher again to go through the next set of questions: (1) Tell me what you thought of the lesson. Did you accomplish your objectives? (2) Did the lesson unfold as you planned? Tell me what happened as planned and what changed. (3) What did you find out about specific students? (4) Would you like me to share the data with you? (5) Tell me how you plan to use the data. (6) If you were to do this lesson again, what would you change? (7) What did you think of the coaching process? Again, the coach avoids giving positive or negative feedback or comments.

Appendix B: Key Terms

²Evered, R., and Selman, J. (Autumn 1989) Coaching and the art of management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 116-32.

TBLT is a core feature of the enhanced *Into English!* TBLT lesson implementation. It refers to an approach based on the use of tasks as the core unit of planning and instruction in language teaching (Richards & Rogers, 2001; Celce-Murcia, M., Ed., 2001) and is incorporated in the design of enhanced *Into English!* TBLT lessons. The TBLT lesson sequence is expected to have the following components:

(1) **Introduction.** The teacher sets the tone for the lesson by making a personal connection with the students, conveying standards of behavior and announcing the lesson objectives. The teacher communicates the standards of behavior by using the *Standards of Behavior Poster*. Using standards of behavior is expected to help students control and coordinate their own learning. The goal is to increase the amount of time spent on paying attention to academic learning by decreasing discipline issues throughout the instructional day;

(2) **Input.** Input begins with an assessment of the students' prior knowledge. The students' sharing of what they already know serves as initial input for one another. This information in turn helps the teacher differentiate his or her plans. The teacher ensures comprehension by explaining and/or modeling the lesson content, strategy, language structure, or procedure. He or she makes the content comprehensible by using realia, pictures, Thinking Maps®, audio and video media, clear, descriptive language, appropriate intonation, phrasing, stress, and nonverbal gesture and movements;

(3) **Focus.** The teacher narrows the input to teach the most critical standards and objectives. The students practice meaningful tasks and are provided with guided opportunities to manipulate objects and materials. The teacher provides immediate feedback on the students' performance;

(4) **Transfer.** Students put their new knowledge to active use in a more communicative way. They transfer their learning from one skill area to another skill area (e.g., from listening and speaking to reading and writing or vice versa). They connect what they are learning to a past experience or to what they know. What is important about transfer is that it is accomplished through meaningful interaction and communication;

(5) **Evaluation.** Students self-reflect on their learning and evaluate their accomplishment of the lesson objectives. The teacher evaluates the students' accomplishment of the objectives;

(6) **Extension.** Students practice the lesson content in a setting outside of the classroom and prepare to share the results of the practice at the beginning of the next lesson.

Research based ELD strategies, which provide multi-level differentiated instruction during the ELD block, are considered to be essential in teaching English learners. These strategies practiced during the ELD Practicum training include:

(1) **Backward Buildup.** Backward Buildup is a cognitive strategy that involves learner practice of L2 sentences by rebuilding and repeating words and phrases from the back to the front of the sentence. Backward buildup is particularly useful for practicing long or expanded sentences, such as the lines of the poems and chants from *Into English!* Part A (Prator, 1979; Ellis, 2003).

(2) **Corrective recasting.** Corrective recasting is a metacognitive strategy that involves reformulating ill-formed utterance(s) while preserving the learner’s intended meaning. The reformulation is called a recast. Teachers are encouraged to use simple recasting throughout the day (reformulating without correcting), and corrective recasting only during the ELD Block (Oliver, 1995; Ortega & Long, 1997; Richardson, 1995; Schmidt, 1992; Ellis, 1994; Swain & Lapkin, 1995).

(3) **RASP.** RASP (Read by All, by Some, and by One Person) is a cognitive strategy which involves structured multiple repetition of an action, phrase, or sentence. To be effective, RASP must include meaningful understanding of what is being practiced. RASP also provides opportunities to practice the “suprasegmental” elements of language—stress, phrasing, and innovations. It is particularly effective with ELD 1 and 2 students (Teisinger, 1998; Asher, 1977; Ellis, 2003).

(4) **Think-Pair-Share.** Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is a strategy that guides students to perform a communicative task by talking, sharing, and negotiating meaning while performing the task. To be effective, students must be taught how to perform TPS. This strategy is considered to be one of the most important strategies in teaching ELD students (Oxford, 1990).

(5) **Pull Out and Talk/Write.** Pull Out and Talk/Write is a strategy that guides students to engage in extended oral discourse by using two scaffolds: a Communication Guide, and a Thinking Map®. Pull Out and Talk/Write is considered to be the most powerful of the ELD strategies because it combines not only the three categories of metacognitive strategies, but also all other direct and indirect strategies (memory, cognitive, affective, social, and compensatory). Pull Out and Talk/Write strategy always goes with the TPS strategy (Ellis, 2003; Lee, 2000; Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001).

(6) **Vocalized Reading Text.** Vocalized Reading is a read aloud strategy. It is a form of RASP. The teacher models reading one or more lines of text using appropriate stress, rhythm, phrasing, and intonation. Multiple vocalized readings provide the students with listening and vocalized opportunities in whole group and small group settings before they read aloud individually (Avery & Erlich, 2001).

(7) **Ballparking.** Ballparking is used to identify students’ approximate current ELD level for speaking and writing.

(8) **Thinking Maps®.** Thinking Maps® are defined as eight visual tools, each connected to a specific thinking process designed to provide both comprehensible input and organization of new information.

