

Title I Achieving Schools Study Report

Eric Barela, Ph.D.

Los Angeles Unified School District
Program Evaluation and Research Branch
Planning, Assessment, and Research Division Report No. 328

September 2006

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all of the principals, administrators, teachers, and school staff members who collaborated in this research by giving their time and providing their valuable insight and information. I also would like to recognize the significant support and assistance I received from my team of researchers. Your hard work, expertise, and professionalism are most appreciated.

Contributing researchers:

Cynthia Ace

Nathan Baird-Hu

Melinda Duff

Brian Gillespie

Nancy Hsu

Aleece Kelly

Jessica Muro

Blessing Nwajuaku

Cyndi Older

Yolanda Prieto

Gabriela Simeonova

Jeffrey Sheldon

Anne Vo

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Executive Summary.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	1
Research Questions.....	1
Methodology.....	2
Sample Selection.....	2
Data collection.....	4
Data analysis.....	5
Findings.....	5
Budget Analysis.....	5
Usage of Title I Documents.....	11
Teacher Qualifications.....	14
Instructional Time.....	19
Use of Technology.....	23
Math Instruction.....	26
ELA Instruction.....	32
EL Instruction.....	45
SWD Delivery of Services.....	51
Use of Paraprofessionals.....	54
Interventions/Partnerships Outside the School Day.....	58
Parent Involvement.....	64
Leadership Climate and Culture.....	67
Professional Development.....	72
Discussion of Findings.....	77
Recommendations.....	81
Future Considerations.....	83
References.....	84

Title I Achieving Schools Study Report

Executive Summary

Purpose

The Title I Achieving Schools Study addresses a need expressed by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Board of Education and of the Specially-Funded Programs Division for information on promising school-level practices of LAUSD's elementary schools receiving Title I funding. Title I was enacted in 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Its intent is to ameliorate the impact of poverty by providing schools with extra funding. These funds are to be used to enact systemic standards-based reform while allowing for adaptability to local conditions. Schools can also choose to enact programs targeted at particular students or schoolwide reforms intended to affect all students. To be eligible for Title I assistance, a school must have at least 40% of its students living in poverty.

Past Title I evaluations have not attempted to determine variations in the implementation of Title I programs that could serve to explain the difference, or lack of difference, in student outcomes. This study examines Title I program implementation as it is being implemented in LAUSD's elementary schools. This was done through observations of classroom instruction and relevant meetings, interviews with teachers and administrators, and analysis of documents related to Title I implementation, such as the Single Plan. The sample included eight Title I Academic Achievement Award (AAA) schools that have been consistently meeting their Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements and four Watch List (WL) schools that did not meet their AYP requirements in 2004-05. In total, 131 days of classroom instructional practice and 66 meetings were observed, 61 teachers and 37 administrators were interviewed, and twelve Single Plans were analyzed.

Findings

Budget Analysis

Upon examination of actual expenditures of the sample schools, it was clear that AAA and WL schools had different priorities with respect to fund allocation. AAA schools were able to channel their categorical and Title I funds to classroom-level supports, such as teacher and substitute pay and paraprofessional pay, than WL schools. The largest proportion of funds in AAA schools was for paraprofessional pay while the largest proportion in WL schools was for

school health professionals. One possible explanation for this is that WL schools were faced with more student physical and psychological health concerns than their AAA counterparts. AAA schools were able to devote more resources to student academic achievement while WL schools needed to direct more of their monies to supplemental health and human services supports. Academic interventions may not work as well on psychologically and physically unhealthy students. Also, WL schools were more likely to use their monies to pay for bilingual office staff member salaries. Office staff can be purchased with Title I funds to increase parent involvement. Given the high percentages of ELs in those schools that purchased bilingual office staff members, it is possible that they saw an increased need to overcome the language barrier between staff and parents that could not be addressed solely through general funds.

Additionally, the proportions of categorical and Title I funds used for teacher and substitute pay and for paraprofessional pay by the TAS schools were much larger than the proportions used for the same things by the SWP schools. Since not all students receive services at TAS schools and since such services need to be explicitly focused on meeting the academic needs of the targeted students, it stands to reason that the TAS schools used higher proportions of Title I funds on services that would address student achievement inside the classroom.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service (2000), 47% of national Title I funds tend to be earmarked for teacher and substitute pay, by far the largest single allocation. SWP schools can use their monies to supplement their core curricula with additional teachers while TAS schools cannot. It was apparent that neither the AAA nor the WL schools engaged in this practice. Very little money was spent for this expense. Most of their categorical and Title I budgets were used to fund supplemental activities.

Usage of Title I Documents

Schools are required to prepare and distribute the Title I Notification Letter and School-Parent Compact. The Title I Notification Letters that were obtained explicitly stated the programs, resources, and services that would be provided with Title I funds. Nearly every school was able to provide a School-Parent Compact. These documents were also clear in their explanations of school, parent, and student responsibilities.

Most sample school Single Plans were prepared in collaboration by a committee of administrators, teachers, and parents. The document was used to guide both general and specific instructional practices, to address student needs, and to reflect on the justification of categorical

and Title I fund expenditures. Many sample school administrators appeared to view the Single Plan as a useful document. A small number indicated that the document did not directly influence instruction or service delivery. However, requiring that schools receiving Title I funds annually update their action plans along with their budget assurances and justifications may serve to ensure that all schools directly benefit from Single Plan development.

Teacher Qualifications

Teachers in the AAA schools and in the WL schools were similar in many respects. The mean percentage of classrooms taught by “highly qualified” teachers was nearly the same in both types of schools. The mean percentages in both the AAA and WL schools were above the district average. Teachers also had similar years of experience. The average teacher in a AAA sample school had eleven years of experience while the average teacher a WL sample school had approximately ten years of experience. Both types of schools also had similar percentages of novice and veteran teachers. In addition, classroom management strategies were similar. Teachers in both types of schools were more likely to incorporate positive management strategies over negative ones.

With respect to the number of Nationally Board Certified (NBC) teachers across the two groups of schools, the analysis revealed that 3 out of the 8 AAA schools employed 5 NBC and 3 out of 4 WL schools also employed 5 NBC teachers. The number of NBC teachers in both types of schools was too small to be meaningful.

However, there are differences with respect to teacher authorization. There is a significantly higher percentage of BCLAD teachers in the WL schools than in the AAA schools. When examining the EL populations at the sample schools, the reason for this difference becomes clear. There are far more ELs in the WL schools than in the AAA schools. Also, the ELs in the WL schools are much more likely to be ELD 1 and the ELs in the AAA schools are much more likely to be ELD 3-5. One would expect to find more BCLAD teachers in schools where there are more students who know little to no English. However, when examining the percentage of teachers with any kind of authorization, AAA and WL schools are similar (70% and 72%, respectively).

There is an indication from the observed 2nd and 4th grade teachers that the AAA and WL schools are different when it comes to staff stability. When examining teachers with at least four years of experience, nearly eight in ten of the observed teachers in the AAA schools had spent at

least half of their careers at that school. Slightly less than six in ten of the observed teachers in the WL schools had done the same. It is possible that the AAA schools were better equipped to hang onto teachers than the WL schools.

Instructional Time

There are some significant differences with respect to the allocation of instructional time between the AAA and the WL schools. The observed WL classrooms spent more time on ELA instruction than the AAA schools. One possible explanation for the additional time spent on ELA in the WL schools is their large EL populations. However, even with a smaller proportion of time, the AAA schools are still able to meet all of their ELA performance AYP criteria. While the AAA classrooms spent more time in math than the WL schools, both types of sample schools met all of their math performance AYP criteria. The AAA schools also spent more time on subjects like art, music, drama, and dance.

The AAA and the WL classrooms spent similar portions of time on all other subjects. Less than 1% of overall instructional time was spent on ELD. While time spent on science and social studies was statistically equal in both types of schools, it appears that a larger proportion was spent on these subjects in 4th grade than in 2nd grade.

Both types of schools spent almost 20% of total instructional time in transitions between instructional activities. During transition time, no instruction occurs. While overall transitions were similar, it appears that a larger proportion was spent in transition in 2nd grade than in 4th grade.

Use of Technology

Teachers were more likely than students to use technology during instruction. They were able to incorporate different types of technology into instruction. Much of it functioned as an additional chalkboard, as evidenced by the preponderance of overhead use. However, they used different devices while teaching different subject areas. Computers were used during social studies. Overheads were used during math. Both were used during ELA. TV's with VCR/DVD players were mainly used during science.

In nearly half of all observed classrooms, student technology usage was not observed. Nearly one-third of AAA teachers indicated that they do not incorporate enough technology into instruction, often because of the disrepair of the equipment. However, in those classrooms where technology usage was observed, students were performing a variety of activities. They

were answering sample problems in both ELA and math, completing enrichment exercises, taking tests, or conducting Internet research. Also, AAA students were more likely to be presented with opportunities to use technology in the classroom. It is possible that the likelihood of student technology usage would increase even further in the AAA schools if the technology was maintained and upgraded accordingly.

Math Instruction

Both the AAA and the WL schools met all of their participation and performance criteria in math so it was expected that there would be few differences between the two types of schools. In terms of coverage of content standards, both the AAA and WL classrooms were observed covering similar topics. The most common content standards being covered were those grouped under number sense. Approximately 85% of all observed 2nd grade instruction addressed these standards. Coverage in 4th grade classrooms was more varied. However, most lessons focused on the number sense and the measurement and geometry standards. Most teachers also indicated that the curriculum being offered was appropriate for their students.

Effective math instruction in Title I schools should include an emphasis on reasoning and thinking skills, concept development, mathematic communication, and building new knowledge from prior experience (U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century, 2000). While this was evident in both types of schools, use of these strategies was more likely to be observed in the AAA schools. AAA teachers were more likely to lead discussions about math concepts while WL teachers were more likely to drill students with questions. It is possible that because of this, students in the AAA schools were much more likely to be observed engaging in academic talk around math vocabulary. Additionally, while teachers in both types of schools were just as likely to correct student errors and check for comprehension, AAA teachers were more likely to follow up with clarification while WL teachers were more likely to follow up with progress checks, which have little instructional value.

ELA Instruction

AAA teachers were more likely to state that OCR was an appropriate curriculum for their students. They indicated that they were able to adapt their instruction to address the needs of all students. WL teachers were more likely to view OCR as rigid, overly structured and, therefore, inappropriate.

Overall, the WL schools were more likely than the AAA schools to address the ELA standards. A higher proportion of WL classrooms address word analysis, writing strategies, writing applications, and written and oral English language conventions standards. A higher proportion of AAA schools addressed the reading comprehension standards. WL classrooms were also more likely to address the reading comprehension standards below the appropriate grade level independent of the reviewing and reteaching embedded in OCR. The AAA and WL schools addressed the literary response and analysis and listening and speaking strategies standards in equivalent proportions.

Effective Title I ELA instruction should include explicit instruction in reading and writing and differentiated instruction. This explicit instruction should be focused on letter-sound correspondence and vocabulary development, especially in the context of reading for meaning (Snow, et al., 1998). While this kind of explicit instruction was evident in both types of schools, it was more likely to be observed in the AAA classrooms. WL classrooms were more likely to address the ELA standards, but the AAA classrooms were more likely to be engaged in dynamic instruction. WL teachers had more interactions with students focused on the standards but the interaction in the AAA classrooms was more meaningful, particularly in reading comprehension. AAA teachers led discussions and were clearer about instructional objectives. WL teachers drilled students with questions and gave them more assignments to be completed individually. They were also less likely to explain the objectives of the lesson. Differentiated instruction in ELA instruction was also more likely to be observed in the AAA classrooms.

EL Instruction

Inside the classroom, teachers were observed differentiating instruction to meet EL needs. AAA teachers were more likely to be observed providing one-on-one assistance and small group instruction than WL teachers. Pairing recent arrivals with more advanced students during ELA was more likely to be observed in WL schools. Little primary language instruction was observed. Also, only eight classrooms were observed providing explicit ELD instruction and only one WL school appeared to be implementing *Into English!* with any regularity. Many teachers indicated that it was too simplistic for their students. SDAIE was used in the AAA and the WL schools with equal regularity. Although the AAA schools have a higher average reclassification rate than the WL schools, they also have more upper-level ELD students, who were more likely to be considered for reclassification.

Outside the classroom, ELs were included in intervention sessions. However, there appeared to be more differentiation in the AAA schools. ELs were observed in separate sessions receiving differentiated instruction based on ELD level.

Regarding attendance at the ELD Institutes, about one half of the study schools (4 AAA and 2 WL) initiated ELD professional development for their third grade teachers in October, 2005, and one AAA and one WL school began their professional development in January 2006. However we did not observe third grade classrooms. The fourth-grade ELD Institutes began in summer 2006, after the observations for the study were complete.

Waivered-To-Basic (WB) instruction was offered in two of the WL schools, although one school only had one third grade WB class. None of the AAA schools offered WB instruction.

SWD Delivery of Services

SWD delivery of services varied somewhat within the TAS schools. Teachers and paraprofessionals in the AAA schools were more likely to offer one-on-one and small group assistance to SWDs. However, students in all observed RSP classrooms, either for a pullout program or for a special day class, were being provided with individualized instruction. TAS schools did not offer as many school health professionals or an ESY to address SWD needs.

Use of Paraprofessionals

Paraprofessionals were observed in most AAA and WL schools. There was little observed small group instruction in either ELA or math. When it was observed, paraprofessionals were often slowing down the pace of instruction so it could be easily understood by a smaller group of students. One-on-one student assistance was more common and paraprofessionals in AAA schools were much more likely to provide this service. Paraprofessionals were also observed grading assignments, walking students around campus, preparing instructional materials, and monitoring student progress. It is possible that the length of time of paraprofessional assignments, rotation to different classrooms, and the NCLB definition of a “highly qualified” paraprofessional were all contributing to paraprofessional activities in the AAA and WL classrooms.

Interventions/Partnerships Outside the School Day

Interventions/partnerships outside the school day existed in all sample schools. While some offered prepackaged programs that promote enrichment exercises, most interventions were run by teachers in each of the sample schools. Effective interventions should include standards-

based enrichment and academic assistance of sufficient duration and intensity (U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, 2001). This was evident in the interventions offered by both types of schools. Before school, after school, and Saturday interventions were run by classroom teachers or long-term subs and are focused on academics. Students in both the SWP and the TAS schools were selected through an examination of class grades, periodic assessment scores in ELA and math, CST scores, teacher recommendations, and, for ELs, CELDT scores and ELD portfolios. Before school interventions concentrated on preteaching while after school and Saturday interventions focused on reteaching and skills practice. Most of the observed interventions covered ELA content areas. However, several covered math topics.

Considering that these interventions were mostly run by teachers and long-term subs, it would be expected that much of a school's categorical and Title I monies would go to paying for teacher and substitute pay. However, only four schools spent over 6% of their categorical and Title I funds for it. It is possible that the sample schools received extra assistance from both Beyond the Bell and their local districts. If this is so, the sample schools were using their categorical and Title I monies to supplement the intervention funds already received from both Beyond the Bell and the local districts.

Parent Involvement

Parents were encouraged to join advisory councils to contribute to budget discussions or to participate in workshops either to benefit themselves (i.e., English classes) or to benefit their children. Few parent centers were observed to be operating. While observing these meetings, it became clear that parent participation differed between the AAA and the WL schools. At the AAA schools, parents contributed more and participated in hands-on activities. At the WL schools, parents often said little and simply nodded to indicate assent. Even though participation was limited, it appeared that parents were given a larger collaborative role in the AAA schools than in the WL schools.

Administrators and teachers perceived that the level of parent involvement was too low. They indicated that it could be related to both the language barrier and busy work schedules. Most of the interviewed teachers and administrators called for increased parental involvement. No one who was interviewed indicated that parent involvement was at an acceptable level. Effective strategies should expand the notion of parent involvement to include activities centered in the home (U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, 2001). Even

though these were seen as barriers for involvement, teachers in both types of schools indicated that they have expanded the definition of parent involvement to include activities outside the classroom. This expanded notion of parent involvement includes making sure students are ready to learn when they come to school in the morning by reading to students, checking homework, making sure they are fed, and making sure they get enough rest. The AAA schools were more likely to have this expanded notion of parent involvement than the WL schools.

Leadership Climate and Culture

AAA and WL administrators brought a similar amount of experience to their schools. The average number of years of administrative experience for both AAA and WL administrators was 4.46 years.

Most of the AAA schools were classified as Collaborative and most of the WL schools were classified as Non-collaborative. It was expected that these two types of schools would exhibit markedly different cultures of leadership. In fact, the differences were subtle. Teachers held similar positive perceptions of administrator feedback. Administrators in both types of schools also readily received support from their local districts and found it to be helpful. Administrators and teachers in both types of schools engaged in limited monitoring of the alignment between curricula, instruction, and content standards. However, in the Collaborative schools, this monitoring was viewed as a matter of course while in the Non-collaborative schools, administrators and teachers were more passive in their monitoring.

While the administrators at the two types of schools tended to behave in similar ways, Collaborative and Non-collaborative schools differed with respect to teacher culture. Teachers in the Collaborative schools were more likely to work with one another and were much more focused during professional development activities. Teachers in the Non-Collaborative schools were more likely to cite personality conflicts as barriers to collaboration. They were also observed to be unfocused and argumentative during professional development activities.