Appendix C: Methodology

Sample

At the outset of the study, a multi-stage stratified sampling procedure was used to identify classrooms for participation in the first wave of data collection. The elementary school sample was drawn from the regular elementary school population with the percentage of English learners at the school level greater than 30% (schools with a percentage of English learners smaller than 30% typically have very small number of English learners in the class). A sampling frame was created by using the School Characteristic Index (SCI) status (high, medium or low) for stratification variables. A sample of 25 schools was then identified within the sampling frame using a systematic probabilities proportional to size (PPS) technique. At the second stage of selection, two classrooms per grade (grades 3 and 4) totaling 100 classrooms were randomly selected from among the English learner classrooms listed on official records for each sample school.

Data Collection

The principal research approach in this study was observational, as suggested by August and Hakuta (1998). Data collection was carried out in the classroom by professional experts (graduate students and other professionals trained in observational methods). Classroom visits were conducted over two days, one day during first semester and one day during second semester. If an ELD block was observed during the first visit per semester, an additional two days of observations were conducted during that period. Descriptive data obtained from fieldnotes and open-ended interviews with teachers and administrators was coupled with quantifiable data taken from observation instruments and student records to address the research questions. The activities and instruments utilized in the observation include:

- Fieldnotes
- 30-minute Timeline of Classroom Interaction Structures
- Observation Summary Statement
- Observation Summary Scale
- Teacher Interviews
- Principal (or Assistant Principal) Interview

Fieldnotes: Fieldnotes are a written narrative which describe the classroom activities, and the interactions between students and the teacher. Fieldnotes capture as much dialogue as possible. Classroom observers become the “eyes and ears” of the project and their notes describe the overall context in which ELD instruction takes place, including details about the ELD lessons being taught and manner of instruction. After the observations are completed, observers translate their raw notes into the typed narrative utilized in analysis.

Timeline of classroom interaction structures. The purpose of this instrument is to document the student language mode, instructional path, ELD materials and assessments used, language of instruction and support, student language, and grouping occurring during the 30 minutes of ELD instruction. Observers document the time at which they begin using the form and, in one-minute increments, note the following:

- Whether the student language mode is listening, speaking, reading, or writing
- Whether the ELD strategies being used are backward buildup, corrective recasting, RASP, think-pair-share, pull out and talk/write, vocalized reading, or other
- Whether any of the following ELD materials are used: TBLT posters, lesson posters, objectives, standards, Thinking Maps®, or no ELD program materials
- Whether the ELD assessment tools (SPF or Ballparking) are used
- Whether language of instruction and support is English, or primary language (L1)
- Whether student language is English, or primary language (L1)
- Whether grouping is whole/large group, small group, one-on-one, pairs, or solo/individual

Observer’s summary statement. At the end of each observation period, observers write a summary statement. This statement provided details about pedagogy and specified which enhanced *Into English!* TBLT lessons were taught and how they were implemented. Observers also noted the activities occurring in the classroom such as dominant teaching strategies used to achieve objectives, L1 support, students’ oral production in L1, evidence of grouping, and use of core materials, books and ELD assessment tools. At the end of the summary, the observer provides his/her conclusion about whether or not enhanced *Into English!* TBLT lessons were implemented, and whether Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and appropriate strategies were used as designed.

Observation summary scale. At the end of each observation period, observers also complete an Observation Summary Scale. The scale contains four predefined choices (none, few, some and extensive¹) that indicate the extent to which the following instructional practices were observed during the time observers were on site:

- Cooperative/collaborative learning
- Whole group instruction
- Small group learning activities
- Individual work

¹“None” applies to when no instances are observed. “Few” applies to when one or more instances are observed. “Some” applies to when several instances are observed, that is, when the instructional practice is in active use by the teacher. “Extensive” applies to when the instructional practice is frequently observed.

- Prior knowledge
- Primary language support
- Use of Backward Buildup strategy
- Use of Corrective Recasting strategy
- Use of RASP strategy
- Use of Think-Pair-Share strategy
- Use of Pull Out and Talk/Write strategy
- Use of Vocalized Reading Text strategy
- Use of Thinking Maps®
- Use of Ballparking
- Use of Student Progress Forms (SPF)
- ELD strategy - Audio
- ELD strategy - Chant
- ELD strategy - Choral Reading
- ELD strategy - Collaborative Reading
- ELD strategy - Echo Reading
- ELD strategy - Games
- ELD strategy - TPR
- ELD strategy - Graphs/charts
- ELD strategy - Realia
- ELD strategy - Think-Pair- Share
- ELD strategy - Visual/Illustrations
- ELD strategy - Demonstrating
- Student engagement
- Oral speech production opportunities
- Oral reading opportunities
- Writing/composition

Teacher and Administrator interviews. In addition to the observations, observers conduct short interviews with each sample teacher and principal (or assistant principal) visited. These interviews provided information on educator attitudes about the *Enhanced Into English! TBLT* lessons, details about how the ELD program was structured, the use of assessment, and professional development and support.

Data Analysis

The qualitative data reduction and analysis for the ELD Program evaluation consisted of the writing of fieldnotes and observation summaries, and the application of a coding scheme (in accordance with District guidelines for students in English learner programs). Atlas.ti, a qualitative data management program, was used to code, determine patterns, and make multi-site comparisons. The fieldnotes from classroom observations were grouped according to the following attributes: grade level, cohort (date when teachers completed ELD Practicum training), and teacher background characteristics such as authorization and years of teaching experience.

The data from the coded fieldnotes and instruments (Timeline of Classroom Interaction Structures and Observation Summary Scale) were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics, frequencies, crosstabs, and analysis of effect sizes were employed as analytic techniques in this study.

Whenever applicable, standardized adjusted gain scores were computed for English learners who tested two consecutive years on the California Standards Tests (CST) in English Language Arts. In order to compare standardized adjusted gain scores for different groups, group to group effect sizes were computed. An effect size difference greater than .20 standard deviations is generally considered to be educationally significant (Cohen, 1988).

Summary statements written by observers were used to determine whether or not the ELD program was implemented. In order to achieve program implementation status, teachers were expected to meet the following criteria:

- *Number of lessons taught:* At least two or three lessons were taught during the three days of observations.
- *Number of objectives met:* For teachers who taught two lessons, almost all of the objectives were met. For teachers who taught three lessons, some or all of the objectives were met.
- *Materials used:* In some classes, ELD program materials were *used* extensively and as directed by the curriculum/lesson design. In other classes, most ELD program materials were used, but not all that were stipulated by the curriculum.
- *ELD strategies used:* If enhanced ELD lessons were being taught, then at least one enhanced TBLT Strategy was used and as directed by the curriculum. If *Into English!* was being taught, then at least one of the ELD strategies was used.
- *Students on task (engagement):* Students were mostly engaged in ELD activities throughout the block of class time.
- *Time spent on ELD:* The average class time spent on ELD in implementing classes was expected to be between 30 minutes (Track 1 and 4) and 45 minutes (Track 3).

Classes that received a “not implemented” or synonymously “no implementation” rating did so because they were determined to be implementing the ELD program at a very low level or not at all. These classes may have contained one or more of the following criteria:

- No lesson or only one lesson was taught during the three days of observation.
- Few, if any, lesson objectives were met.
- Few or no ELD Program materials were used.
- Few or no ELD Enhanced TBLT or other ELD strategies were used.
- Students were not engaged in learning activities.

Finally, we looked at the relationship between implementation of the ELD program and student performance. It was expected that the ELD Practicum would help teachers fully implement the ELD Program and consequently help students improve their learning and performance on achievement tests. Our hypothesis was that implementation of the ELD program as designed will be associated with improved academic and language performance among EL students. We used the California Standards Test (CST) performance scores and California English Language Development Test (CELDT) reading performance scores to measure student progress in English Language Arts (ELA) and language acquisition. We used CELDT reading performances scores due to the fact that the highest correlation exists between CST ELA scores and CELDT reading scores (compared to the correlation between CST ELA scores and other CELDT scores). Standardized adjusted gain scores were employed to control for initial language differences for English learners, as measured by the CST in ELA.

Appendix D: Demographic Overview

The Year 1 sample consisted of 100 classrooms including: 50 third grade and 48 fourth grade classrooms, plus one mixed fourth and fifth grade classroom, and one fifth grade classroom (Exhibit A).

Exhibit A
Classrooms observed

	# of classrooms
3 rd grade classrooms	50
4 th grade classrooms	48
Mixed grade classroom (4 th and 5 th)	1
5 th grade classroom	1
Total classrooms observed	100

The next chart focuses on the authorization of the sample group, as reported by teachers during their interview. Teachers who teach English learners are expected to meet California's State minimum requirements of authorization for teaching ELD or ESL. For the purpose of this study, sample teachers satisfied these requirements if they had a CLAD,¹ BCLAD,² or other State of California recognized authorizations. In Year 1, we found that 96% of teachers in our sample did indeed have authorization from the State of California to teach ELD classes. Only one teacher reported not having an authorization and three teachers did not provide any information about their authorization. Exhibit B shows the specific type of authorization held by the teachers in our sample.

¹Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development.

²Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development.

Exhibit B**Teacher authorization**

Teacher Authorization	#	Percentage
BCLAD/BCC	34	34%
CLAD	60	60%
Other (SB 1969 & SB 395)	2	2%
No authorization	1	1%
No info	3	3%
Total	100	100%

In Year 1 we found that our sample teachers had an average of 11 years of teaching experience with a minimum of 2 years and a maximum of 41 years. Exhibit C shows the years of teaching experience in our sample. Just over half of the teachers have between 4 and 10 years of teaching experience, while 39% have 11 or more years of teaching experience, and 8% have 3 years or less.

Exhibit C**Teacher experience**

Teacher Experience	# of teachers	Percentage
0-3 years	8	8%
4-10 years	51	53%
11 or more years	38	39%
Total # of teachers with data on experience	97	100%

Appendix E: Examples of the use of supplemental materials

One teacher who used realia to supplement the program said, “I like bringing in realia whenever possible for the same reason. Last time, I brought my grandmother’s housecoat. I was teaching a lesson on culture.” A teacher who uses visuals to supplement the program told us that for the seasons, she brought in various pictures representing different seasons. She said that she usually brings in pictures from home for lessons that do not provide them. Another teacher explained why he used additional books/literature: “I did get additional books from the library for the Moon lessons because there wasn’t much information on the moon for students to complete the final writing tasks.” One teacher who supplemented lessons told us, “I use books from the library, my own books, and the internet for concrete examples and greater understanding.”