Professional Development

In all sample schools, a variety of professional development activities were offered by administrators, coaches, and teachers. Most professional development activities focused on examination of student data and subject matter instruction.

Differences in professional development implementation existed between AAA and WL schools. The AAA schools were more likely to develop action plans from their examinations of

student data. They were also more likely to engage in collaborative curricular planning in their grade level meetings. Observed grade level meetings of the WL schools consisted of little data exploration or curricular planning. A practice CST was merely used to determine emphasized findings while planning occurred in isolation.

Differences also existed between Collaborative and Non-collaborative schools. In the Collaborative schools, teachers were more focused on the activities while Non-collaborative teachers were often uninterested or disruptive. Administrators in collaborative schools were more likely to hold teachers accountable for professional development activities through observation. Therefore, it is not surprising that Collaborative and Non-collaborative teachers held different perceptions of professional development activities. Teachers in the Collaborative schools were either positive or ambivalent about professional development while the Non-collaborative teachers consistently held negative perceptions.

Based on the collected data, the following recommendations are offered as strategies that should be adopted by WL schools for staying out of Program Improvement: 1) use funds to support subgroups more explicitly, 2) establish a collaborative environment, 3) offer differentiated and dynamic English/language arts instruction, and 4) monitor and encourage use of ELD instruction.

Title I Achieving Schools Study Report

Introduction

Background

The Title I Achieving Schools Study addresses a need expressed by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) Board of Education and of the Specially-Funded Programs Division for information on promising school-level practices of LAUSD's elementary schools receiving Title I funding. Title I was enacted in 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Its intent is to ameliorate the impact of poverty by providing schools with extra funding. These funds are to be used to enact systemic standards-based reform while allowing for adaptability to local conditions. Schools can also choose to enact programs targeted at particular students or schoolwide reforms intended to affect all students. To be eligible for Title I assistance, a school must have at least 40% of its students living in poverty.

Past Title I evaluations have mainly focused on quantitative analyses of student outcomes linked to Title I programs (Carter, 1984; Kennedy, et al., 1986; Borman & D'Agostino, 1996; Abt Associates, 1997; van der Klaauw, 2003). None of these evaluations made an attempt to examine variations in the implementation of Title I programs that could serve to explain the difference, or lack of difference, in student outcomes. This study examines Title I program implementation as it is being implemented in LAUSD's elementary schools.

Research Questions

The following questions were developed to guide the study:

- How are LAUSD's Title I Academic Achievement Award schools implementing the NCLB Title I, Part A required services (teacher qualifications, paraprofessional qualifications, proven educational methods, professional development, student assessments, parent involvement, and supplemental services)? In particular, how do these schools supplement their core practices with Title I programs?
- What practices exist in LAUSD's Title I Academic Achievement Award schools that may explain their success? Special consideration will be given to those practices targeted at Special Education students and English Learners (ELs).

Methodology

Sample Selection

Schools were selected based on their status as either California Title I Academic Achievement Award (AAA) schools or as Watch List (WL) schools in 2004-05. AAA and WL status is based on meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) criteria as stipulated by No Child Left Behind (NCLB). A school is eligible to apply for AAA recognition when it meets all AYP¹ criteria for at least two years. The AAA schools in the sample had been received the award between one and four years. The sample included nine AAA elementary schools selected from a population of 43 LAUSD AAA elementary schools. No sample school had a magnet program on its campus.

A school is placed on the Watch List for possible entry into Program Improvement status when it does not meet all of its AYP criteria for one year. In this study, WL schools were considered if they did not meet their Academic Performance Index (API) growth criterion, their schoolwide English/language arts (ELA) performance criterion, and their socioeconomically disadvantaged (SED) and EL subgroup ELA performance criteria. However, once the above sample characteristics were introduced into the selection process, only three WL schools did not meet their schoolwide, SED, and EL math performance criteria. In other words, all WL sample schools met all of their math performance criteria. The sample included four WL schools selected from a population of 138 LAUSD WL schools.

Title I schools can also differ in their distribution of funds. Schoolwide Program (SWP) schools can reallocate their categorical program funds to meet the needs of all students. Targeted Assistance Status (TAS) schools must direct their funds to students targeted for assistance. Of the 429 elementary schools in LAUSD that receive Title I funds, approximately 25% (n = 113) are TAS schools. The sample was selected to reflect this proportion. Nine of the sample schools are SWP schools and three are TAS schools.

Also, only sixteen possible schools (five AAA and eleven WL) had disabled student (DI) AYP criteria to meet. Because of this, no SWP school in the sample had to meet DI criteria. However, many of those that had DI criteria were TAS schools. Therefore, both the AAA and

¹ AYP criteria consist of schoolwide participation and performance targets in English/language arts and math. If there are numerically significant subgroups of students, a school must then meet participation and performance requirements in ELA and math for each subgroup. Relevant subgroups are organized around student ethnicities, socioeconomically disadvantaged status, English learner status, and disability status. In addition, CA elementary schools must also meet an Academic Performance Index growth target criterion.

WL TAS schools in the sample had DI criteria. The AAA TAS schools met their ELA performance criteria for DI students while the WL school did not. Again, all schools met their math performance criteria for DI students.

Table 1 shows the characteristics of each sample school. To protect anonymity, each school is referred to by a number. Additionally, all names in this report have been changed and some genders have been altered.

Table 1. Sample school characteristics.

	AAA	WL
SWP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School 2 • School 3 • School 7 • School 9 • School 11 • School 12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School 1 • School 5 • School 10
TAS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School 4 • School 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School 6

WL schools were matched to AAA schools by poverty ranking, overall school population, and proportion of SED and EL students. Schools must have a poverty ranking above 65% to get the maximum amount of Title I funding from LAUSD. All sample schools had a poverty ranking of at least 65% and ranged from approximately 68% to approximately 97%. The overall school populations of the sample schools ranged from approximately 400 to approximately 950. The proportion of SED students ranged from approximately 63% to approximately 96%. The proportion of EL students ranged from approximately 34% to approximately 85%. When possible, WL schools were also matched by local district. Sample schools were chosen from six different local districts.

Student body makeup was also examined to ensure that students attending the sample schools qualified for services. Of the twelve sample schools, only three received students as part

of the Capacity Adjustment Program (CAP). The three CAP-receiving schools took in a total of 25 students in 2004-05. Only two schools participated in the Permit With Transportation program and they received a total of five students. Only one school received ten special education students who were not receiving proper services at their home schools. Therefore, it can be concluded that the vast majority of students at each of the sample schools did not participate in traveling programs and were resident at each school.

Data collection

Data collection occurred between the end of February 2006 and the beginning of June 2006. Prior to beginning data collection, three 2nd grade and three 4th grade teachers were randomly selected at each school. Teacher instructional practice was observed for two consecutive days. At the end of the observation, the observed teacher was interviewed. In addition to observing classroom practice, up to seven relevant meetings were observed. These meetings included grade-level meetings, Banked-Time Tuesday meetings, parent meetings, and interventions/partnerships outside the school day. Principals, Assistant Principals, Title I Coordinators, and Bilingual Coordinators were interviewed at each school site. At most school sites, the Title I Coordinator and the Bilingual Coordinator were the same person. In total, 131 days of classroom instructional practice from 43 AAA and 23 WL teachers and 66 meetings were observed. Also, 61 teachers and 37 administrators were interviewed.

Additionally, data were collected from each sample school's Single Plan and from Budget Services. Schools receiving Title I funds are required to provide yearly assurances and justifications concerning how the funds will be spent. Single Plans also contain data related to overall school achievement and subgroup achievement. This achievement data must be used to develop action plans to address any weak achievement areas. The budget assurances and justifications must be linked to the action plans. Budget Services was able to provide 2004-05 Categorical Programs, or "4-Pot," actual expenditure information for ten of the twelve sample schools. The "4-Pot" budget consists of Title I, Economic Impact Aid-State Compensatory Education, Economic Impact Aid-Limited English Proficient, and School Improvement funds. The two remaining schools had 2005-06 "4-Pot" budget data in their Single Plans so this was considered in analysis.

Data analysis

Budget data were analyzed to determine the proportion of funds being allocated for Title I services. Observation and interview data were analyzed in the aggregate to determine patterns of behavior common to AAA and WL schools. Additionally, these patterns were examined to determine similarities and differences between AAA and WL schools. All qualitative data were analyzed in the aggregate.

Findings

The following section presents findings related to the budget and qualitative data collected from each of the twelve sample schools. They represent consistent patterns that emerged from the sample schools.

Budget Analysis

To determine how schools use their categorical funds to supplement their core programs, actual “4-Pot” expenditures were examined. However, the Title I Budget Pot was also examined to determine if schools allocated monies for Title I expenses differently than their overall categorical budgets. Expenditures were divided into the following nine categories based on object code descriptions:

- Teacher and substitute pay (e.g., teacher z-time and day-to-day substitutes);
- Professional development and conference attendance;
- Paraprofessional pay (e.g., three-hour and six-hour teacher assistants);
- School health professional pay, which included counselors, nurses, psychiatric social workers, and psychologists;
- Categorical program advisor and coordinator pay;
- Classified staff pay (e.g., office assistants, clerical relief time, and custodial overtime);
- Instructional materials;
- Equipment; and
- Other expenses.

Table 2 shows the mean proportion of “4-Pot” and Title I Pot expenditures in the above categories for AAA and WL schools. By examining the table, it becomes evident that AAA and WL schools set different priorities for the use of both their categorical and Title I funds.

Table 2. Mean proportion of “4-Pot” categorical Title I Pot expenditures of AAA and WL schools, 2004-05.

	AAA “4 Pot”	AAA Title I Pot	WL “4 Pot”	WL Title I Pot
Teacher and Substitute Pay	7.1%	8.1%	3.1%	1.6%
Professional Development and Conference Attendance	1.2%	0.5%	0.8%	0.3%
Paraprofessional Pay	37.9%	38.8%	19.2%	20.0%
School Health Professional Pay	9.8%	16.0%	35.5%	46.1%
Categorical Program Advisor and Coordinator Pay	25.4%	29.0%	21.8%	16.4%
Classified Staff Pay	2.7%	1.9%	4.1%	3.0%
Instructional Materials	9.8%	3.7%	13.1%	9.9%
Equipment	2.3%	1.2%	2.6%	2.8%
Other Expenses²	3.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

The proportion of categorical funds spent on teacher and substitute pay at AAA schools was approximately twice what it was at WL schools. When only the Title I Pot is considered, the AAA schools spent over four times as much Title I funds. In the AAA schools, these funds were primarily spent on teacher x-time, teacher z-time³, and day-to-day substitutes. In the WL schools, these funds went to coordinating teacher differentials and day-to-day substitutes.

² Other categorical expenses include pending expenses and no item description available. Other Title I expenses include pending distribution and funding variance.

³ Teacher x-time and teacher z-time refer to additional pay teachers receive for work done beyond normal instructional time.

According to administrators in both AAA and WL schools, this money went to teachers who led the interventions outside the school day. However, the mean proportion for the AAA schools was skewed by two schools that directed nearly 17.5% of their categorical and Title I funds to teacher and substitute pay. According to the principal of School 8, teachers are given plenty of release time to engage in grade-level planning and to carry out some administrative duties, such as the job of Title I Coordinator. School 8 used more money for day-to-day substitutes than any other school. At School 12, Title I funds were used to partially fund an RSP teacher.

Both AAA and WL schools used approximately 1% of their categorical funds, and 0.5% of their Title I funds, for professional development and conference attendance. Five of the AAA schools and only one of the WL schools allocated monies for this purpose. AAA schools were more likely to use funds for staff conference attendance or curricular trips.

The proportion of categorical and Title I funds spent on paraprofessional pay is also approximately twice as high at the AAA schools. AAA schools used between 14% and 67% of their categorical funds for paraprofessional pay, which included object codes set up for teacher assistant pay and relief, paraprofessional pay, and educational aide pay and relief. Only two AAA schools used less than 25% of their total “4-Pot” and Title I budgets on paraprofessional pay. This is markedly different from WL schools, where only 2 schools spent more than 25% of their categorical and Title I funds on it. One WL school did not use any “4-Pot” or Title I monies for paraprofessionals. However, it is possible that WL schools are using monies mandated from their “EL Pot” to fund paraprofessionals.

WL schools spent approximately 3.5 times as much of their categorical funds for school health professionals than AAA schools and spent between 23% and 56% of their entire categorical budgets on them. WL schools also spent a much higher proportion of their Title I funds on school health professionals. All four WL schools funded nurses and psychologists with Title I funds while three of the four schools also funded PSA counselors. Five of the eight AAA schools used categorical funds to pay for school health professionals, most of which went to psychologists and nurses. Two schools, one WL and one AAA, used categorical funds to pay for a psychiatric social worker.

AAA and WL schools spent similar proportions on categorical program advisors and coordinators. Ten of the twelve sample schools used their funds to pay for a categorical program coordinator. At these ten schools, approximately 18% to approximately 56% of their total

categorical budgets went to fund categorical program advisors and coordinators. WL schools used a smaller proportion of their Title I funds to pay for them.

WL schools spent a higher proportion of both categorical and Title I funds on classified staff pay than AAA schools. However, these percentages represent a small portion of their overall categorical program budgets. Only six schools, three AAA and three WL, used funds for classified staff. Monies at both AAA and WL schools were directed to clerical relief time, custodial overtime, and community representatives. In addition, two AAA and two WL schools also used Title I funds to secure bilingual office assistants. One possible reason that these schools used Title I funds, rather than general funds, to purchase office assistants is that these assistants are bilingual. At three of these four schools, at least 68% of all students are ELs. It is possible that hiring more bilingual staff can provide additional support to ELs and their parents. An administrator in one of these schools noted that bilingual office staff members are necessary for translation purposes.

All schools used categorical and Title I funds to purchase instructional materials and equipment. WL schools spent a slightly higher proportion of their funds on instructional materials. Administrators from eleven of the twelve sample schools noted that funds go to the supplemental curricular materials that are used in their interventions outside the school day. AAA and WL schools used equivalent proportions for equipment. When asked about where categorical funds tend to be allocated with respect to equipment, the most common response was for the purchase and maintenance of a copy machine.

Three AAA schools and one WL school also had monies listed in their “4-Pot” budgets that did not go to any of the above categories. The categorical funds were listed with object codes that specified pending expenses or were not attached to any object code. The object description listed as “no item description available.” It is unclear how these categorical funds were used by these four schools. The Title I funds were listed with object codes corresponding to pending distribution or funding variance. All Title I funds were accounted for by each of the sample schools.

Table 3 shows the mean proportion of “4-Pot” and Title I Pot funds in the same categories for SWP and TAS schools in 2004-05. Since TAS schools must target their programs to specific students, differences in spending patterns between them and the SWP schools would be expected. By examining the table, it becomes evident that this is true.

Table 3. Mean proportion of “4-Pot” and Title I expenditures of SWP and TAS schools, 2004-05.

	SWP “4 Pot”	SWP Title I Pot	TAS “4 Pot”	TAS Title I Pot
Teacher and Substitute Pay	4.8%	4.4%	8.5%	10.6%
Professional Development and Conference Attendance	0.8%	0.3%	1.7%	0.9%
Paraprofessional Pay	28.1%	27.5%	42.6%	47.7%
School Health Professional Pay	20.2%	29.9%	12.8%	14.6%
Categorical Program Advisor and Coordinator Pay	27.9%	29.4%	13.1%	11.1%
Classified Staff Pay	2.9%	1.5%	3.9%	4.5%
Instructional Materials	12.1%	5.1%	7.4%	7.9%
Equipment	2.4%	1.4%	2.6%	2.7%
Other Expenses⁴	0.9%	0.7%	7.4%	0.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

The TAS schools used a much higher proportion of their categorical and Title I funds for salaries and professional development for classroom personnel. They also had higher proportions of funds going to teacher and substitute pay, professional development and conference attendance, and paraprofessional pay. According to administrators at each of the TAS schools, academic interventions were run by either teachers or long-term subs. Also, paraprofessionals were observed working in most TAS classrooms. The TAS schools also spent

⁴ Other categorical expenses include pending expenses and no item description available. Other Title I expenses include pending distribution and funding variance.

a much lower proportion of their categorical and Title I funds on school health professional pay and categorical program advisor and coordinator pay. In fact, while each of the SWP schools used their Title I funds to hire a categorical program coordinator, only one of the TAS schools did the same. Once again, all Title I funds were accounted for by each of the sample schools.

Summary

Upon examination of actual expenditures of the sample schools, it was clear that AAA and WL schools had different priorities with respect to fund allocation. AAA schools were able to channel their categorical and Title I funds to classroom-level supports, such as teacher and substitute pay and paraprofessional pay, than WL schools. The largest proportion of funds in AAA schools was for paraprofessional pay while the largest proportion in WL schools was for school health professionals. One possible explanation for this is that WL schools were faced with more student physical and psychological health concerns than their AAA counterparts. AAA schools were able to devote more resources to student academic achievement while WL schools needed to direct more of their monies to supplemental health and human services supports. Academic interventions may not work as well on psychologically and physically unhealthy students. Also, WL schools were more likely to use their monies to pay for bilingual office staff member salaries. Office staff can be purchased with Title I funds to increase parent involvement. Given the high percentages of ELs in those schools that purchased bilingual office staff members, it is possible that they saw an increased need to overcome the language barrier between staff and parents that could not be addressed solely through general funds.