One teacher who uses *Open Court* to supplement the program said, “More often, I use *Into English!* as an introduction to something else. We talk about what the students want to know about and I sometimes use OCR and science to support ELD too.” A teacher using science books and aids to supplement the program told us, “I connect material from *Open Court*, science and social studies. For example, when they did the moon, we brought in the solar system. I look at what units from other subjects go together.” Another teacher elaborated, “I get books from the library, and I actually read it to them. If it [ELD lessons] relates to science or social studies, I connect them to science and social studies.” A teacher using supplemental grammar aids explained, “We have *English at Your Command*, I think that’s it. It has a lot of vocabulary in there that I like to use along with the ELD lessons and also other subject lessons.” One teacher who mentioned using music to supplement the program told us, “We use jazz chants, activities, and songs where the kids can talk.” The use of magazines/newspapers as supplements is described in following quote:

I use realia, National Geographic magazines, samples of Highlights, newspapers, other children’s magazines from when my children subscribed to them, museum booklets, like for that day’s OCR Braille lesson, and just other supplemental things. I found some “missions things” for our missions projects. I use these things to reinforce. I like what they (the program) have, but I like to bring in new things. I want to encourage them to look at things, bring in newspapers with clips about something we’re studying.

A teacher who used videos or movies as a supplement said, “I might use videos or images I download to give them a more in depth perspective.” A teacher using worksheets to supplement the program stated, “Sometimes I find stuff on the Internet like reading comprehension worksheets and stories.” The teacher who used another ELD program to supplement *Into English!* told us, “Sometimes I use *Open Court*, or re-teach from the old ELD booklet.”

Appendix F: A closer look at implementation

By ELD Lesson Type: During both semesters, the vast majority of teachers teaching the enhanced ELD lessons were implementing the program. Upon closer analysis of the enhanced lessons observed, we found that the majority of teachers using the enhanced lessons taught at least three lessons, met almost all of the lesson objectives, and employed the prescribed strategies in doing so. During the first semester, 86% of the enhanced ELD lessons observed were implemented successfully, while 14% of the enhanced ELD lessons observed were not implemented. During the second semester, 94% of the enhanced ELD lessons observed were implemented, while 6% were not. This means that teachers had increased success in achieving implementation of enhanced ELD classes from first to second semester. In the first semester, 81% of teachers observed teaching regular *IE!* implemented their lessons, while 19% did not. In the second semester, teachers observed teaching regular *IE!* seemed to struggle with implementation, as only 57% implemented the lessons, while 43% did not. Teachers observed teaching both regular and enhanced lessons increased from 81% to 100% implementation from first to second semester. Exhibits A and B below display the implementation results for all lesson types.

Exhibit A
Implementation level by ELD lessons observed, Semester 1

ELD Program	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	N	%	N	%
Enhanced	37	86%	6	14%
Regular	21	81%	5	19%
Enhanced & Regular	9	82%	2	18%
Special Cases	13	81%	3	19%
No ELD Program	0	0%	4	100%
Total	80	80%	20	20%

Exhibit B**Implementation level by ELD lessons observed, Semester 2**

ELD Program	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	N	%	N	%
Enhanced	48	94%	3	6%
Regular	8	57%	6	43%
Enhanced & Regular	11	100%	0	0%
Special Cases	10	53%	9	47%
No ELD Program	0	0%	5	100%
Total	77	77%	23	23%

By by Grade Level: When we examined implementation by grade level over the two semesters, we found that implementation decreased from first to second in the 3rd grade, while it increased in the 4th grade. The number of classes implementing the program dropped from 43 to 37 in the 3rd grade, while the number of classes implementing the program increased from 37 to 40 in the 4th grade. Exhibits C and D display these results.

Exhibit C**3rd grade implementation**

Semester	Implemented	Not Implemented	Totals
First	43	7	50
Second	37	13	50

Exhibit D**4th grade implementation**

Semester	Implemented	Not Implemented	Totals
First	37	13	50
Second	40	10	50

All third grade teachers had been through the ELD training by fall observations, and had had some experience using the TBLT strategies to implement the new program. Thus, we were surprised by the dip in implementation among third grade teachers from fall to spring semester, that is, from first to second semester.

Teacher Attitude and Implementation Level

We gauged teachers' attitudes toward the program from their interviews. We found that their opinions about the overall strength of the program fit into the categories of positive, neutral, or negative. Teachers who expressed a positive attitude about the program felt that TBLT strategies met their students' needs. Teachers with a neutral viewpoint felt the program had strengths and weaknesses. They felt that the strategies were mostly beneficial, but the program took too much time to implement. Teachers who had negative sentiments about the program did so because of the time involved to prepare and implement the lessons or because they felt that the strategies and program content were not beneficial to their students.

Teachers' attitudes about the program did seem to have some impact on implementation. Teachers with a positive outlook toward the program were most likely to implement the program. In fact, 92% of teachers with a positive attitude about the program successfully implemented it, while only 79% of teachers with a neutral attitude toward the program implemented it. Just under half (47%) of the teachers with a negative outlook toward the program successfully implemented it, while 53% did not. The results from 96 interviews are tabulated in Exhibit E.

Exhibit E
ELD implementation by teacher attitude, Semester 2

Attitude	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	N	%	N	%
Positive	36	92%	3	8%
Neutral	30	79%	8	21%
Negative	9	47%	10	53%

Appendix G: Explaining low or no implementation

Exhibit A
Specific factors contributing to very low or no implementation, Semester 2

Only one lesson taught over 3 days	5
No ELD Program materials were used	4
Teacher cited timing issues	4
No ELD instruction of any kind was observed	2
Grade level or student population issues	2
Other	6

In five classrooms, the main reason for not achieving implementation was that only one lesson was attempted over the course of the observation period. Notably, all but one of these teachers had been through TBLT training. In four classes, no ELD program materials or strategies were used, even though these teachers claimed to have created their own lessons for the purpose of teaching ELD. In another four classes, teachers did not teach ELD during the observation period, but during interviews, cited timing issues as the reason. In one class, the teacher said she was preparing for Open House, in another class, the teacher was preparing for parent-teacher conferences. In the two remaining classes, teachers were catching up on other work before the close of the year. A few of these teachers also expressed that enhanced lessons required “too much work.”

In two classes, no ELD instruction of any kind was observed. One teacher had not been trained and stated that he rarely taught ELD lessons. The other teacher simply told us she was not planning to teach ELD for the last two months of the year. Both teachers are at the same school site; a site that has little administrative support for the program.

Two classes that we observed were fourth and fifth grade split classrooms with students at the lowest ELD levels. ELD was simply not being implemented in these classes.

In six classes, reasons for very low or no implementation were unique to all other specific factors stated above. In all cases, some ELD program materials were used (regular and/or TBLT), and a part or one or more lessons were taught. But the teachers failed to cover enough lesson objectives to meet implementation criteria.

Appendix H: CST outcomes

The following Exhibit shows the change in CST ELA performance levels for third graders measured from 2006 to 2007.

Exhibit A
3rd grade CST ELA performance levels for 2006 and 2007

ELA performance level 2006	ELA performance level 2007							
	Far Below Basic		Below Basic		Basic and higher		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Far Below Basic	56%	73	36%	46	8%	10	100%	129
Below Basic	20%	35	52%	92	28%	49	100%	176
Basic and higher	6%	11	30%	60	65%	129	100%	200
Total	24%	119	39%	198	37%	188	100%	505

Overall, 37% of third graders are performing at the basic level or higher, while 63% (39% + 24%) are performing at below or far below basic levels. For those students performing at the far below basic level in 2006, 44% (36% + 8%) progressed one level or more in 2007. For those students at the below basic level, about 28% progressed to the basic level or higher, while 20% regressed to far below basic. Thirty-six percent (30% + 6%) of students performing at the basic level or higher in 2006 dropped to below basic or lower in 2007.

Exhibit B shows the change in CST ELA performance levels for 4th graders measured from 2006 to 2007.

Exhibit B
4th grade changes in CST ELA performance levels for classrooms

ELA performance level 2006	ELA performance level 2007							
	Far Below Basic		Below Basic		Basic or higher		Total	
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N
Far Below Basic	39%	76	42%	83	19%	37	100%	196
Below Basic	8%	20	31%	74	60%	143	100%	237
Basic or higher	2%	4	10%	20	88%	170	100%	194
Total	16%	100	28%	177	56%	350	100%	627

A little over half of the fourth grade population (56%) performed at the basic level or higher. Just over 60% (42% + 19%) of students performing at the far below basic level progressed one level or more from 2006 to 2007. The same was true for those students performing at the below basic level in 2006, that is, 60% progressed by one level to basic or higher in 2007.

Appendix I: CST outcomes across ELD levels and program implementation

Exhibit A shows the population of students at each ELD level. Overall, the student body in our sample is dominated by ELD levels 3 and 4, which comprise 65% of the population. The lowest level students (ELD level 1) make up only 5% of the student population.

Exhibit A
Overall ELD levels (3rd and 4th grade)

ELD Level	PERCENTAGE	N
ELD 1	5%	64
ELD 2	16%	211
ELD 3	34%	434
ELD 4	31%	395
ELD 5	14%	182
Total	100%	1286

The distribution of students by grade, ELD level and implementation is provided in the Exhibits below. These exhibits reveal that implementing classrooms and not implementing classrooms had similar distribution of students by ELD level.

Exhibit B
3rd grade ELD level by implementation (547 students)

ELD Level	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	%	N	%	N
ELD 1	5%	21	9%	11
ELD 2	20%	84	14%	18
ELD 3	38%	158	45%	57
ELD 4	30%	124	26%	33
ELD 5	8%	33	6%	8
Total	100%	420	100%	12

Exhibit C
4th grade ELD level by implementation (702 students)

ELD Level	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	%	N	%	N
ELD 1	3%	16	9%	13
ELD 2	14%	81	16%	23
ELD 3	29%	162	31%	44
ELD 4	34%	190	27%	38
ELD 5	20%	113	16%	22
Total	100%	562	100%	140

The following Exhibit shows the overall student performance in ELA for various ELD levels and implementation levels.

Exhibit D
Overall student performance in ELA by ELD Level and implementation (Adjusted Standardized Gains)

ELD Level	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	Gain	N	Gain	N
ELD 1 & 2	-.31	149	-.44	47
ELD 3	-.08	299	-.48	100
ELD 4 & 5	.09	452	-.16	103

According to overall student performance in ELA, students in implementing classes outperformed students in non-implementing classes at all ELD levels. Thus, the implementation of the ELD program is a benefit to all students. However, the best performance was exhibited by students at ELD levels 4 and 5, followed by students at ELD level 3. Students at ELD levels 1 and 2 turned in the weakest performance.