Additionally, the proportions of categorical and Title I funds used for teacher and substitute pay and for paraprofessional pay by the TAS schools were much larger than the proportions used for the same things by the SWP schools. Since not all students receive services at TAS schools and since such services need to be explicitly focused on meeting the academic needs of the targeted students, it stands to reason that the TAS schools used higher proportions of Title I funds on services that would address student achievement inside the classroom.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service (2000), 47% of national Title I funds tend to be earmarked for teacher and substitute pay, by far the largest single allocation. SWP schools can use their monies to supplement their core curricula with additional teachers while TAS schools cannot. It was apparent that neither the AAA nor the

WL schools engaged in this practice. Very little money was spent for this expense. Most of their categorical and Title I budgets were used to fund supplemental activities.

Usage of Title I Documents

The usage of documents linked to the receipt of Title I funds was also examined. These documents include the Single Plan, Title I Notification Letters, and School-Parent Compacts. The two latter documents inform parents of Title I services being provided by the school. The Title I Notification Letter is to be sent out to parents and includes a list of programs, resources, and services that will supplement the school's core program. The School-Parent Compact is a written agreement that stipulates the activities that students, parents, and school staff are expected to undertake to nurture increased student achievement.

The Title I Notification Letters obtained from the sample schools explicitly stated the programs, resources, and services being funded with Title I monies. For example, a WL school indicated that paraprofessionals, interventions, summer school, and coaches would be used to improve student achievement in ELA and math.

Eleven of the twelve sample schools provided a copy of their School-Parent Compacts. Each document clearly stated school responsibilities for student improvement. For example, a sample school stated that it would provide "high-quality curriculum and instruction in a supportive and effective learning environment . . . , hold parent-teacher conferences . . . , provide parents with frequent reports on their children's progress . . . , provide reasonable access to staff . . . , and provide parents opportunities to volunteer and participate in their child's class and to observe classroom activities." The sample schools also clearly stated parent responsibilities. A different sample school listed the following as parent responsibilities: "monitoring attendance, monitoring homework completion, monitoring television watching, volunteering in the classroom, participating in decisions related to the child's education, promoting positive use of extracurricular time, communicating with the school by reading all school and district notices, and serving on policy advisory groups." Student responsibilities were also clearly articulated. Another sample school included doing homework every day, reading at least thirty minutes every day outside of school, and giving all notes to parents in its description of student responsibilities. Administrators in nearly every sample school indicated that parents are expected to sign and return the document.

Administrators from eleven of the twelve sample schools were asked about the usage of the Single Plan. All interviewed administrators noted that the Single Plan is used to drive student improvement. Several different methods of accomplishing this were cited by administrators. Five administrators, three AAA and two WL, indicated that the Single Plan is used to guide instruction. An administrator at School 2 stated that the Single Plan guided overall instructional development, “Whatever we put into the Plan is used to indicate our instructional focus for the year and then we buy materials to support those areas of need whether it’s in language arts or math.” At other schools, the Single Plan also guided specific instructional strategies, such as the allocation of instructional time. According to a School 4 administrator, “Language arts, we say we’re going to have 2 ½ hours for it daily, that’s what we do. For [Open Court], that’s required. Also, 45 minutes for ELD, all of this is in our Plan.” Seven administrators, including those from each TAS school, made specific mention of using the Single Plan to determine what student needs must be addressed by the purchase of supplemental materials. According to an administrator at School 4, a TAS school, “We use the student needs established during the development of this process to plan our budgets, which in turn gets put into instruction, whatever our kids need for success.” Two WL administrators also noted that the Single Plan is used to drive professional development for the following year. However, it was unclear how this was done.

The most commonly cited use for the Single Plan was to justify the spending of Title I funds. Each administrator noted that the yearly updating of budget assurances and justifications requires their school to reflect on where money needs to be directed. If a school wants to use Title I funds in a way not stipulated in the Single Plan, a budget adjustment form must be submitted and approved or the funds cannot be spent that way. Because of this, administrators stated that Single Plan development requires much thought related to what needs to be funded to truly increase student achievement. The following administrators from AAA schools indicated how the Single Plan is used to promote reflection on the necessary resources for student achievement.

Certain jobs and programs are defined in the Single Plan, such as the Title I Coordinator and teacher aides. If they are not included in the Single Plan, they cannot be funded. The Single Plan is more of a budget tool. Budget expenditures come straight out of the plan. If anything needs to be changed or added, an addendum must be submitted. This can be a hassle so it’s important to

anticipate any budget changes. It helps to define what the school really needs. *(Administrator, School 9)*

It keeps us focused. Advice from parents to spend money to improve the programs always goes back to the Single Plan. We have to stick to the plan. We make changes only at the end of the year after we see what was accomplished and what was not accomplished. If proposals/suggestions are not in the original plan, we tell them it doesn't fit into the plan by parents and teachers. Any changes outside of the plan are for the future. *(Administrator, School 11)*

However, two administrators from AAA schools who have each been working for LAUSD for over 30 years indicated that the Single Plan does not really influence instructional development. They both acknowledged that the document was effective for thinking about budgets but that it did not directly influence instructional practice or service delivery. They both indicated that the document indirectly influences instruction and service delivery through budget development.

While a small minority of administrators did not view the Single Plan as being directly influential for instruction, the current budget assurance and justification submission process may change their view. Up to 2004-05, schools had to submit their budget assurances and justifications annually with each budget line corresponding to the proper object code. Starting in 2005-06 for the 2006-07 school year, schools must also revise their action plans annually and link them to their budget assurances and justifications. This may allow for the Single Plan to be a more direct influence of instruction and service delivery.

Summary

Schools are required to prepare and distribute the Title I Notification Letter and School-Parent Compact. The obtained Title I Notification Letters explicitly stated the programs, resources, and services that would be provided with Title I funds. The School-Parent Compacts also provided clear explanations of school, parent, and student responsibilities.

Single Plans were used to guide both general and specific instructional practices, to address student needs, and to reflect on the justification of Title I fund expenditures. Many sample school administrators appeared to view the Single Plan as a useful document. A small number indicated that the document did not directly influence instruction or service delivery. However, requiring that schools receiving Title I funds annually update their action plans along

with their budget assurances and justifications may serve to ensure that all schools directly benefit from Single Plan development.

Teacher Qualifications

The following is an examination of teacher qualifications in the sample schools. NCLB requires that states, districts, and schools make every effort to ensure that there is a “highly qualified” teacher in every classroom. A “highly qualified” teacher has a Bachelor’s degree, is fully credentialed, and has demonstrated subject knowledge. This definition can also include effective classroom management. Time spent managing students can have an impact on time spent engaged in instruction. In addition to “highly qualified” status, years of experience, authorization, and staff stability were examined. Classroom management strategies were determined through analysis of classroom observation data.

LAUSD schools provide the percentage of classrooms being taught by a “highly qualified” teacher on their School Accountability Report Cards (SARCs), which were examined for each sample school. Table 4 shows the mean percentages of AAA and WL schools. According to the SARCs, the mean percentage of classrooms being taught by a “highly qualified” teacher in LAUSD schools is 65.0%. The mean percentage in the AAA schools is slightly higher than the mean percentage in the WL schools. However, both types of schools had a higher mean percentage than the overall district mean percentage. Only two schools, one AAA and one WL, had a mean percentage lower than the overall district mean.

Table 4. Mean percentages of classrooms being taught by a “highly qualified” teacher

	AAA (N = 8)	WL (N = 4)	All LAUSD schools
Mean Percentage of Classrooms Being Taught by a “Highly Qualified” Teacher	78.0%	74.8%	65.0%

Table 5 shows the mean number of years of teacher experience, the percentage of teachers with 0-3 years of experience, and the percentage of teachers with 15 or more years of experience in both the AAA and the WL schools. The percentages of teachers with 0-3 or 15 or

more years of experience were analyzed to determine if there were more novice or veteran teachers in either type of school.

Table 5. Mean years of experience, percentage of teachers with 0-3 years of experience, and percentage of teachers with 15 or more years of experience in the AAA and WL schools.

	AAA (N = 277)	WL (N = 198)
Mean Years of Experience	11.0 years	10.1 years
Percentage of teachers with 0-3 years of experience	23.2%	26.3%
Percentage of teachers with 15 or more years of experience	28.1%	26.3%

No comparisons were statistically significant.

The AAA teachers had approximately one additional mean year of experience than the WL teachers but the difference is not statistically significant. However, analyzing the mean years of teacher experience does not say anything about the numbers of novice or veteran teachers in the AAA and WL schools. Even though the mean years of experience is statistically the same in each type of school, there could be more novice teachers in one type of school and more veteran teachers in the other. The percentages of teachers with 0-3 years of experience (novice teachers) and teachers with 15 or more years of experience (veteran teachers) were similar in each type of school. Approximately one-quarter of teachers are novices and approximately one-quarter of teachers are veterans in both the AAA and WL schools. Even though there was a slightly higher percentage of novice teachers in the WL schools and a slightly higher percentage of veteran teachers in the AAA schools, these differences were not statistically significant.

With respect to the number of Nationally Board Certified (NBC) teachers across the two groups of schools, the analysis revealed that 3 out of the 8 AAA schools employed 5 NBC and 3 out of 4 WL schools also employed 5 NBC teachers. The number of NBC teachers in both types of schools was too small to be meaningful.

Teacher authorizations were examined to determine if there were higher percentages of CLAD, BCLAD, SB1969, or no authorization teachers in either type of school. Table 6 shows the percentages of teachers with each type of authorization in both the AAA and WL schools. There are similar percentages of teachers that had either no authorization or a CLAD in both types of schools. Approximately 30% of teachers in the sample schools had no authorization and approximately 43% of teachers had a CLAD. The differences between the two groups were not statistically significant.

Table 6. Percentage of teachers with each type of authorization.

	AAA (N = 277)	WL (N = 198)
No Authorization	30.0%	28.0%
SB1969*	14.1%	3.5%
CLAD	43.3%	42.5%
BCLAD*	12.6%	26.0%

* $p < .05$

However there were significant differences with the percentages of teachers who had an SB1969 authorization, $\chi^2(1, N = 46) = 18.55, p < .05$, or a BCLAD, $\chi^2(1, N = 87) = 32.61, p < .05$. A significantly higher percentage of AAA teachers had an SB1969 authorization while a significantly higher percentage of WL teachers had a BCLAD. On the surface, this appears to be counterintuitive. The AAA schools, those meeting their AYP criteria for at least two years, would be expected to have more teachers authorized to teach ELs at risk of failing. However, there was a far higher percentage of BCLAD teachers in the WL schools.

Upon examination of the percentages of ELs by ELD level in both types of schools, it becomes clear why there was a higher percentage of BCLAD teachers in WL schools. There are far more ELs in the WL schools. Table 7 shows the number of students at each ELD level, the percentage of students at each level as compared with the entire EL population at each type of school, and the mean percentage of ELs in each type of school's total student population. Of all the observed classrooms, only one 4th grade AAA classroom did not have any ELs. There were 60 more total ELs in the 4 WL sample schools than in the 8 AAA sample schools. Also, the

mean percentage of ELs in the AAA schools is 42.6% while the mean percentage in the WL schools is more than 20% higher.

Since the proportions of ELD levels were significantly different between the two types of schools, it is clear that the AAA schools and the WL schools are being charged with educating different types of ELs. There was a significantly higher proportion of ELD 1 students in the WL schools, $\chi^2(1, N = 1218) = 221.24, p < .05$. In fact, there were approximately 65% more ELD 1 students in the 4 WL schools than in the 8 AAA schools. However, the proportions are reversed with the higher ELD levels. There were significantly higher proportions of ELD 3, $\chi^2(1, N = 1215) = 18.54, p < .05$; ELD 4, $\chi^2(1, N = 784) = 35.82, p < .05$; and ELD 5, $\chi^2(1, N = 205) = 29.22, p < .05$, students in the AAA schools than in the WL schools.

Table 7. Number of students at each ELD level, the percentage of students at each level as compared with the entire EL population, and the mean percentage of ELs as compared with the entire student population.

	ELD 1*	ELD 2	ELD 3*	ELD 4*	ELD 5*	Total	Mean EL Percentage
AAA	459 (20.6%)	549 (24.7%)	645 (29.0%)	443 (19.9%)	131 (5.9%)	2227 (100.0%)	42.6%
WL	759 (33.2%)	543 (23.7%)	570 (24.9%)	341 (14.9%)	74 (3.2%)	2287 (100.0%)	63.2%

* $p < .05$

It stands to reason that there was a higher proportion of BCLAD teachers in the WL schools. The WL schools have a significantly larger proportion of ELD 1 students while the AAA schools have significantly larger proportions of ELD 3, ELD 4, and ELD 5 students. Since ELD 1 students know very little English, more BCLAD teachers would be needed to address their academic needs.

Teacher interviews were used to determine staff stability at the AAA and WL schools. The 61 observed teachers were asked how long they had been teachers and how long they had taught at their current schools. These responses were compared as a measure of staff stability. Novice teachers may not provide an accurate measure of staff stability because they are too new

to be considered stable at a particular school. Therefore, the 56 observed teachers who had been teaching for at least four years at the time of the interview were included in the analysis. A teacher was considered stable if he or she had taught at his or her current school for at least half of his or her career.

Table 8 shows the percentage of teachers considered stable in both the AAA and the WL schools. The percentage of teachers who have either only taught at their current schools or who have taught there for at least half of their careers is significantly higher in the AAA schools than in the WL schools, $\chi^2 (1, N = 56) = 4.73, p < .05$. A significantly higher proportion of teachers stayed in the AAA schools than in the WL schools. However, it is important to remember that this difference only represents the observed 2nd grade and 4th grade teachers, rather than all teachers in the sample schools. The data merely indicate that staff stability was more likely to be prevalent in the AAA schools.

Table 8. The percentages of teachers considered stable in the AAA and WL schools.

	AAA (N = 37)	WL (N = 19)
Percentage of teachers considered stable*	78.4%	57.9%

* $p < .05$

Teachers in both types of schools were similar with respect to classroom management strategies. The most common observed classroom management strategy was reminding. Teachers were most likely to be observed reminding students to be quiet or about class rules. However, this reminding rarely led to the use of more negative strategies. In both ELA and math, teachers were more likely to use positive strategies (motivate, praise, or reward) than negative strategies (reprimand or punish). This pattern of classroom management was observed in both 2nd grade and 4th grade classrooms.

Summary

Teachers in the AAA schools and in the WL schools were similar in many respects. The mean percentage of classrooms taught by “highly qualified” teachers was nearly the same in both types of schools. The mean percentages in both the AAA and WL schools were above the district average. Teachers also had similar years of experience. The average teacher in a AAA sample school had eleven years of experience while the average teacher a WL sample school had

approximately ten years of experience. Both types of schools also had similar percentages of novice and veteran teachers. In addition, classroom management strategies were similar. Teachers in both types of schools were more likely to incorporate positive management strategies over negative ones.

With respect to the number of Nationally Board Certified (NBC) teachers across the two groups of schools, the analysis revealed that 3 out of the 8 AAA schools employed 5 NBC and 3 out of 4 WL schools also employed 5 NBC teachers. The number of NBC teachers in both types of schools was too small to be meaningful.

However, there are differences with respect to teacher authorization. There is a significantly higher percentage of BCLAD teachers in the WL schools than in the AAA schools. When examining the EL populations at the sample schools, the reason for this difference becomes clear. There are far more ELs in the WL schools than in the AAA schools. Also, the ELs in the WL schools are much more likely to be ELD 1 and the ELs in the AAA schools are much more likely to be ELD 3-5. One would expect to find more BCLAD teachers in schools where there are more students who know little to no English. However, when examining the percentage of teachers with any kind of authorization, AAA and WL schools are similar (70% and 72%, respectively).

There is an indication from the observed 2nd and 4th grade teachers that the AAA and WL schools are different when it comes to staff stability. When examining teachers with at least four years of experience, nearly eight in ten of the observed teachers in the AAA schools had spent at least half of their careers at that school. Slightly less than six in ten of the observed teachers in the WL schools had done the same. It is possible that the AAA schools were more attractive to teachers than the WL schools.

Instructional Time

Making effective use of instructional time is an important component of a school's Title I program. To determine how the AAA and WL schools were apportioning instructional time, the activities that took place during the 131 observed days of classroom instruction were categorized as the following:

- ELA;
- ELD;
- Math;

- Science;
- Social Studies;
- Other, which included art, dance, drama, music, and any other instructional activity not categorized as any of the above; and
- Transition, which included time spent between instructional activities and did not include recess or lunch.

Fieldnotes were typed up in five-minute intervals. Each interval was assigned a category based on the predominant activity during that five-minute period.

Table 9 shows the overall breakdown of instructional time in the AAA and the WL schools. The WL schools spent significantly more time on ELA instruction than the AAA schools, $t(130) = 2.85, p < .05$. They spent approximately 5.5% more time on ELA instruction. Also, the WL schools also spent over twice as much time on ELD than the AAA schools. However, both types of schools used less than 1% of their instructional time for explicit ELD instruction. One possible explanation for these findings is that the WL schools have far more ELs than the AAA schools.