The data above was used to calculate the following effect sizes between ELD levels (see Exhibit below).

Exhibit E**Effect sizes (ELD level by implementation)**

ELD Level	Implemented	Not Implemented
4 & 5 vs. 1 & 2	.40	.28
3 vs. 1 & 2	.23	-.04
4 & 5 vs. 3	.17	.32

Exhibit E affirms what we learned from the previous table, which is that students at higher ELD levels outperformed students at lower ELD levels with one exception. Students at ELD level 3 did not outperform their classmates at levels 1 and 2 in non-implementing classes (ES = -.04).

In the following exhibits, we examine student performance at various ELD levels as well as make effect size comparisons between ELD groups for the third grade.

Exhibit F**3rd grade student performance in ELA by ELD level and implementation (Adjusted Standardized Gains)**

ELD Level	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	Gain	N	Gain	N
ELD 1 & 2	-.28	84	-.45	23
ELD 3	.10	146	-.44	56
ELD 4 & 5	.07	149	-.08	39

Exhibit G shows the effect sizes for various ELD groups for the third grade. The results show that students in implementing classes are significantly outperforming students in non-implementing classes at all ELD levels. The best performance was exhibited by students at ELD levels 3, 4 and 5. Students at ELD levels 1 and 2 turned in the weakest performance. Students at ELD level 3 did not outperform their classmates at levels 1 and 2 in non-implementing classes (ES = .01).

Exhibit G**3rd grade effect sizes (ELD level by implementation)**

ELD Level	Implemented	Not Implemented
4 & 5 vs. 1 & 2	.35	.37
3 vs. 1 & 2	.38	.01
4 & 5 vs. 3	-.03	.36

Exhibits H and I examine student performance and make effect size comparisons for various ELD groups in the fourth grade.

Exhibit H
4th grade student performance in ELA by ELD level and implementation (Adjusted Standardized Gains)

ELD Level	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	Gain	N	Gain	N
ELD 1 & 2	-.36	65	-.35	19
ELD 3	-.22	147	-.60	39
ELD 4 & 5	.08	293	-.18	60

In fourth grade, we found that student performance was strongest for students at ELD levels 4 and 5 in implementing classes. For ELD levels 3, 4 and 5, student scores were significantly better in implementing classes than in non-implementing classes.

Exhibit I shows that students in the fourth grade at ELD levels 4 and 5 significantly outperformed students at ELD levels 1 and 2. Interestingly, fourth graders at ELD levels 4 and 5 also significantly outperformed their classmates at ELD level 3. This was not the case in third grade where ELD 3 students performed as well as ELD 4 and 5 students in implementing classes. Thus, in the fourth grade, students at ELD levels 1, 2 and 3 had the weakest performance.

Exhibit I
4th grade effect size (ELD level by implementation)

ELD Level	Implemented	Not Implemented
4 & 5 vs. 1 & 2	.44	.17
3 vs. 1 & 2	.14	-.25
4 & 5 vs. 3	.30	.42

Exhibits J and K examine third grade performance based on CELDT reading scores. The CELDT reading scores confirm what we learned from the CST ELA scores. All students performed better in implementing classes than in non-implementing classes. In the third grade, students at ELD levels 4 and 5 performed best in implementing classes, followed by students at ELD level 3. Students at ELD levels 1 and 2 had the weakest performance. In fact, the effect sizes in Exhibit

K confirm that ELD 4 and 5 students significantly outperformed ELD 1 and 2 students and ELD 3 students, and ELD 3 students significantly outperformed ELD 1 and 2 students.

Exhibit J
3rd grade student performance: CELDT reading by ELD level and implementation (Adjusted Standardized Gains)

ELD Level	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	Gain	N	Gain	N
ELD 1 & 2	-.27	84	-.48	24
ELD 3	.00	139	-.14	51
ELD 4 & 5	.25	138	-.06	37

Exhibit K
3rd grade effect sizes (ELD level by implementation)

ELD Level	Implemented	Not Implemented
4 & 5 vs. 1 & 2	.52	.42
3 vs. 1 & 2	.27	.34
4 & 5 vs. 3	.25	.08

In the fourth grade, CELDT reading scores also reveal that all fourth graders in implementing classes performed better than in non-implementing classes. ELD 1 and 2 students had the weakest student performance while ELD 4 and 5 students had the best student performance. Although the scores for ELD levels 1 and 2 were low, they were significantly better in implementing classes than in non-implementing classes. Unlike the CST ELA scores, ELD 3 students had a strong performance.

Exhibit L
4th grade student performance: CELDT reading by ELD level and implementation (Adjusted Standardized Gains)

ELD Level	Implemented		Not Implemented	
	Gain	N	Gain	N
ELD 1 & 2	-.26	79	-.68	25
ELD 3	.17	143	-.04	42
ELD 4 & 5	.44	261	.28	57

Exhibit M**4th grade effect size (ELD level by implementation)**

ELD Level	Implemented	Not Implemented
4 & 5 vs. 1 & 2	.70	.96
3 vs. 1 & 2	.43	.64
4 & 5 vs. 3	.27	.32

Appendix J: Quality of Teaching and Learning Framework

Dimensions and Strategies

Intellectual Challenge. This dimension measures the intellectual challenge inherent in and required by the learning tools and tasks posed to the learners. Tools include those whose intellectual challenge is established independently of this rubric (curriculum, textbook, technology, Instructional Guide) and those that are more local to the classroom (e.g., reading level or text selection, mathematical assignment, science lab). 1) Disciplined Inquiry-Construction of Knowledge (Key Concepts); 2) Builds towards higher order thinking skills-construction of understanding; 3) Balance of skills procedures and understanding key concepts; 4) Requires analysis or multiple perspectives, reasoning and synthesis; 5) Appropriately integrates prior learning; 6) Authentic learning/active learning; and 7) Demands disciplined Inquiry-Communication.