Table 9. Overall breakdown of instructional time in the AAA and the WL schools.

	AAA	WL
ELA*	45.2%	51.8%
ELD	0.4%	0.9%
Math*	23.0%	17.9%
Science	3.3%	3.4%
Social Studies	1.2%	1.8%
Other*	9.0%	5.3%
Transition	17.9%	18.8%

* $p < .05$

While the WL schools spent significantly more time on ELA instruction than the AAA schools, the reverse is true for math, $t(112.69) = -3.07, p < .05$. The AAA schools spent nearly 5% more on math instruction than the WL schools. However, this difference has not had an

effect on AYP. All the WL sample schools met all of their math criteria despite spending less time on math instruction.

With respect to the remaining instructional categories, the AAA and WL schools had similar percentages of instructional time in science and social studies. They differed significantly on the amount of other activities, $t(104.96) = -2.32, p < .05$. The AAA schools spent over 4% more time on subjects like art, music, dance, and drama than the WL schools. The AAA schools were able to offer more enrichment activities to their students.

Although transition time did not differ significantly between the AAA and the WL schools, it is important to note how much time was spent between instructional activities. Nearly 20% of instructional time was spent engaging in interstitial activities. Observed teachers in the AAA classrooms spent nearly as much time on transitions as they did on math instruction while the observed teachers in the WL classrooms spent slightly more time on transitions than on math instruction.

It is also important to examine instructional time within each type of school by grade to determine if instructional time was divided in similar ways by in the observed 2nd grade and 4th grade classrooms. Table 10 shows the breakdowns of instructional time in the 2nd and 4th grade classrooms in both the AAA and the WL schools.

Table 10. Breakdowns of instructional time in the AAA and WL schools by grade.

	2nd Grade AAA (N = 46 days)	2nd Grade WL (N = 22 days)	4th Grade AAA (N = 40 days)	4th Grade WL (N = 23 days)
ELA	49.9%	55.1%	39.8%*	48.7%*
ELD	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%	1.6%
Math	18.6%	17.9%	28.2%*	17.9%*
Science	0.9%	0.8%	6.0%	6.0%
Social Studies	0.8%	0.8%	1.7%	2.8%
Other	8.8%	4.7%	9.1%	5.9%
Transition	20.3%	20.6%	15.0%	17.2%

* $p < .05$

There are no statistically significant differences between the 2nd grade AAA and WL classrooms with respect to instructional time. Approximately half of all instruction was in ELA and about 18% was in math. Very little instructional time was devoted to ELD, science, or social studies. However, transitions took up approximately 20% of instructional time, a larger block of time than for math instruction.

However, there were significant differences among the 4th grade classrooms. The 4th grade WL classrooms spent significantly more time on ELA than the AAA classrooms, $t(61) = 2.92, p < .05$ and the 4th grade AAA classrooms spent significantly more time on math than the WL classrooms, $t(61) = -3.51, p < .05$. These findings are consistent with the overall breakdown of instructional time. However, unlike the overall breakdown, there is not a statistically significant difference in the percentage of time devoted to other instructional activities in either 2nd grade or 4th grade.

Summary

There are some significant differences with respect to the allocation of instructional time between the AAA and the WL schools. The observed WL classrooms spent more time on ELA instruction than the AAA schools. One possible explanation for the additional time spent on ELA in the WL schools is their large EL populations. However, even with a smaller proportion of time, the AAA schools are still able to meet all of their ELA performance AYP criteria. While the AAA classrooms spent more time in math than the WL schools, both types of sample schools met all of their math performance AYP criteria. The AAA schools also spent more time on subjects like art, music, drama, and dance. They were able to offer more enrichment activities to their students.

The AAA and the WL classrooms spent similar portions of time on all other subjects. Less than 1% of overall instructional time was spent on ELD. While time spent on science and social studies was statistically equal in both types of schools, it appears that a larger proportion was spent on these subjects in 4th grade than in 2nd grade.

Both types of schools spent almost 20% of total instructional time in transitions between instructional activities. During transition time, no instruction occurs. While overall transitions were similar, it appears that a larger proportion was spent in transition in 2nd grade than in 4th grade.

Use of Technology

The incorporation of technology into classroom instruction is another important component of Title I programs. Classroom observation and teacher interview data were analyzed to determine the types of technology that were being used to complement instruction and how the observed teachers incorporated it into instruction. Both teacher uses and student uses of technology were analyzed.

In both types of schools, teacher use of technology was very prevalent. In the AAA schools, 85.4% of observed teachers used technology during instruction while in the WL schools, 75.0% used technology. Teacher use of technology primarily consisted of using a cassette/CD player, a TV with VCR/DVD player, a computer, or an overhead projector.

Cassette/CD players were primarily used by teachers to either play story recordings or songs. They were used mostly in ELA lessons. Teachers in AAA classrooms were more likely to incorporate audio recordings into their instruction than teachers in WL classrooms. In nearly every instance, students would also be expected to follow along in their OCR books. In some cases, the player was also used to play songs while the students sang along. For example, in a AAA classroom, the teachers plays an audio recording of what the students know as “The Hello Song.” The students first read through the lyrics and comment on liking that “hello” is spoken in many languages in the song. The students listen to the song and then sing it several times.

There were only a few instances when TV’s with VCR/DVD players were used by observed teachers and the WL teachers were just as likely as the AAA teachers to use it. There was also no apparent difference in use between 2nd and 4th grade classrooms. In most cases, a video was played to illustrate a concept in science. However, the AAA and the WL teachers differed in how they used the video. In a AAA classroom, a teacher played a video on static electricity and then asked students questions about what was seen. In a WL classroom, a teacher played a video about animals and was not observed questioning students about its content.

The AAA teachers were more likely to use computers in the classroom than the WL teachers. Teachers in 2nd grade classrooms were also more likely to use computers than teachers in 4th grade classrooms. The computers were mostly used in ELA or social studies lessons and were mainly used to display slideshows of words on PowerPoint or to access the internet for providing additional examples. In a AAA classroom, a teacher accessed the internet to show

students cultural artifacts and geographic features from Mexico, such as the Mexican flag and a map of Baja California.

By far, the most commonly used piece of technology by teachers was the overhead projector. The AAA teachers were just as likely as the WL teachers and 2nd grade teachers were slightly more likely than 4th grade teachers to use overheads. The most common usage of the overhead projector was as an additional chalkboard. However, it would sometimes be used to work through problems and solutions with students. Teacher use of overheads was most prevalent during math instruction. Teachers would demonstrate how to solve math problems for students. In the following example, a teacher in School 3, a AAA school, uses the overhead to show students how to measure angles.

T turns on the overhead.

T: Look at this to know how to measure yourselves. Let's say here I have to determine where I'm going to measure the angle. I can measure from AB to BC. So you first have to determine where to begin measuring the angle. Put a point on the vertex...Look at the protractor, raise your hand for the bottom set of numbers.

T turns Brent around (he's facing the back) and has him put his head down.

T: Raise your hand if you think 40 is the answer. Who's going to use the top? Where does the arrow fall - between what degrees?"

Students shout out '140' and '150.'

T: Who agrees?

Students raise their hands.

While teacher use of technology was commonplace, student use of technology was less prevalent, both in the AAA and in the WL schools. In only 56.1% of observed AAA classrooms and 55.0% of WL classrooms were instances of student technology use observed. Additionally, students were more likely to be observed using technology in 2nd grade classrooms than in 4th grade classrooms. Students primarily used overhead projectors or computers.

Student use of overhead projectors was more likely to occur in AAA classrooms. They used it to complete sample problems in both ELA and math that other students could see. In the following example from School 3, the teacher is asking students to put quotation marks around parts of statements.

T: Ashley, would you like to try? Come up and put the quotation marks around it.

Ashley does it right.

T: Why not around 'said mom?' Do we need quote marks around the speaker tag?

Students: No.

T writes number two, 'Ms. [Lee] said I like the way you line up.'

T: Next sentence. Please read for me, Jorge.

Jorge reads.

T: We need quote marks. David, come up and show me.

Daniel is fixing his backpack. David does it right.

T: Is he correct?

Students: Yes.

T: The speaker tag doesn't always have to be at the end. It can be at the beginning. Let's give him a hand.

Students in the AAA schools were just as likely to use computers as students in the WL schools and were more likely to use computers in 2nd grade than in 4th grade. Students used computers in several ways. One use was to complete enrichment assignments in both ELA and math. Students were observed using ELA programs like Accelerated Reader and Match Rhymes and math programs like Mathasaurus II and Mighty Math Number Heroes. Students also took tests, completed assignments, and browsed the Internet during observed class time. Many of these activities were completed with minimal teacher supervision. Many teachers indicated that students are allowed to do Internet research as long as their parents give permission. This was cited as a barrier to student technology usage by few teachers. Several organized class activities involving computer usage were also observed. In School 11, 2nd grade students were using computers during library time as their teacher monitored their usage and answered questions. In School 9, a classroom of 2nd grade students was taken to the computer lab to learn how to use the computer.

The lack of student technology usage does not appear to be due to a lack of resources. Most observed classrooms had computers. Many sample schools also had computer labs students could use. In fact, computer lab instruction was observed in several sample schools. However, teachers in several schools noted that they did not use computers much with their students because the available ones are old and slow.

Summary

Teachers were more likely than students to use technology during instruction. They were able to incorporate different types of technology into instruction. Much of it functioned as an additional chalkboard, as evidenced by the preponderance of overhead use. However, they used

different devices while teaching different subject areas. Computers were used during social studies. Overheads were used during math. Both were used during ELA. TV's with VCR/DVD players were mainly used during science.

In nearly half of all observed classrooms, student technology usage was not observed. Nearly one-third of AAA teachers indicated that they do not incorporate enough technology into instruction, often because of the disrepair of the equipment. However, in those classrooms where technology usage was observed, students were performing a variety of activities. They were answering sample problems in both ELA and math, completing enrichment exercises, taking tests, or conducting Internet research. Also, AAA students were more likely to be presented with opportunities to use technology in the classroom. It is possible that the likelihood of student technology usage would increase even further in the AAA schools if the technology was maintained and upgraded accordingly.

Math Instruction

Although there was no difference in math performance between the AAA and the WL schools, it is still important to determine what math instruction looks like in both types of classrooms. Classroom observation and teacher interview data were analyzed to determine the focus of math instruction in the sample schools.

Most teachers in both the AAA and the WL schools indicated that they thought the math curriculum used at their schools (Harcourt Math) was appropriate for their students. The curriculum covered important lessons related to the content standards. Many teachers noted that there were gaps in the math curriculum, which they supplemented with other programs, mostly Excel Math). The few teachers who indicated that the math curriculum was inappropriate were more likely to be from WL schools. They most often criticized the amount of material covered in the textbook. They noted that it was difficult to get through that much material and expect students to retain the information. Many teachers from both types of schools also stated that, while the curriculum was appropriate, the district's pacing plan was not. The most common criticisms were that the pacing plan was erratic or rushed.

To determine how standards were being addressed during math instruction, data were coded using the California content standards groupings for math in 2nd and 4th grades. They are:

- Number sense;
- Algebra and functions;

- Measurement and geometry;
- Statistics, data analysis, and probability; and
- Mathematical reasoning.

Across all schools, more lessons involving the number sense standards were observed than those focusing on any other set of standards. More observed math lessons focused on number sense than on all of the other groupings combined. Math standards instruction in the AAA and WL schools looked similar. However, there were differences between 2nd grade and 4th grade classrooms.

In 2nd grade, approximately 86% of all observed math lessons involved number sense. Teachers were observed instructing students on place value, fractions, and decimals and were requiring that students perform basic mathematical operations. The following was an example of a fractions lesson from a 2nd grade AAA classroom.

T: Counters should be out of your hands at the top of your desks. I'm not gonna say it again. For the first one, they want you to find $\frac{2}{3}$ of 12. How many counters do I need total?

Students: 12.

T: To find $\frac{2}{3}$ of 12, I have a very important clue here. How many groups will I need? Emma?

Emma: 3.

T: 3 groups so I will circle 2 groups out of my 3. Now, what is the total number of counters that I have in my 2 groups?

Students: 8!

T: Good. For the next one, I will need how many counters?

Students: 10!

T: And they want you to find $\frac{2}{3}$ of 10. How many groups will I need?

Students: 5.

T: So you will make 5 equal groups.

T walks around and waits for students to make 5 groups of 2. (*Ms. Stein, School 2*)

In 4th grade, the number sense standards targeted the place value, addition, and subtraction of decimals, the understanding of negative numbers, and the factoring of small whole numbers.

Approximately half of all observed 4th grade math lessons involved number sense. The following example was an observed lesson on negative numbers from a 4th grade WL classroom.

T: Ok, we'll be learning about negative numbers today. What are they? That's the big question. Let's open our books to page 9 and write page 9 on the top. Ok, all numbers to the left of 0, underline left, are negative numbers. All numbers to the right, underline right, are positive numbers.

T waits as students copy the sentences from the projector.

T: Paper monitors, please pass out paper to everyone. Ok, so we should've all written down the definitions. Here's my number line. We have one on the wall. What numbers does it start and end with? Kim?

Kim: 0 and 100.

T: Yes, but that's not really true because there are numbers to the left of 0, which you don't see. What are they called?

Students: Negative numbers.

T: Yes, the numbers to the left of 0 are less than 0 and the numbers to the right are greater than 0. So numbers to the left get what?

Students: Smaller.

T: Right and those numbers have what in front, Jenny?

Jenny: A minus sign.

T: Right. So here, I have -1, -2, -3, -4, -5...-10 and you read it by saying negative before the number. So Raphael, how do we say this number?

T writes -10 on the board.

Raphael: Negative 10.

T: Good, now on your math paper, draw a line with arrows at the end. That just means the line keeps going in both ends. Then in the middle write 0.

T waits for students to draw their number lines.

T: Ok, then let's write in the positive numbers since we're used to that and go up to +10. On top, write 'Positive Numbers' just as a reminder. For today, we'll write positive signs in front of everything, but we don't say positive 1 or plus 2.

Then on the other side, let's write from -1 to -10. (*Mr. Shaw, School 10*)

Overall, there was little observed emphasis on the other groups of standards in both 2nd grade and 4th grade classrooms, with the exception of the measurement and geometry standards in 4th grade. Nearly 35% of math instruction addressed these standards, which included the understanding of perimeter and area, coordinate grids, and plane and solid geometric objects. The following example, from a 4th grade AAA classroom, was focused on plotting points on a coordinate grid to form a line.

T: Where do you put the dot if it's [number] and [number]? Where they intersect?

Lexy: Plotted.

T: Very nice. Plotted.

T: What is the same about the 2? Armin? When you're finding A6, how do you do it?

Armin: You find A and go up to 6.

T: Right. When it's an art graph, you go to A and up. I have an equation here.

What is it?

Students: $y = x + 3$.

T: Amy, give me a number.

Amy: 12.

T: 12. Wow. What is y?

Students: 15.

T writes 12 under x column and 15 under y column on the board

T: Amy likes big numbers. What's going to be my problem when I go to graph this? Rosa?

Rosa: The points aren't on the graph.

T says the points would be off the chart in relation to the graph he has.

T: Can someone give me a number that would be on the graph?

Rosa: 4.

T writes 4 under the x column.

T: What's y? Think in your head, then all at once. What is it?

Students: 7.

T writes 7 under the y column.

T: Excellent. Can I plot this?

Students: Yes.

T says he wants someone to come up and plot a point. Flor says she wants to. T tells her to come up, saying she will pick someone else when she's finished. Flor comes up to the board. T says he thinks she's going to do (7, 10). Students tell Flor no, saying her plot is wrong.

Flor: I'm not doing (7, 10).

T: Oh, she's not doing (7, 10).

Flor plots a point at (4, 7) on the graph.

T: And can you do the ordered pair next to it?

Flor writes (4, 7)

T: Oh, she even put it in parentheses. Very nice. (*Mr. Flicek, School 7*)

While instructional content was similar between the AAA and the WL schools, instructional delivery differed. The AAA teachers were more likely to use discussion during math while the WL teachers were more likely to use questioning. In the AAA classrooms, teachers were more likely to lead their students in a discussion of the lesson objectives. In the WL schools, teachers were more likely to ask questions of specific students. The discussion that took place in the AAA classrooms may have been responsible for more occurrences of student academic talk and student use of math vocabulary. The question/answer format observed in the WL schools may not have been as conducive to increased student participation.

The following lesson was observed in a 4th grade AAA classroom. The lesson emphasized fraction addition. The teacher led students in a discussion of the process, which led to increased usage of relevant math vocabulary, such as numerator and denominator.

T: Let's try another one. T writes on the board:

$$\begin{array}{r} \frac{1}{4} \\ + \\ \frac{2}{3} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

T: What's the first thing you notice, James?

James: They're not the same.

T: How are we going to make the denominators the same? How are we going to fix this? Ashley what do you think?

Ashley says nothing.

T: Vanessa, help her out. Well, last time we were able to make this denominator the same as this one.

T points to the two denominators of the fractions on the board.

T "Ok Guillermo, go ahead. I'm curious.

Guillermo: If denominators are different we have to change by multiplying or dividing.

T: This one is hard to change. Can we change a three into a four or a four into a three with multiplication or division? Do we have to change them into new numbers? Think of a number both three and four will fit into evenly.

Students start to make noise.

T: If you're not thinking you're not learning, not exercising yourself, not learning new information.

Raul: I'm still thinking.

James: Turning three and four into twelve.

T: Will three fit into twelve?

Students: Yes!

T: Will four fit into twelve?

Students: Yes!

T: How do we go about turning them into twelve?

Ricky: We have to multiply the numerator by three.

T: Someone repeat the rule for me. On the count of three, tell me what I'm multiplying by three?

Students: Multiplying the numerator and the denominator by three. (*Ms. Swanson, School 8*)

The next lesson was observed in a 4th grade WL classroom. The lesson was focused on multiplication of large numbers. However, unlike the previous example, the teacher asked mostly yes/no questions to the students. They were unable to use much math vocabulary.

T writes on the board:

3389 (each day) 5 days

T: Let's read that.

Students: 3389 people each day.

T: How many days?

Students: 5.

T: They need to figure out how many people will show to this carnival. Are we going to add?

Students: No.

T: If we have to add that would give us $3389 + 5$. Is that the answer?

Students: No.

T: Are we going to subtract?

Students: No.

T: Are we going to divide?

Students: No.

T: Because that would give us each day. Are we going to multiply?

Students: Yes.

T writes on the board:

3389×5

T solves problem on the board with the help of Rocky, who writes what she says.

The correct answer is 16,945.

T: This might be elementary, but it's definitely going to be on the CAT/6. Do we agree that's the correct answer?

Students: Yes.

T: If you just write the answer, do you think I'll give you credit?

Students do not answer.

T: Why I won't give you full credit?

Rocky: Because they want people.

T: I love you! Right, you need to put down people! Copy the way we did it on the board, not just the answer. (*Ms. Gonzales, School 1*)

The use of other instructional strategies also differed between the AAA and the WL schools. Teachers in both types of classrooms were equally as likely to correct student errors and to check for comprehension. However, teachers in the AAA schools were more likely to clarify difficult concepts for students during math instruction. This involved simplifying, repeating, or rewording concepts to make them easier for students to understand. Teachers in the WL schools were more likely to engage in checks of student progress towards task completion. These progress checks ensured that students completed assignments on time but had little

instructional value. A commonly observed progress check involved teachers asking for students to raise hands if they were finished with an assignment and then announcing the remaining time.

Summary

Both the AAA and the WL schools met all of their participation and performance criteria in math so it was expected that there would be few differences between the two types of schools. In terms of coverage of content standards, both the AAA and WL classrooms were observed covering similar topics. The most common content standards being covered were those grouped under number sense. Approximately 85% of all observed 2nd grade instruction addressed these standards. Coverage in 4th grade classrooms was more varied. However, most lessons focused on the number sense and the measurement and geometry standards. Most teachers also indicated that the curriculum being offered was appropriate for their students.

Effective math instruction in Title I schools should include an emphasis on reasoning and thinking skills, concept development, mathematic communication, and building new knowledge from prior experience (U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century, 2000). While this was evident in both types of schools, use of these strategies was more likely to be observed in the AAA schools. AAA teachers were more likely to lead discussions about math concepts while WL teachers were more likely to drill students with questions. It is possible that because of this, students in the AAA schools were much more likely to be observed engaging in academic talk around math vocabulary. Additionally, while teachers in both types of schools were just as likely to correct student errors and check for comprehension, AAA teachers were more likely to follow up with clarification while WL teachers were more likely to follow up with progress checks, which have little instructional value.

ELA Instruction

WL schools were unable to meet their schoolwide, SED, and EL AYP ELA performance criteria. AAA schools met all of their AYP criteria. Therefore, it would be expected that there were differences in ELA instruction between the two types of schools. To determine these differences, classroom observation and teacher interview data were analyzed.

All teachers were observed implementing the Open Court Reading curriculum (OCR) during ELA instruction. Teachers in the AAA schools were more likely to state that OCR was appropriate for both English Only students and ELs. They also noted that the phonics lessons

were especially appropriate for younger students. Newer AAA teachers were more likely to note that OCR was appropriate because it gave them structure. Veteran AAA teachers still noted that they found OCR appropriate but lamented that much of their creativity had been taken away due to the highly scripted nature of OCR. Teachers from most AAA schools also noted that the language being presented in OCR can be tough for students to master, but that it was possible. Both 2nd and 4th grade teachers were equally as likely to indicate that OCR was appropriate for their students.

Teachers in the WL schools were more likely to indicate that OCR was not appropriate for their students. They cited the boringness of the stories, the lack of opportunity for review and reteaching due to the structure of the pacing plan, and difficulty of the language being presented, and the “one size fits all” nature of the program as reasons why OCR was inappropriate. The AAA teachers viewed OCR differently than the WL teachers. They were more likely to note that they sometimes must adapt OCR to meet the needs of their ELs, but that they are able to do so. They did not view OCR as “one size fits all.” The following is a quote from a AAA teacher who noted that OCR did give her some instructional flexibility.

I like [OCR]. A lot of teachers don't. It stretches the kids. It's a teaching tool. You can scaffold and use it in a way that is interesting for the kids. They get a good foundation for reading. 4th and 5th grade [OCR] is excellent. I taught 5th grade. There are only four stories in 4th grade and two stories in 5th grade that I don't like. If you are trying to engage them, you can engage them. (*Ms. Martin, School 7*)

To determine how standards were being addressed during ELA instruction, data were coded using the California content standards groupings for math in 2nd and 4th grades. They include:

- Word analysis, fluency, and systematic vocabulary development;
- Reading comprehension;
- Literary response and analysis;
- Writing strategies;
- Writing applications (genres and their characteristics);
- Written and oral English language conventions;
- Listening and speaking strategies; and
- Speaking applications (genres and their characteristics)

In both types of schools, most lessons focused on the word analysis, fluency, and systematic vocabulary development and the written and oral English language conventions standards. However, lessons covering all groups of standards were observed in both types of schools.

The 4th grade classrooms were more likely to be addressing standards below the appropriate grade level than the 2nd grade classrooms. One possible explanation for this is how OCR structures review and reteaching, which is addressed throughout the curriculum. Since 4th grade students were expected to know several years worth of standards, it stands to reason that there would be more review in 4th grade classrooms.

Lessons aimed at the word analysis standards, which included decoding and word comprehension, and vocabulary and concept development were slightly more likely to be observed in the WL schools. In 2nd grade, students were more likely to be engaged in recognizing spelling patterns, identifying plurals, understanding synonyms and antonyms, and understanding prefixes and suffixes. In 4th grade, they were more likely to be engaged in using their knowledge of word origins, derivations, synonyms, antonyms, idioms, and root words to determine the meanings of words and phrases. Decoding and word comprehension standards were being addressed in 84% of all observed AAA classrooms and 83% of all observed WL classrooms. Vocabulary and concept development was observed in 53% of AAA classrooms and 61% of WL classrooms. However, the overall number of activities addressing these standards was higher in the WL schools. Also, these groups of standards were more likely to be addressed in 2nd grade than in 4th grade. The following lesson was observed in a 2nd grade WL classroom. In it, students were learning vocabulary related to volcanoes.

Miguel: Like when volcanoes...

T: Volcanoes do erupt, don't they? What happens when a volcano erupts? What does erupt mean?

Seth: When something comes out?

T: Ok, so when the volcanoes erupt, what happens? What comes out of it? Seth.

Seth: Smoke.

Miguel: Lava!

T: Raise your hand! Yes, very good. My book says to break out suddenly with force. Good job. Ok, last word, what is it?

Students: Discovery!

T: Good! What does discovery mean?

Miguel: Like the Discovery Channel.

T: You need to raise your hand. My book says discovery means to see something for the first time. (*Ms. Jenkins, School 10*)

A disproportionate number of these lessons were observed in the context of ELD instruction, which occurred more often in WL classrooms. When the ELD lessons were not considered, the number of activities addressing the word analysis standards was similar in the AAA and the WL schools.

The reading comprehension standards included objectives related to structural features of informational materials and comparison and analysis of grade-level-appropriate text. These standards were addressed more often in AAA than WL classrooms (60% and 48% of all observed classrooms, respectively). In 2nd grade, students were observed stating the purpose of their reading, asking clarifying questions, and interpreting information from diagrams and charts. In 4th grade, students were observed making and confirming predictions, testing hypotheses based on existing information, and distinguishing between cause and effect as well as fact and opinion. These standards were more likely to be addressed in 2nd grade than in 4th grade. In the following example from a 4th grade AAA classroom, students are learning about the difference between fact and opinion.

T: The purpose of today's reading is to look at reading comprehension skills called fact and opinion. A fact is something that can be proven. If you say my birthday is...you can prove that it is a fact usually when you have dates and numbers. What is a fact?

Sally: Something that can be proven true.

T: Can someone disprove a fact?

Students aren't sure.

T: No, they can't disprove. An opinion is? It's a matter of taste or preference. For example, people have different hobbies because they have different opinions on what is fun. Everybody has different thoughts or...can you prove opinion? No. Scientists give us lots of information, but not always fact. They may have opinions about what they've read. Ivan, is everything a scientist says fact?

Ivan: No.

T: I'm going to choose who is ready to read. Rina, you want to go first?

Rina: "The Song of the Humpback..." Rina reads the story.

T: Ok, very good. Ok, Molly.

Molly reads: "...not only are humpback whales singers, but they also are composers..." T helps Molly with the word 'theorizes.'

T: Good. Alert. The Pains are scientists - a couple studying whales here. They find what?

Molly: Near Baja California, the whales sing the same song.

T: Is that a fact or an opinion. Who says fact? Some students raise hands.

T: Why do you say opinion? They listened to the recording of songs. They were the same. Is that an opinion?

Jamal: No.

T: Anyone can say by looking at the tape, I can prove to you. (*Ms. Sun, School 3*)

WL teachers were also more likely to be observed addressing the reading comprehension standards that were below grade level. In the following example, a 4th grade WL teacher had students demonstrate comprehension by identifying answers in the text, which is a 3rd grade reading comprehension objective.

T: What are some supplies that Matthew Henson had to survive?

Nathan: Snowshoes, pans.

T: Good and they had to have enough supplies for how long?

Students: 2 ½ years.

T: How long were they going to stay there?

Students: 1 year.

T: Good. Who did Matthew Henson get to help him, Paul?

Paul: The Eskimos.

T: What did they do, Vincent?

Vincent: They taught him how to speak Eskimo.

T: Good, what else Kim?

Kim: They said to not stand with your legs spread apart and to keep your arms close.

T: Good, why?

Kim: So you don't get cold.

T: Exactly. They said that if you keep your elbows close to your bodies, then you don't lose your warmth. (*Ms. Weiss, School 10*)

The literary response and analysis standard includes objectives related to the narrative analysis of grade-level-appropriate text. These standards were addressed in only 17% of all observed AAA classrooms and in 16% of all observed WL classrooms. In 2nd grade, students were observed identifying the use of rhythm, rhyme, or alliteration in poetry. In 4th grade, students were observed using plot knowledge to determine causes for character actions. These standards were more likely to be addressed in 4th grade than in 2nd grade. The following example is from a 2nd grade AAA classroom where the teacher presented a review of alliteration in the context of test prep.

T: Use the poem below to answer the questions. What do you have in the box?

Ricky: a poem.

T: Thanks. Ricky was listening to what I said. 'Mighty Monkeys.' OK, begin reading.

T walks around the room to facilitate.

T: OK, you should be done by now. OK? Mighty monkeys mill about the trees. They make music and munch on mangoes. They do as they please. Which line is an example of alliteration? Remember what alliteration is?

Clarissa: When you have single letters? Same sounding letters?

T: Good. Like silly Sam sat on the sand. Did you hear that? Most of the words start with that 'S' sound. OK, change the answer if you didn't know before.

Micaela: D?

T: Correct. "Making music and munching mangoes." OK, most start with the 'mmm' sound. On the test you can't ask me what alliteration is. You must remember. (*Mr. Alvarez, School 9*)

The writing strategies standards included objectives that focused on organization and focus, penmanship, research and technology, and evaluation and revision. These standards were addressed in 30% of all observed AAA classrooms and 43% of all observed WL classrooms. However, half of the classrooms addressing these standards were in one AAA school and two WL schools. In other words, few observed teachers actually addressed the writing strategies standards. In 2nd grade, students were observed grouping related ideas, creating readable documents with legible handwriting, and revising original drafts. In 4th grade, students were observed creating multiple-paragraph compositions, writing in cursive, and revising original drafts. The research and technology objectives, which require 2nd students to understand the purpose of reference texts and 4th grade students to use reference texts, were not observed. These standards were addressed equally poorly in 2nd grade and 4th grade classrooms. The following is an example from a 2nd grade WL classroom where the teacher worked with individual students on editing their writing assignments.

T: You are going to work on your writing.

Rosa: Is this a new paragraph?

T: 'My sister and...' What do you have to do here?

Rosa: Indent!

T whispers writing suggestion to Rosa and Christina.

T: Listen what do you hear? Slip-pery.

Christina: Two p's.

T: And we are going to end the sentence like that. Hold up, I'm not done checking it. 'My dad did tricks.' What kind of tricks? Magic tricks? Okay, so what do we need in the end?

Christina: -ed

T: Okay, beautiful. Garden, spell garden.

Christina: g-a-r-d-e-n

T reads Jessica's paper.

T: One day I went to Disneyland. Is this a name of a place?

Jessica: Yes

T: So what to we need to do?

Jessica: Capitalize. (*Mr. Ayala, School 5*)

The writing applications standards call for students to use the writing strategies standards to write brief narratives and friendly letters (2nd grade) or narratives, responses to literature, information reports, or summaries (4th grade). These standards were observed in a higher proportion of WL classrooms. While these standards were addressed in 23% of all observed AAA classrooms, they were addressed in 43% of all observed WL classrooms. However, this does not mean that these standards were emphasized in all of the sample schools. Of all teachers who addressed these standards, 70% were observed in only two AAA and two WL schools. These standards were addressed equally in 2nd grade and 4th grade classrooms. The following example is from a 2nd grade WL classroom where the teacher led students through a writing exercise.

T and students read the Student Model.

T We are going to write a personal narrative. Since our unit is about courage, I want you to write about a time when you showed courage. What is the first stage of writing?

Students: Thinking about ideas.

T: Good. You'll be a much better writer if you think about what you want to write about first. Take your paper and write your name. I see a number of people who want to earn a class dollar today.

T uses the overhead projector transparency of the sheet:

Writing Ideas Genre: Personal Narrative Audience: Classmates Purpose: Courage

T tells students to stay on topic.

T writes student-generated examples on transparency.

1. camping 2. haunted house 3. rode a horse 4. Indiana Jones ride

T: Do I have to think of 5 things/times?

Students: No.

T: You can think of more than 5 or you can think of less than 5. I will give you time to share your ideas later. Take out your pencils. What do you do if you don't know how to spell a word?

Students: Sound it out.

T: Now you should be thinking and writing your ideas.

T puts on a classical music CD on very low volume. It plays as students are working. (*Ms. Tyler, School 1*)

The written and oral English language conventions standards include objectives designed to address sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. In 2nd grade, students were observed distinguishing between complete and incomplete sentences, identifying parts of speech, using commas and quotation marks, capitalizing proper nouns, and spelling

irregular words (e.g., was, said, and why) correctly. In 4th grade, students were observed using simple and compound sentences, identifying and using irregular verbs and adverbs, capitalizing names of organizations and the first word in quotations, and spelling roots and inflections correctly. Table 11 shows the percentage of AAA and WL classrooms that were observed addressing each type of written and oral English language conventions standard. A higher proportion of WL classrooms were observed addressing sentence structure, capitalization, and spelling while a higher proportion of AAA classrooms were observed addressing the grammar standards. The AAA and WL classrooms emphasized punctuation standards in similar proportions. With the exception of grammar, which was addressed equally in 2nd and 4th grade, all written and oral English language conventions standards were more likely to be observed in 2nd grade classrooms.

Table 11. Percentage of observed AAA and WL classrooms addressing the written and oral English language conventions standards.

	Sentence Structure	Grammar	Punctuation	Capitalization	Spelling
AAA (n = 43)	33%	60%	49%	21%	26%
WL (n = 23)	48%	52%	48%	26%	48%

The listening and speaking strategies standards include objectives aimed at comprehension and organization and delivery of oral communication. In addition, 4th grade students are expected to engage in analysis and evaluation of oral media communication. These standards were addressed in nearly the same proportion of AAA and WL classrooms (40% and 43% of all observed classrooms, respectively). In 2nd grade, students were observed asking for clarification, paraphrasing information shared orally by others, and retelling stories. In 4th grade, students were observed summarizing ideas and supporting evidence presented in oral messages and using details and anecdotes to explain and clarify information. In the following example from a 4th grade AAA classroom, students try to persuade one another about length of the school week. During the lesson, students were called upon to summarize the arguments.

T: OK, listen to the reader and see if they persuade you to believe what they want you to. Did they? What reasons did they use to persuade you?

Lena: More days to study.

T: So you're persuading teachers and parents?

Lena: yes.

James: More trips.

Ricky: More trips with parents.

T: OK, see how you can persuade. Frank, what's the whole speech about?