In an *Optimal* situation: Task or toll requires learners to use higher-order thinking skills such as analyzing, evaluating, making conjectures with reasonable justifications, reasoning, designing. Lower level skills may be called for, but in the service of accessing advanced cognitive skills.

In an *Emerging* situation: Tools or task requires learners to some conceptual integration such as through summarizing or synthesizing or requires them to apply a format or procedures in straightforward way.

In a *Minimal* situation: Thinking requirements of tool or assignment is focused only around the learning of basic facts or practice of fundamental skills (e.g. worksheets on basic facts, curricula that focuses primarily on building discrete skills).

Learning Environment. This dimension examines the context in which learners learn, including cultural practices and norms established in the classroom and the physical and international spaces that foster learning. Specific examples of learning environment follow:

Student centered lessons: Teaching was centered on the needs and abilities of the students. Topics are relevant to the students' lives, needs, and interests. The teacher shares control of the lesson.

T: We're all standing in line and really excited to enter the new café.
Welcome to Hello Kitty's Regional Café. Welcome. Take a seat, please.
Students smile as they walk back into class. Ss laugh when she says Hello Kitty's Café.
T: Do you all have appetites? Hope you're hungry.
Ss: Yes.
T: So the Hello Kitty. As you look over or peruse the menu, I'll give you a history of Hello Kitty's Regional Café. The café was created two years

ago with me and my cousins. We wanted to have a café that includes all regional foods. This is my restaurant and my cousins are in the back, cooking up your meals. They're ready for 27 students. They're quite busy. Students smile and look at the menus that the teacher prepared for them. The front has a Hello Kitty print and the inside has the menu items.
T: If you want to talk with your partner about what you want to order, I'll take your order soon.

Teacher adapts pacing plan: The teacher adjusts the lesson to meet the needs of the students. If the teacher adjusted the lessons or did not teach the ELD lesson in order to meet his or her needs, this was not considered. Changing of lessons must have been accomplished with the goal of benefitting the students.

Extra oral opportunities for students that need it: The teacher carefully instructs students who needed the extra help with pronunciation and forming sentences. This was particularly prominent when teachers helped ELD 1 and 2 students to put together thoughts and words.

T: OK. Amanda, another idea?
There was a long pause as Amanda thought.
T: Keep thinking.

The teacher says things like: I want different people to talk to me. The teacher also says: You can use your imagination. It does not need to be correct.

Discourse. This is the quality of the dialogue the teacher promotes and facilitates.

Volunteer/Oral speaking opportunities: There is extensive use of Think-Pair-Share. The teacher encourages the students to volunteer and even yell out responses.

Vocabulary in context: Words are learned in a meaningful context. The teacher takes the time to teach vocabulary embedded in the stories, chants, and lessons.

The teacher tells a student: You were riding or writing?
S: Riding.
T: Riding. What does that mean, is that a sentence?
A student has a hand up.
Alexis: I was riding and ringing.

Complete sentences: The teacher encourages the students to use complete sentences. Communication Guides were not considered, though it is likely that they heavily influenced this activity in the classroom.

T: So what is something that flies?
Students raise hands

Oscar volunteers: UFO.

Angel volunteers: A jet.

T: Now, those two answers were great, but I would like complete sentences. So go back. What is something that flies, Oscar?

Oscar: A UFO flies.

L1: Teacher used L1 with the students to communicate instructions or explain the lesson.

T: We have the time, we need the place. Rubel, you want to say it in Spanish?

Rubel: No hay sol.

Assessment, Data-Driven Instruction, and Accountability. This dimension measures how a teacher uses information about learner performance and provides information to learners to support learning goals. Also measure is the extent to which teacher and learners are accountable for learning and completion of tasks (versus engaging in activity for activity's sake.)

SPF/Ballparking: Teacher used ELD assessments SPF or Ballparking during instruction.

Instructional Cycle. This measures the coherence of a goal-directed process that includes accessing learners' prior knowledge; appropriate use of direct instruction and opportunities to perform the learning task through guided and independent practice, feedback, and development of met-cognition. This dimension also considers appropriate differentiation, scaffolding, and modeling throughout the instructional cycle. Specific examples follow:

TPR/gestures/dramatization: Teacher or students use gestures either in or out of the context of chants. The teacher has the students gesture when they hear vocabulary words. The teacher dramatizes to help students understand an element of the lesson.

The teacher pauses when she reads the word 'cupboard': I don't know what cupboard means? Where do you put the cereal?

Sam volunteers: On the table.

T: You put your cereal on the table all day? Messy, messy house.

Sam: No.

T: Where do you put your cereal?

Jackie volunteers: Top of the refrigerator.

T: Ok, other put it where?

Jennifer volunteers: Inside these (describes cupboards).

T clarifies: In a cupboard. Those are cabinets. You open (demonstrates with her hands) them and put the cereal with other things like (names cans of food).