Frank: I think it's bad to have 5 days of school and 2 days of no school. I think kids should have more breaks.

T: Why? Can you tell us why?

Frank: Because it makes us tired.

T: OK, let's go with this idea. What can we say about students being tired?

Come on. Why is that a good argument?

Soledad: If we're tired, we can't study good?

T: Well.

Soledad: Well.

T: Frank?

Frank: I think it's unfair because sometimes there's too much pressure.

T: Anyone pick another topic?

Paula: I think we should have school 5 days a week because school is good for kids and we should learn.

T: Were you persuaded?

Students: Yes.

T: OK, next.

Yolanda: I think kids shouldn't live in school because they should have fun.

School is not fun and it's unfair.

T: What's your main idea?

Yolanda: That kids should not live in school.

T: OK, that needs to be the topic sentence. (*Ms. O'Connell, School 9*)

The speaking applications standards focused on making narrative presentations. In 2nd grade, students were expected to recount experiences or present stories. In 4th grade, students were expected to make different types of presentations, deliver oral summaries, or recite poetry. Few teachers were observed addressing these standards. Only 14% of all observed AAA classrooms and 4% of all observed WL classrooms had activities that focused on the speaking application standards.

Instructional delivery differed between the two types of schools. There were more instances of student-teacher interaction concerning each of the standards groups in the WL schools. However, as in math, AAA teachers were more likely to engage students in discussion while WL teachers were more likely to use questioning. This would lead to fewer overall

interactions, but more meaningful and dynamic instructional conversation, in the AAA schools. In the following example from a 4th grade AAA classroom, the teacher was leading a discussion of survival skills with students in the context of the stories being read during ELA.

T: What have you learned from me that you might be able to use later on?
Juan: I forgot the name. It's the one that you make a triangle.
T: Is it with math? Does anyone remember the triangle?
Students: The balance.
T draws a scale, which represents an equation. What's on the left has to be the same as the right side.
T: This is a very important skill...So, in order to survive you need to know what others have taught you. You never know what...
Samantha: McGraw...and the Big Wind.
T: What made that story different?
Jaime: Because they had to survive a storm.
T: Do we agree it was different?
Students: Yes.
T: How?
Geoffrey tries to answer, but doesn't know.
T: Can you describe it?
Geoffrey: Big storm.
T: Do you remember the characters? Geoffrey doesn't remember.
T: Were the characters different?
Geoffrey: There were kids in other stories.
T: Who can help Geoffrey out?
Joshua: It was funny.
Angelica: It was fake.
T: What do we call this? T is holding her hand up high.
Geoffrey: Folktale.
Maria: Tall tale.
T: Remember that tall tales are fiction that exaggerates. Could a bunny fly up in the sky?
Students: No.
T: A lot of things that happened were funny, but couldn't happen. How did they survive? How did the characters deal with the problem?
Juan: By putting biscuits in the door.
T: That was funny because the biscuits were so hard.
Manuel: By using a sense of humor.
T: They're making fun of the situation. Instead of [getting scared], they are using humor. That's an important skill you need to learn. Sometimes when you're nervous what happens to your thinking?
Jason: Can't think.
T: Do you have an example?
Jason: I was nervous to call my cousin. I was sweating.

T: Good example. He needed to talk to his cousin he didn't know that well. He started to sweat. He couldn't think of what to say. Very good example. (*Ms. Velasquez, School 3*)

The following is from a 4th grade WL class that was working of the same OCR survival unit. The teacher mostly gave students questions to answer, which led to an unfocused discussion.

T: We're using the strategies. I want you to turn to page 330 in your [OCR] books.

T turns on the overhead.

T: Let's look at these clues. What was the first clue that someone had? I'm going to wait. I don't want to hear your shouting, I want to hear you whispering. Students (reading the transparency): They explored the Arctic.

T: How do we know that?

Students: The title.

Students read the prompt on the transparency and T asks the students about their work.

T: When we read Ann Frank it was a different type of survival. Next one.

Ryan: He had made other trips with Robert Peary.

T: I think they went to other places. What are some other biographies?

Alicia: Birth of a baby food.

T: It really wasn't a biography. A biography is a true, story of someone's life. The last one.

Students (reading the transparency): One of his friends fell in a crevasse and died.

T: What's a crevasse?

Ss: It's a hole in the rock. (*Ms. Roper, School 6*)

In line with instructional delivery, the types of instructional activities observed in the different types of schools also differed. AAA teachers were more likely to lead more dynamic activities. WL teachers were more likely to give students assignments to complete individually or in small groups without stating a purpose. The following examples are continuations of the above activities from the survival unit. In the AAA classroom, students contributed to the development of a list of survival techniques that elicited student prior knowledge. The teacher even used a student's primary language to contextualize vocabulary.

T gets out a large piece of paper to make a list.

T: How should we title our chart?

Aida: Survival techniques.

T: When can you apply survival techniques?

Salma: When you're in a bad situation.

T: But chances are very low that you'll get be lost in the desert. What's something that's likely that you'll have to apply survival techniques?

Juan: Get lost in the store.

Manuel: Because when I see the games, I start looking, and then I have to go back to where I was.

T: Good skill. What's another thing?

Gloria: When I was in Mexico, we went to see...My mom went to hide...I thought I was lost. T: Any other things?

Jason: I got lost at a horse race. We were betting.

T: You were betting?

Paul: No, my friend's dad was.

T: Ok, somewhere else you might need to survive.

Jason: After an earthquake. If your mom get's hurt.

T: Thank you. That's a good one.

...

T: So now let's look at vocabulary words. Are we ready?

Students get out paper.

T: Who wants to read the first one?

Juan: Tidal.

Darlene has trouble reading Unconscious.

T: That's a long word. What can you do?

Tina: Break it into syllables.

T: Good job.

...

T: Do you know what 'unconscious' means?

Jason: Like in Spanish. Conciente.

T: "Está conciente? What does that mean?"

Jason: Like you can't move.

T: No, conciente is the same as conscious. A lot of times that helps. English is a borrowed language. It's borrowed a lot from Spanish. Is everyone here conscious?

Students: Yes.

T: How do you know you're conscious? To be conscious means to be aware of what's going on around you - to be awake. Are you unconscious, Guillermo?

Guillermo: No

T: How do you know?

Guillermo: I can move.

T reads sentence: 'Although the patient was unconscious, his family still talked to him.' What does that mean?

Cindy: The patient was hurt, but could move still.

T: Why were they talking to him?

Cindy: They thought he would wake up and start talking to them.

T: Right.

Soledad: In novellas.

Juan: Oh, yeah, in novellas, this woman was asleep...they kept talking to her.

T: So they showed to you, the viewer, the woman is unconscious. I'm glad you're getting something out of watching soaps, but you don't watch them everyday, do you?

Students: No. (*Ms. Velazquez, School 3*)

In the WL classroom, students answered summary questions in groups while the teacher monitored. No explanation about the assignment's purpose was given. The teacher also interacted with her students less than the AAA teacher.

T: Okay with your groups you're going to ask a question for page 334, everyone has to have a question or you're not going to get credit. And you're going to have to have sentences, and they have to be complex sentences.

T moves students around into groups.

T: A question for page 334 and a short summary for page 335.

Students get into their groups and begin to work. Students write in notebooks.

They write their own questions, but help each other as they do so. The groups have approximately 5 students.

Ryan: What happened first?

Joshua: First the men ...

Joshua becomes inaudible over the talking in the room.

Students in his group agree and write down what Joshua says. There is a dispute over how many sentences in the summary.

Joshua go to ask T.

T: There is a dispute, I said that there had to be two sentences, but it can be complex sentences like after the women chew the fur, they sew it and make clothes.

Students write the sentence down.

T: You have to summarize the whole page, not just the first paragraph.

Students continue to work and T circulates, making sure that they are doing the assignment correctly.

T: How many groups are finished?

Half of the students raise hands.

T: How many groups can finish in one more minute?

Most students raise their hands.

T: Okay, one more minute.

Students rush to finish the work. T takes down a poster paper and sets up.

T: I will start with a question from page 334.

Ryan: Why did they leave Matthew Henson?

T: Who can answer that question?

Sam: They were finding Eskimos.

T: What is it?

Sam: So he could finish the wood house.

T: And over in RafaELs group?

Rafael: How did the earth's rotation affect the weather?

T: Is that in the book?

Students: No

T: It has to be answered in the story. You could have asked the question about the ship, but I don't know about why, I'm just thinking that you could say why

did the expedition leave there in July. You're asking why could the ship only get through the ice in the summer, and the answer is already there, because it's summer. (*Ms. Roper, School 6*)

Summary

AAA teachers were more likely to state that OCR was an appropriate curriculum for their students. They indicated that they were able to adapt their instruction to address the needs of all students. WL teachers were more likely to view OCR is rigid, overly structured and, therefore, inappropriate.

Overall, the WL schools were more likely than the AAA schools to address the ELA standards. A higher proportion of WL classrooms addressed word analysis, writing strategies, writing applications, and written and oral English language conventions standards while a higher proportion of AAA schools addressed the reading comprehension standards. WL classrooms were also more likely to address the reading comprehension standards below the appropriate grade level independent of the reviewing and reteaching embedded in OCR. The AAA and WL schools addressed the literary response and analysis and listening and speaking strategies standards in equivalent proportions.

Effective Title I ELA instruction should include explicit instruction in reading and writing and differentiated instruction. This explicit instruction should be focused on letter-sound correspondence and vocabulary development, especially in the context of reading for meaning (Snow, et al., 1998). While this kind of explicit instruction was evident in both types of schools, it was more likely to be observed in the AAA classrooms. WL classrooms were more likely to address the ELA standards, but the AAA classrooms were more likely to be engaged in dynamic instruction. WL teachers had more interactions with students focused on the standards, but the interaction in the AAA classrooms was more meaningful, particularly in reading comprehension. AAA teachers led discussions and were clearer about instructional objectives. WL teachers drilled students with questions and gave them more assignments to be completed individually. They were also less likely to explain the objectives of the lesson. Differentiated instruction in ELA instruction was also more likely to be observed in the AAA classrooms.

EL Instruction

ELs are one of the subgroups considered in the determination of a school's AYP. If a school has a critical mass of ELs, it must meet participation and performance criteria for them in

both ELA and math. All sample schools had EL criteria to meet. While all schools met their EL math criteria, only the AAA schools were able to meet their EL ELA criteria. To determine EL instructional strategies in each type of school, classroom instruction and interventions outside the school were observed. Additionally, administrators and teachers were interviewed about the types of instructional strategies and interventions used with ELs.

Teachers indicated that they used a variety of strategies for EL instruction inside the classroom. Both AAA and WL teachers claimed that they differentiated their instruction to address EL needs. AAA teachers were more likely to indicate that they would work one-on-one with students during IWT. WL teachers were more likely to note that they worked with students in small groups. However, AAA teachers were more likely to be observed working with students both one-on-one during IWT and in small groups than WL teachers.

Administrators in the TAS schools indicated that they hired bilingual paraprofessionals to assist in the classroom. Paraprofessionals were not observed providing explicit differentiated instruction focused on EL needs. However, they were observed providing differentiated instruction to students. Students were also used as an instructional resource in the sample schools. AAA and WL teachers were just as likely to claim that they would pair a recent arrival (often at ELD 1 or 2) with a higher-level EL during instruction. This was done to provide translation to the recent arrival. Student pairing during ELA was observed more often in WL classrooms. Student pairs often were observed reading to each other.

AAA and WL teachers were also just as likely to claim that they used students' primary language, most often Spanish, in the classroom. However, more primary language usage was observed in the WL schools in both ELA and math. Students in the WL classrooms were more likely to speak to teachers in Spanish. Teachers in the WL classrooms were also more likely to respond in Spanish. Given the number of ELD 1 students in the WL schools, these findings are expected. Most of the observed Spanish-language discussion between teachers and students was focused on classroom management or clarification, as seen in the following example. A teacher was reprimanding a student for putting puzzle pieces in his mouth. After the reprimand, the teacher explained why the word "maybe" must be used when discussing fossils.

T: Think about puzzle pieces like...Dámelo! Te dije que no estuvieras jugando.

Michael: He put it in his mouth.

T: Yuck, then throw it away. I don't want it in my hand.

Jaime throws the puzzle piece away.

T: In order for bones to become fossils the bones must be covered quickly. Why do we have to say ‘maybe’ that’s what happened?

Jaime: Because no sabemos.

T: Right, nobody was there who can tell us what happened we just use the bones [and] the skeletons. (*Mr. Menendez, School 5*)

Even though the WL teachers were more likely to use student primary language in the classroom, there was still very little Spanish spoken. Most of the incidents of primary language usage were observed in only three AAA classrooms and three WL classrooms.

Explicit ELD instruction, in the form of *Into English!* lessons, was also observed and documented. Administrators from nine of the sample schools indicated that *Into English!* was offered to ELs in the classroom. However, ELD instruction was observed in only 8 classrooms, which represents 12% of the total number of classrooms observed. ELD instruction occurred in two AAA schools and two WL schools. It was seen in three 2nd grade classrooms and five 4th grade classrooms. *Into English!* was commonly used at only one WL school, where three classrooms were observed using it. ELD lessons are supposed to last for thirty minutes. The eight observed ELD lessons lasted for an average of 27.5 minutes, which is close to the expected lesson duration of 30 minutes. During these lessons, teachers used *Into English!* materials and realia to emphasize vocabulary development, as can be seen in the following example from a AAA 2nd grade classroom.

T shows cards with pictures on them to the students who raise their hands and call out the items in unison.

Students: Spatula. Watering Can. Knife. Spoon. Paint Bucket. Broom.

T: OK this is a broom.

Thomas: Yeah but there’s no stick.

T: That’s OK. It is still a broom.

T asks Michael to retrieve the broom from across the classroom. He gets it for her and she shows the whole class.

T: You see? This is the broom and this is the broomstick. This is how I fly home every night.

Students, paying attention to the class activity, giggle.

T is showing cards to students and they are calling out the items.

Students: Chopsticks. Mop.

T: OK, I’m going to need some volunteers.

T uses girls’ hair as an example of mops.

T: Brittany, Frances, and Jeanie have hair that look like mops, see?

T continues to read cards.

Students: Tape Measure.

T discusses several uses of a tape measure.

Thomas: Yeah, but there are other ways to use it, too.

T: You're right. Thomas is right. There are many, many ways to use them but we need to finish this right now. I'm going to give you each a card and you'll group yourselves according to the tool you have. I'm going to give you these cards and you'll group yourselves like that with the tools that you think go together. Please be careful and do not fold the cards because I will need them for next year.

T passes out cards to students on the floor. Students get up and organize themselves into groups while talking to and playing with one another.

T: You have one minute so let's go.

Students approach T with questions.

T: Don't talk to *me*. Get into your groups.

T: Do you need more time?

Students: Yes.

T: OK, one more minute.

Students are still trying to place themselves in groups.

Thomas (to Brittany): No, we're indoor tools and you have an outdoor tool.

T: Times Up! (*Ms. Rai, School 7*)

One possible reason for the lack of use of an explicit ELD curriculum is teacher perception. Approximately one-third of interviewed teachers indicated that *Into English!* was inappropriate for their students. The most common reason cited by teachers was that the curriculum's objectives were set too low for most ELs. Nearly one-third of interviewed teachers indicated that they used the curriculum because it was appropriate for ELD 1 students. However, *Into English!* usage was seen in far fewer classrooms.

Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) was cited by teachers in all sample schools as an additional strategy for EL instruction. SDAIE is intended to provide content knowledge to ELs, particularly students with intermediate to advanced knowledge of English (e.g., ELD 3-5 students) (Hayes, et al., 2004). During analysis, SDAIE strategies were categorized as being either visual, verbal/linguistic, bodily/kinesthetic, or musical/rhythm. Visual strategies included the use of visual images, print-rich visuals, multimedia, and realia. Verbal/linguistic strategies included the use of comprehension aids (e.g., story maps or graphic organizers), listening aids (e.g., echo reading or choral reading), or writing aids (e.g., poetry or dialectic journals). Bodily/kinesthetic strategies included the use of gestures, Total Physical Response (TPR), and hands-on activities. Musical/rhythm strategies included the use of singing, chanting, or dancing. The above strategies were considered SDAIE if the primary purpose was to provide contextual knowledge of English.

There were equivalent instances of all types of SDAIE strategies in both the AAA and the WL schools. Teachers were most likely to use visual strategies. They showed students pictures from books and used realia to illustrate vocabulary in context. Teachers also used many verbal/linguistic strategies. The most common verbal/linguistic strategy employed were graphic organizers, mostly in the form of Thinking Maps®, seemed to be used as comprehension aids. Common bodily kinesthetic strategies were TPR and hands-on activities. For example, a 2nd grade teacher in School 4 called students to the front of the room to represent the layers of the earth that are shaken during an earthquake.

Six more students come up to the front of the class

T: Build me layers, diagonal layers, more layers. The bottom layer is ocean, then comes sand, rock, dirt, grass, and trees. (*Ms. Madigan, School 4*)

Few instances of musical/rhythm usage were observed. In all instances, songs were used to teach vocabulary.

It was expected that more SDAIE strategies would be observed in AAA schools because they had higher proportions of ELD 3-5 students, who are supposed to benefit more from English language contextualization. However, equivalent usage of these strategies was observed in both types of schools. It is possible that this equivalence occurred because, although the AAA schools had higher proportions of upper-level ELD students, the WL schools had more ELD students overall. The increased number of ELs could be seen as a reason for equivalent SDAIE usage in the WL schools.

Reclassification rates also differed by type of school in 2004-05, with the AAA schools reclassifying a higher percentage of students than the WL schools. The AAA schools reclassified, on average, 11.1% of their ELs while the WL schools, reclassified, on average, 5.0% of their ELs. However, the WL schools had a significantly higher proportion of ELD 1 students while the AAA schools had a significantly higher proportion of ELD 3-5 students. The upper-level ELD students were closer to being considered for reclassification than the lower-ELD students. Therefore, it would be expected that the AAA schools would reclassify more ELs.

Administrators indicated that ELs also received assistance in interventions outside the school day. Administrators from five of the AAA schools and three of the WL schools noted that ELs participated in before school or after school interventions. The content provided was

similar to the other interventions offered by the schools—before school interventions focused on preteaching and after school interventions focused on tutoring. Administrators from the multitrack sample schools also stated that intersession ELD interventions were also provided.

Administrators in the AAA schools also indicated that differentiated instruction was provided during intervention sessions. This kind of differentiation was not observed in the WL schools. In School 7, ELs were observed during two ELA intervention sessions receiving differentiated instruction. In both sessions, lower-level ELs and higher-level ELs were separated into two groups. The same content from an *Into English!* lesson on “Cinder-Elly” was being presented by the teacher. However, instruction was modified for the lower-level ELs. In the following example, the teacher presented different aspects of the name, “Cinder-Elly,” to the students. The first group was made up of lower-level ELs and the second group was higher-level ELs. The teacher emphasized the capitalization of the name with the lower-level ELs and the sound spelling of the name with the higher-level ELs.

T: Fairy godmother. You can write it with me.
T and students write ‘Fairy Godmother on their Thinking Maps®.
T: Okay, who is another character?
Miguel: Cinder-Elly.
T: Cinder-Elly. Remember, it's Cinder-Elly. Two capitals. What else?

T writes ‘Cinder-Elly’ on the board.
T: Why is this a sausage card and not a camera card?
T points to ‘C’ in ‘Cinder-Elly.’
Xochitl: Because of the ‘i.’
T: Please use complete sentences.
Xochitl: It is a sausage card because of the ‘i’.
T: Why is this a long e?
T points to ‘Y’ in ‘Cinder-Elly.’
Guillermo: Because...
T: It is a long e because?
Guillermo: It is a long e because you can see it from there.
T: It's a long e because it has two consonants. (*Ms. Bhakta, School 7*)

Regarding attendance at the ELD Institutes, about one half of the study schools (4 AAA and 2 WL) initiated ELD professional development for their third grade teachers in October, 2005, and one AAA and one WL school began their professional development in January 2006.

However we did not observe third grade classrooms. The fourth-grade ELD Institutes began in summer 2006, after the observations for the study were complete.

Waivered-To-Basic (WB) instruction was offered in two of the WL schools, although one school only had one third grade WB class. None of the AAA schools offered WB instruction.

Summary

Inside the classroom, teachers were observed differentiating instruction to meet EL needs. AAA teachers were more likely to be observed providing one-on-one assistance and small group instruction than WL teachers. Pairing recent arrivals with more advanced students during ELA was more likely to be observed in WL schools. Little primary language instruction was observed. Also, only eight classrooms were observed providing explicit ELD instruction and only one WL school appeared to be implementing *Into English!* with any regularity. Many teachers indicated that it was too simplistic for their students. SDAIE was used in the AAA and the WL schools with equal regularity. Although the AAA schools have a higher average reclassification rate than the WL schools, they also have more upper-level ELD students, who were more likely to be considered for reclassification.

Outside the classroom, ELs were included in intervention sessions. However, there appeared to be more differentiation in the AAA schools. ELs were observed in separate sessions receiving differentiated instruction based on ELD level.

Regarding attendance at the ELD Institutes, about one half of the study schools (4 AAA and 2 WL) initiated ELD professional development for their third grade teachers in October, 2005, and one AAA and one WL school began their professional development in January 2006. However we did not observe third grade classrooms. The fourth-grade ELD Institutes began in summer 2006, after the observations for the study were complete.

Waivered-To-Basic (WB) instruction was offered in two of the WL schools, although one school only had one third grade WB class. None of the AAA schools offered WB instruction.

SWD Delivery of Services

Students with Disabilities (SWD) are another subgroup considered in the determination of a school's AYP. If a school has a numerically significant subgroup of SWDs, it must meet participation and performance criteria for them in both ELA and math. Of the 12 sample schools, only the TAS schools had numerically significant subgroups of SWDs. Therefore, while SWD delivery of services was observed and teachers and administrators were interviewed

about SWD interventions in all sample schools, analysis focuses on the practices that existed in TAS schools.

There was evidence of tiered instruction in all sample schools. SWDs who had been mainstreamed into classrooms were observed participating in instructional activities. Other students were observed receiving pullout interventions or full instruction in Resource Specialist Program (RSP) classrooms. The most common strategies cited by administrators were teacher-led interventions inside and outside the classroom, RSP, use of student health professionals, and the Extended School Year (ESY).

Teacher-led interventions were similar to those offered to other students. In the classroom, teachers and paraprofessionals either worked one-on-one or in small groups with SWDs. In the TAS schools, teachers and paraprofessionals in the AAA schools were more likely to be observed assisting SWDs in the WL school. The following is an example of test accommodation that was observed in a AAA school. Simon and Sally, two SWDs, sit with the paraprofessional and finish their tests while the teacher works with the rest of the class.

On board:

#1 job is test

#2 cut out your 10 shamrocks

#3 color and cut out your hats

T reads these out loud as she writes them on the board

T: No extras today (referring to the art resources students will be working on after the test) so what you do is what you do. Ok, start moving. Go. Go. Go. Remember it is a test, no talking, make sure to get your pencil box back, you need your pencil and your crayons. Raise two hands up to see whose bracelet I have. Ok, you may start as soon as you have a test.

Quentin goes to back table with T.A.

T: Don't forget to write the page number and prove your answer.

Students have to use the page number as reference to where they found the answer in the book.

T: No talking to friends [and you] can't read story out loud.

Students begin work on a Brain Power test.

T is walking around assisting and monitoring.

Simon is working by himself at the back tutoring table

Students raise hands and T goes to them to assist and guide.

T.A. is correcting spelling tests at the back table and monitors and assists Simon.

Sally moves back to back table to work with T.A., who monitors.

T begins collecting tests.

T: You don't have to answer the last two questions. Get on with your art projects.

Students are working independently, finishing test, and beginning task #2 while T monitors.

Sally and Simon are still working with T.A. Simon hands his test to T. A., who begins to correct it.

T gives logistical directions re: putting divider away, chairs put back, and no seat changes.

T.A. (to Simon): 100 percent.

Simon gives a big smile, leaves the back table, and begins to work on task #2 while Sally finishes test with T.A. monitoring her. (*Ms. White, School 4*)

Such in-class interventions were not evident in the WL schools. In the following example, Maria, a SWD, comes in from the RSP classroom and joins the instructional activity. She does not receive any assistance from the teacher and has difficulty completing her work.

Maria, the inclusion student in this class, comes in and sits at a back table. She begins to work on a few math problems. She is included in math and science with this class. Margarita works on a test of multiplication. Students continue to work on the test. Maria uses a 12 X 12 multiplication table and fills in the multiplication of the numbers with the first row on top and first column on the left. Maria counts out loud as she adds numbers up from the multiplication. T works on a laptop, at one of the student's desks. She remains standing so that she can watch the students and type at the same time. T goes to work with Nathan at his desk. She takes out papers in his desk and then takes them.

Maria has nine math problems to do, she has completed four problems.

Maria stops working and stares off. T comes to Maria's desk.

T: Keep working Margarita.

Margarita resumes work immediately.

T (to class): 25 is a little confusing. When you get to 25 let me know. It's worded a little funny.

T begins to set up for the next lesson.

T: Okay I see Lincoln's hand up, just let me finish with this paper.

T goes to help him. Their conversation is inaudible. (*Ms. Jackson, School 6*)

While there were differences between TAS teacher and paraprofessional assistance in the inclusion classroom, all students in RSP classrooms received individualized instruction. RSP teachers were observed providing instruction aligned with inclusion classroom lessons. In the following example, a RSP TAS AAA teacher works with a SWD on reference books, a lesson that was also observed in the student's inclusion 4th grade classroom.

RSP and Paula go over what the reference sources are in the Daily Language.

RSP: Do you know what an atlas is?

Paula doesn't answer. RSP tells her.

RSP: Do you know what an encyclopedia is? I don't have any in this room.

Paula doesn't answer. RSP tells her.

RSP: There are volumes of them. If you wanted to find out about World War II, you could look in an encyclopedia.

RSP says that she knows Paula knows what a telephone book is. She asks if Paula knows what an almanac is. Paula doesn't.

RSP: When I want to look up a celebrity's birthday, I go to an almanac.

RSP tells Paula to read all five and they'll correct them.

RSP: What a Siberian tiger eats. If you want to know, where would you look it up? Look here. If you wanted to read up about it, where would you look? No.

RSP erases Paula's paper.

RSP: Encyclopedia. If you wanted to look up Siberian tigers you'd look in an encyclopedia. I should probably get some for my room. Ethiopia to Niger. The distance traveled between Ethiopia and Niger.

Paula continues to write. RSP looks at Paula's paper as she writes.

RSP: Uh huh (agreeing). Uh huh. (agreeing). Uh uh. (disagreeing). Okay, this one is not correct. The names of dentists in your area would be in the telephone book.

Paula erases and writes the answer.

RSP: Okay. That's it for Friday, okay.

Paula puts away her Daily Language. (*School 8*)

SWP schools were more likely to indicate that they used student health professionals or the ESY as SWD interventions. TAS schools earmarked less of their categorical and Title I budgets for school health professionals. Administrators from seven schools indicated that they used Title I funds to provide additional school health professionals. Only one of the seven schools was a TAS school. SWP schools were also more likely to indicate that SWDs were offered the ESY and summer school to help meet their needs. Only administrators from SWP schools indicated that they offer summer school as a means of extending the school year for their SWDs.

Summary

SWD delivery of services varied somewhat within the TAS schools. Teachers and paraprofessionals in the AAA schools were more likely to offer one-on-one and small group assistance to SWDs. However, students in all observed RSP classrooms, either for a pullout program or for a special day class, were being provided with individualized instruction. TAS schools did not offer as many school health professionals or an ESY to address SWD needs.

Use of Paraprofessionals

Paraprofessionals hired with Title I funds are expected to hold an AA degree, have completed two years of college, or have passed a formal assessment. In the sample schools,

paraprofessional pay constituted a large part of their overall categorical budgets (AAA-37.9%, WL-19.2%, SWP-28.1%, TAS-42.6%). While this indicates that paraprofessionals were purchased to supplement a school's core program, it does not illustrate how paraprofessionals were used. Usage of paraprofessionals in observed classrooms and teacher and administrator interviews were analyzed. This section of the report concerns only paraprofessionals involved in general classroom instruction. Paraprofessional use with special education students will be covered in the Tiered Instruction section.

Paraprofessionals were observed leading small group instruction in ten of the twelve sample schools in both ELA and math. In these classrooms, the teacher would either lead the lesson while the paraprofessional did the same with a small group of students or the teacher and the paraprofessional would each work with small groups of students. The following occurred in a WL classroom during a 2nd grade ELA lesson. The paraprofessional assisted with instruction for a small group of students and also got to work one-on-one with a student.

Students and T reading the sentence on the board: Last night I swam, I worked out, I ate, and then I slept.

On the T's board is written: Nouns I ate a pizza, bread, and a banana for lunch.
Verbs Last night, I swam, I worked out, I ate, and then I slept.

T then has students move back to their seats and turn to page 141 in their workbook.

T: Table 4 read the number 3.

Students: The girls went ice skating comma, rode bikes comma, and ate pizza.

T: I want you to separate the next one with commas on your own.

Students in the small group read the same lesson out loud. T.A. reads the answers to a question, that the T has just asked.

T: They're on the same one, and there are your answers.

T.A: Sorry.

T: It's okay.

T to class: Did you get that? There's your answers. Okay guys you may do two through five, and raise your hands when you do all five. If you need me to, let me know and we can do all five.

Students work at their desk independently.

Jason talks to Andrea.

T.A. works with the students in the small group. Not all of the Ss work on the assignment in the small group, and the T.A. works with Ginny. (*Ms. Chen, School 6*)

It was more common to observe paraprofessionals working one-on-one with students, most often during individual work time. This was observed in seven of the AAA schools and

two of the WL schools. Paraprofessionals were far more likely to work one-on-one with students in the AAA schools than in the WL schools in both ELA and math. One-on-one assistance was observed in twenty-one classrooms in seven different AAA schools and in only five classrooms in three different WL schools. One-on-one assistance was also observed in more 2nd grade classrooms than 4th grade classrooms and more in ELA than in math. Overall, in both types of schools, paraprofessionals were observed in a higher proportion of 2nd classrooms than 4th grade classrooms.

In the observed AAA classrooms, paraprofessionals worked with students in several ways. A common task was keeping students focused on the task at hand by either reprimanding students or providing them with directions. The following occurred in School 6:

T.A. tells Jackie that she doesn't need to do the concepts and personal response part. T.A. tells her to do the rough draft. Jackie gets out nice paper. T.A. tells her she can use rough draft paper. Jackie decides to keep the nice paper. (*School 6*)

Most of the one-on-one assistance provided by paraprofessionals was focused on meeting individual student needs. During individual work time, the teacher and paraprofessional would circulate and work with students who needed help. One-on-one assistance also occurred during whole class instruction when the paraprofessional would work with individual students while the teacher worked with the rest of the class. The paraprofessional from a AAA school in the following example is working with a student on reading during individual work time.

T.A. calls Jason to the table for reading.
Jason reads, He had a nice shell. Still comma.
T.A.: When do you say comma when you read? Never right?
Jason: Still, he was not happy...His mother told him...
T.A.: Jason, try to read a bit faster. Sound it out ok?
Jason: ...clam ate his slipper...
T.A. corrected it to 'supper.'
Jason: ...even thought...
T.A. corrected it to 'though.'
T.A.: It's 'ough' like 'O' like in the long 'O'.
Jason: Even though he wasn't hungry. He kept on thinking about where we would like love live without his shell...He would love live in a shore.
T.A. corrected to 'shoe'.
Jason: He would live in a bootle.
T.A.: Sound it out.
Jason: Bottle. (*School 2*)

Paraprofessionals were also observed engaging in non-instructional tasks, such as grading tests, copying pages from textbooks, walking students to the office, and picking up students from the playground. They circulated in classrooms without providing assistance during individual work time and testing. Paraprofessionals were observed performing such non-instructional tasks in all sample schools where paraprofessionals were observed.

Teachers in the sample schools expressed that they had difficulty with utilizing paraprofessionals for several reasons. Schools can hire paraprofessionals for two, three, four, or six hours. According to the categorical and Title I budget analysis, six of the sample schools with paraprofessional pay budgets earmarked the most money for three- or four-hour paraprofessionals. Only two sample schools, both AAA, spent most of their paraprofessional funds on six-hour paraprofessionals. Two sample schools spent equivalent amounts of their categorical funds on three- and six-hour paraprofessionals. Teachers in both the AAA and WL schools indicated that paraprofessionals are rotated to different classrooms throughout the day. It may be difficult for teachers to have paraprofessionals assist with instruction when they have to divide their time between several classrooms.

We get TAs only an hour every day, so it's limited in how much help we get. Mostly their time is spent working with individual students. We're in the middle of a lesson when my TA comes in, so I can't have him work with groups. I try to target specific skills that students need to work on, and also have him work with recent arrivals. (*Ms. Chen, School 3*)

[The T.A. will] work with individual students on skills, or work in a group, sit and monitor because he's there to help and guide kids with extra help. Sometimes he's just walking up and down [the aisle]. The T.A. only comes in once a week. (*Ms. Stein, School 8*)

Several administrators also indicated that the current definition of a “highly qualified” paraprofessional makes it difficult for schools to hire them. According to NCLB, paraprofessionals must have completed at least two years of higher educational study, must possess an AA degree, or must pass a formal assessment. It becomes difficult to retain paraprofessionals with these qualifications, especially for three-hour positions, when they can get other jobs that offer more hours.

We don't have a plethora of TA's but the ones we have are hired for 6hours and not the usual three hours. That's mostly because we have full day kindergarten, which has helped because NCLB has made it harder to find TA's to work for

only three hours since not very many are qualified to do that job. (*Mr. Johnson, School 10*)

Summary

Paraprofessionals were observed in most AAA and WL schools. There was little small group instruction observed in either ELA or math. When it was observed, paraprofessionals were often slowing down the pace of instruction so it could be easily understood by a smaller group of students. One-on-one student assistance was more common and paraprofessionals in AAA schools were much more likely to provide this service. They also engaged in non-instructional activities, such as grading assignments, walking students around campus, preparing instructional materials, and monitoring student progress. It is possible that the length of time of paraprofessional assignments, rotation to different classrooms, and the NCLB definition of a “highly qualified” paraprofessional are all contributing to paraprofessional activities in the AAA and WL classrooms.