Visuals/Charts: This includes pictures, posters, picture cards, drawings, as well as print rich materials, done by the teacher as well as drawings done by the students. It also includes charts and graphs but excludes Thinking Maps.

Student teacher: Today we will do signs, posters, or buttons to persuade someone not to waste water. Tomorrow, we will do #5 and #6.

Yesterday, we focused on slogans such as (reads all the slogans that are taped on the white board, which are the McDonald's, Nike's, Ford's, and Coca-Cola's slogans).

Student teacher: Today, discuss with your group what kind of symbol you can use to represent not to waste water. For instance, I want to persuade them not to waste water by leaving the faucet on. What kind of symbol can I do?

Leo volunteers: Draw a faucet with water, circle it, and cross it off.

Thinking Maps®: Teacher used Thinking Maps to teach ELD.

Prior knowledge: Teacher questions students about their personal experiences or knowledge, tapping into prior knowledge.

T: Who's had a hot dog? [Students raise their hands]

T: A regular hot dog, when you cook it, will get bigger. It plumps.

Differentiation: The teacher adjusted his or her instructional style to teach all ELD levels in the classroom. This may have included such things as: TPR, visuals, and the rigor of the lessons. Teachers gave students opportunities to use simple, elaborated, or complex sentences, while incorporating other elements, such as visuals or TPR, so that the lesson would be accessible to all students. For example, a teacher may have chosen to do character analysis, but also had students raise their hands when they heard vocabulary words in the book. Students also received one-one-one instruction and support.

Teacher listens to students: The teacher exploited teachable moments, taking the time to listen to students sharing or asking questions and uses this to inform his or her teaching. The teacher helped students who were unable to form sentences or pronounce words. The teacher listened to students' feedback in order to teach them better. The teacher monitored student conversations.

Alina reads her writing to the whole group.

T: I'm gonna give you a star and a wish, a star for something you did well and a wish for you to improve. I give you a star because everything was in sequential order. My wish for you is to add more details.

Alina: Ok.

T: Would you like to pick the next person?

Alina: Genesis.

Genesis reads her writing to the whole group

T: You had a lot of details. I hope you spell checked your work.

Overall Quality of Teaching and Learning was considered as part of the summative process in looking at how each classroom performed. Because of the nature of this dimension, it was not used in the analysis itself, but is mentioned instead in the findings:

Overall Quality of Teaching and Learning: Taking into account the analytic dimensions, this holistic assessment considers how the teacher's choices during instruction promote learners' learning, how the teacher assists the performance of learners.

An Additional Note about 'Differentiation': In order for a classroom to have differentiated instruction, teachers are required to create multiple paths so that students of different abilities or learning needs each experience appropriate ways to absorb the instruction taught in the classroom. The teacher made the lessons accessible to different learning modalities, to students of differing language capacities, and/or to students with learning levels and interests. Lessons were adjusted to suit the needs of all students in the classroom.

At no point do any of these teachers make the whole lesson accessible to ALL students. Part of the lesson may have been accessible but other parts of the lessons were not. Most of the time, the lessons are not accessible to lower ELD students

References

- Asher, T. (1977). *Learning another language through the actions*. Los Gatos: Sky Oaks Productions.
- August, D. & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- August, D. & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1998). *Educating language-minority children*. Washington, DC.: National Academic Press.
- Avery, P. & Ehrlich, S. (2001). *Teaching American English Pronunciation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Researching Pedagogic Tasks*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Costa, A. L. & Garmstone, R. J. (1994). *Cognitive coaching: A foundation for renaissance schools*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers, Inc.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evered, R., and Selman, J. (Autumn 1989) Coaching and the art of management. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, 116-32.
- Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design*. Macquarie University: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Hayes, K., Salazar, J. & Vuckovic, G. (2005). *Evaluation of the Structure English Immersion Program - Year 5 Final Report*. LAUSD, Planning Assessment and Research Division Publication No. 241.
- Hayes, K., Salazar, J. & Vuckovic, G. (2004). *Evaluation of the Structure English Immersion Program - Year 4 Report*. LAUSD, Planning Assessment and Reserach Division Publication No. 179.

- Lee, J. (2000). *Tasks and communicating in language classrooms*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Lipsey, M. W. & Wilson, D. B. (1993). The Efficacy of Psychological, Educational, and Behavioral Treatment: Confirmation from Meta-Analysis. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1181-1209.
- Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 17, 459-481.
- Ortega, L. & Long, M. (1997). The effects of models and recasts on the acquisition of object topicalization and adverb placement in L2 Spanish. *Spanish Applied Linguistics* 1, 65-86.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Prator, C.H., with M. Celce-Murcia (1979). An outline of language-teaching approaches. In *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, edited by M. Celce-Murcia and L. McIntosh. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Richards, J. C. & Rogers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, M. A. (1995). *The use of negative evidence in second language acquisition of grammatical morphemes*. M.Ed. thesis. University of Western Australia, Graduate School of Education, Perth.
- Schmidt, R. (1992). Psychological mechanisms underlying second language fluency. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 357-385.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*, Oxford: O.U.P.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 370-391.
- Teisinger, E. (1998). *English as a non-native language*. Teacher seminar guide. Fresno, CA: LitConn, Inc.
- Wills, J. (1996). *A Framework for Tasked-Based Learning*. London: Longman.