Interventions/Partnerships Outside the School Day

Schools receiving Title I funds are also expected to provide services that supplement instruction. These interventions are expected to occur outside of the school day are intended to extend learning time. Teachers and administrators were interviewed about how students were selected for the interventions, when they occurred and who led them, the nature of the interventions, and what types of support they received from their local districts. In addition, intervention sessions were observed at every sample school.

Administrators in both the AAA and WL schools indicated that they use a variety of strategies to determine student selection. Students were selected for the program based on class grades, scores on periodic assessments in both ELA and math, scores on the CST, and teacher recommendations. In many sample schools, students who did not advance a level on the CST and who were not yet at Proficient or above were given priority in selection. ELs were selected based on the above criteria as well as California English Language Development Test (CELDT) scores and ELD portfolio indicators. Most administrators indicated that they made sure to use LAUSD’s criteria for determining who gets selected to receive intervention services.

Since TAS schools only provide services to specific students, it is important to determine if their selection criteria differ from the SWP schools. There are no differences in student selection criteria between the TAS and the SWP schools. Administrators from three AAA

schools (two SWP and one TAS) also noted that parents can request that their students be placed in the interventions.

Administrators at seven sample schools indicated that they offered readymade programs to its students. While these programs appeared to provide enrichment to students in AAA schools, they provided tutoring in the WL schools. For example, AAA schools offered prepackaged programs in reading, science, and art enrichment while WL schools offered such programs that provided tutoring in reading and science. These interventions were implemented by individual schools and none were used by more than one school.

There were several interventions that were common across multiple schools. Six sample schools, five AAA and one WL school, offer homework clubs. These are operated after school and are meant to provide assistance for students having trouble completing their homework. Three schools, two AAA and one WL, indicated that they sought out partnerships with outside organizations, such as local businesses or homeowner associations. The schools receive money from the partnerships to provide extra tutoring.

The most common form of intervention in the sample schools is the teacher-led academic intervention session that is conducted either before school, after school, or on Saturdays. All sample schools indicated that they had this kind of intervention in place. These interventions are usually monitored by administrators and are run by administrators, teachers, or long-term substitute teachers. All of the observed intervention sessions were organized by grade and were run by a classroom teacher. Students were primarily organized into whole groups for intervention instruction. Most observed interventions covered ELA content but several did cover math content.

The before school interventions consisted of preteaching in both the AAA and the WL schools. However, the content was different in the observed intervention sessions. In a AAA school, nineteen 2nd graders were being instructed on making connections in reading comprehension while ten 2nd graders in a WL school were being asked to identify long vowel sounds.

T: What is clarify? John?

John: It's like when you don't know what something means and you ask.

T: Yes, so you'll raise your hands and you'll say Ms. Torres what does this mean?

T informs the class that they'll be doing all of the above activities with the passage that they'll be reading this morning.

T: Making a connection has to do with relating an idea in the story to something they already know or something they've done before. That way, they can understand the story in a better way. Now browse the selection. What does browse mean?

Jaime: To look at the pictures.

T: Yes, to browse means to look. Why would we want to browse? Cindy?

Cindy: To get ideas.

T: Yes, we look at the title and the pictures to get an idea of what the story could be about. Now, let's look at the pictures. What does it look like they're doing?

Guillermo: Having a party.

T: Now, how many of you have had a party or gone to party before?

All Ss raise their hands.

T: Boys and girls, guess what? You just made a connection. Now, the story could be real or fictional because I see the little girl, who could be real, but because I also see a dinosaur, it could also be fictional. (*School 2*)

Four students are now in the room.

T: It's time to begin. Everybody sit. Remember how we spell long e?

Jimmy: e, ea.

T holds up the card containing all the sounds.

T: Now take your long e cards and hold up the cards with the right now if you hear it.

T reads a list of words including spoke, flee, she, who, knew, shop. Students hold up the card when they hear the long e sound in each word. Two more students arrive and are asked to sit down on the rug. T holds up a stack of cards and students read them before saying whether or not they hear the long e.

Students: Today, no. Too, no. She, yes. Said, no. Somewhere, no. Will, no. We, yes. Water, no. What, no. Who, no. Why, no. Where, no.

T: Jimmy, you watching?

Three more students arrive late.

T: Is this hear or heard?

Students: Heard!

T: Good, ea breaks the long e rule. Ok good job. Now look at these and tell me which long e is in the word.

T flips through another stack of cards containing the following words: keep, me, each. Ss identify the long e sounds without difficulty.

T: Good, now let's think of some words that have the long e sound, but doesn't have the long e in the spelling. Anybody?

No one answers.

T: Rock-ah-bye...

Students: Baby!

T: Good, what else? Today is what day?

Students: Thursday!

T: But Thursday ends in -ay.

Students: Candy!

T: Right, Candy Thursday. Anything else?

Jenny: Any.

Jimmy: Cranky!

T: Good, ok. Hi Joseph, come on in. Ok, Tuesday, we left off with long o. How do we make a long o? When it's an open ending like toe, how do we spell it?

Thomas: Oe?

T: Right and how do we get the long o on boat?

Thomas: Oa?

T: Good, let's do some blending. (*School 10*)

After school interventions were also common in both types of schools. Aside from homework clubs, teachers and long-term subs were reteaching and giving students opportunities to practice their skills. Like the before school interventions, these sessions were often made up of larger classes of students and were organized by grade. In several of the observed after school sessions, a classroom teacher led the intervention with his or her own students. The following example is from a AAA 2nd grade classroom working on the difference between fantasy and reality and practicing reading. While most of the students are from the observed teacher's class, several are from a different class.

2:55

T: Another skill we've been working on is fantasy and reality. Does this sound familiar to students in the other class?

Students No, we did this last week.

On board:

Fantasy

Real

 ity

T: Does anyone see the base word in reality?

Students: Real.

T: Reality means things that are real. This baby wipe can fly.

Students: Fantasy.

T: T Rex had pink polka dots.

Students: Fantasy.

T hands out two sheets of paper.

3:00

T: Focus. Concentrate. You're here to practice reading.

They are going to read from *Digging up Dinosaurs*.

T: Read the title with me. T reads title and students read out loud in unison with

T. T points out that students who are reading have their index fingers under the

words and follow/track them. T and students start over, reading from the

beginning. T reads and students read along out loud in unison

T: Ok, let's go back to how fossils are made.

T reads and students read along in unison out loud. (*School 4*)

Students in several sample schools also participated in Saturday interventions. These sessions were organized by grade and consisted of mostly whole-class instruction. Teachers of these sessions also engaged in reteaching. The following example is from a WL school that had organized a Saturday intervention for its 4th grade students. It was meant to reinforce concepts from *The Diary of Anne Frank* the students were expected to learn in class.

T: We're going to start out with blending and it's related to *The Diary of Anne Frank* you've been reading in class this week. I'm going to take attendance in 15 minutes so we give everybody who's coming a chance to get here. David, will you remind me in 15 minutes? Thank you. Ok, those of you who have read it, what can you tell me about Anne Frank?

Michelle: It's about a young girl who got killed.

T: Yeah, she was about 13 years old and she lived in hiding before they found her and killed her right? Let's go over some vocabulary. What's this word? T holds up a card with ration written on it but no one tries to answer.

T: So during the time of war and there's not enough food...

Manuel: It means that you only get this little amount of food.

T: Yes, it means each family only gets a certain amount of food and what about this word?

T holds up the word quarters.

Manuel: It means rooms.

T: Good, is it the same as the quarters in money?

Students: No! (*School 10*)

While it appears that the sample schools rely on teachers and long-term subs to run the intervention programs, little categorical and Title I funds were allocated towards teacher and sub pay. It is possible that the money needed to run the interventions is coming from core program funds at the sample schools. For instance, many of the interventions cited by administrators are under the auspices of the LAUSD Beyond the Bell branch. The Emergency Immigrant Education Program (EIEP), the English Language Acquisition Program (ELAP), the Extended Learning Program, LA Bridges, Reading is Fundamental, and YS Care programs were noted by at least one administrator and all are run by Beyond the Bell. Since Beyond the Bell programs are already funded by the district, the additional categorical and Title I funds could serve as a supplement.

According to the administrators, local districts also provide some intervention support. Administrators in eight of the sample schools indicated that their local districts provide some type of financial assistance. These eight sample schools are located in six different local districts, which is an indication that this practice is widespread. The local districts provide training and/or financial assistance for the interventions. They also provide intervention coordinators, who provide monitoring help and general advice to the schools. It is possible that some extra money for the interventions is coming from the local districts.

Summary

Interventions/partnerships outside the school day existed in all sample schools. While some offered prepackaged programs that promote enrichment exercises, most interventions were run by teachers in each of the sample schools. Effective interventions should include standards-based enrichment and academic assistance of sufficient duration and intensity (U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, 2001). This was evident in the interventions offered by both types of schools. Before school, after school, and Saturday interventions were run by classroom teachers or long-term subs and are focused on academics. Students in both the SWP and the TAS schools were selected through an examination of class grades, periodic assessment scores in ELA and math, CST scores, teacher recommendations, and, for ELs, CELDT scores and ELD portfolios. Before school interventions concentrated on preteaching while during school, after school, and Saturday interventions focused on reteaching and skills practice. Most of the observed interventions covered ELA content areas. However, several covered math topics.

Considering that these interventions are mostly run by teachers and long-term subs, it would be expected that much of a school's categorical and Title I money would go to paying for teacher and substitute pay. However, only four schools earmarked over 6% of their Title I funds for it. It is possible that the sample schools received extra assistance from both Beyond the Bell and their local districts. If this is so, the sample schools were using their "4-Pot" monies to supplement the intervention funds already received from both Beyond the Bell and the local districts. As Title I funds were intended to supplement a school's core program, it is possible that the sample schools considered their interventions as a component of their core programs.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement is another important component of the Title I, Part A requirements. To determine the extent of parent involvement, meetings involving parents were observed in both types of schools. Teachers and administrators were also interviewed about the extent of parent involvement.

Parents were encouraged to join advisory councils, such as the English Learners Advisory Council (ELAC) and the Compensatory Education Advisory Council (CEAC), in both the AAA and the WL schools. This encouragement came during Back-to-school Night, Open House, and parent conferences. Several ELAC and CEAC meetings were observed. In them, the most common topic of discussion was the budget. Administrators and teachers would present categorical program budget information to parents. In most ELAC/CEAC meetings, few parents were present. However, two ELAC/CEAC meetings in the AAA schools had between 20 and 65 parents. In most meetings, translation services were made available. Also, parents were mostly quiet in the WL meetings while there was more conversation and discussion among parents in the AAA meetings. Additionally, administrators in five of the AAA schools indicated that participation in the school's PTA was encouraged, while this was noted in only one of the WL schools.

Parents were also encouraged to come onto campus for parent conferences. Administrators in all but one sample school noted this as a strategy to increase parent involvement. Most administrators in both types of schools noted that they try to communicate to parents that they are welcome on campus to discuss the students' progress. These conversations can take place in either the formal parent conference setting that occurs several times a year or whenever the parents feel the discussion is necessary. A principal in one of the AAA TAS schools stated that he monitors student scores and requests parent conferences when he notices that students are performing poorly. However, there was only one mention of this practice. It appears that informal parent conferences are mostly requested by parents in the sample schools.

Sample schools offered some on-campus services to parents. Parent centers were operating at four of the sample schools. Two of them were located in AAA schools and two were in the WL schools. In School 1, a WL school, the parent center opened during data collection. During meetings observed at the parent centers, parents were presented with volunteering opportunities or were recognized for their service to the school. Administrators

from three schools, two AAA and one WL, claimed that parent English classes were also being offered.

In three AAA schools, parents were observed participating in workshops designed to supplement student learning. Administrators and teachers would provide parents with strategies and books to enrich student learning in fluency, math, and science. They were also given the opportunity to practice with the strategies and ask questions of staff. While the science meeting had only four GATE parent participants, the workshops for fluency and math had between two and six dozen participants. One of the workshops was billed as “Family Math Night” and also included students.

Teachers and administrators perceived that there was limited parent involvement inside the classroom. Nearly half of all interviewed teachers stated that there was little to no parental involvement. Few teachers at both AAA and WL schools reported that parents came into the classroom. When they did volunteer, only one or two did so regularly. These parents usually read to students. Teachers at five AAA schools also noted that parents took students to the library and helped them select books. When parents volunteered for classroom activities, it was most likely to assist with the coordination of holiday parties.

The perceived level of parent involvement worried most administrators and teachers. Teachers from every sample school indicated that it was a problem. Most of these teachers noted that they thought some reasons why parents are not volunteering were busier parent work schedules and the language barrier. A bilingual teacher in a AAA school was able to communicate with parents and make them feel welcome.

I make it a point to let parents know that I’m here (I make myself very available to them). I make them comfortable by speaking to them in Spanish. Many of the Spanish speaking parents have developed a trusting relationship with me. They have expressed how good it is to be able to communicate with their child’s teacher. Some parents have also said that in the past they briefly met teachers because they could not communicate with them (*Ms. Quiñones, School 12*).

Monolingual teachers may have difficulties establishing the same type of relationship. While teachers in eleven of the twelve sample schools indicated a desire to have an open line of communication with parents, several teachers also pointed to the difficulty of doing this. According to a Mr. Kelly, a teacher at School 1, “Fifteen out of twenty students in my class are

Spanish-speaking parents. Since they do not know a lot of English it is not very useful for them to come in during the class room.”

However, when teachers were asked about what they expected from parents, they provided a range of answers that suggest an expansion of the notion that parental involvement only occurs in the classroom. Most of the AAA and the WL teachers indicated that they expected parents to support student learning at home. This could be done by reading to their children, making sure homework gets done, assisting with take-home projects, responding to phone calls or notes home, and attending formal parent conferences. Direct communication was not always possible so the teachers looked for other ways to communicate their expectations to parents.

It’s difficult for them to come here and give their time. And with the language barrier, they are intimidated. I open my arms for them to come whenever, but I don’t get much. I expect them to monitor homework at home. And for them to sign notes when needed. [for homework] I’ve had to resign to the fact they don’t like to come in. So I have communication with them without having to have them come in. With homework, they see what is assigned and are checking that it is done. I am expecting them to read with their kids and go over homework
(Mr. Fielding, School 7).

In addition, teachers also looked to parents to provide basic needs to their children, such as food, rest, and communication. According to many of the interviewed teachers, if students do not come to school ready to learn, teachers cannot teach effectively. The teachers in AAA schools were more likely to communicate these kinds of expectations to parents than the teachers in WL schools. The following are quotes from two teachers in AAA schools regarding the expectation that parents attend to basic student needs.

To have a somewhat structured home environment, be with them at least 30 minutes a day to know what is going on in their life. I want them to have a discussion about what they’re doing. Some kids are going through puberty. Some parents say that their kids have something to talk about but want to talk to me instead. Some kids live in a home where no one has discussions with them. They’re low income and often share a small space with a lot of people, so it’s hard for them to have their own space
(Ms. Chung, School 3).

I need parents to read with their kids, make sure they get enough sleep, make sure they are well fed, make sure they’re doing their homework and providing assistance where they can, get them here, and take them to the library to read
(Ms. Madigan, School 4).

Summary

Parents were encouraged to join advisory councils to contribute to budget discussions or to participate in workshops either to benefit themselves (i.e., English classes) or to benefit their children. Few parent centers were observed to be operating. While observing these meetings, it became clear that parent participation differed between the AAA and the WL schools. At the AAA schools, parents contributed more and participated in hands-on activities. At the WL schools, parents often said little and simply nodded to indicate assent. Even though participation was limited, it appeared that parents were given a larger collaborative role in the AAA schools than in the WL schools.

Administrators and teachers perceived that the level of parent involvement was too low. They indicated that it could be related to both the language barrier and busy work schedules. Most of the interviewed teachers and administrators called for increased parental involvement. No one who was interviewed indicated that parent involvement was at an acceptable level. Effective strategies should expand the notion of parent involvement to include activities centered in the home (U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, 2001). Even though these were seen as barriers for involvement, teachers in both types of schools indicated that they have expanded the definition of parent involvement to include activities outside the classroom. This expanded notion of parent involvement includes making sure students are ready to learn when they come to school in the morning by reading to students, checking homework, making sure they are fed, and making sure they get enough rest. The AAA schools were more likely to have this expanded notion of parent involvement than the WL schools.

Leadership Climate and Culture

School leadership is an important variable to examine when determining effective school-level practices. Schools with a collaborative leadership structure tend to produce higher-achieving Latino students than schools with a non-collaborative leadership structure (Barela, Fernandez, & Hayes, 2005). A collaborative leadership structure exists when administrators and teachers jointly take responsibility for student achievement. Teachers buy into the principal's school vision and work to promote it. Teachers and administrators have positive relationships with one another. Effective administrators also utilize resources outside the school to improve student achievement, such as resources from the local district. To determine the leadership

climate and culture of each of the sample schools, administrators and teachers were interviewed and professional development meetings were observed.

Table 12 displays the AAA and WL schools characterized as Collaborative and Non-collaborative. Nearly all of the AAA schools were determined to be Collaborative while nearly all of the WL schools were determined to be Non-collaborative. However, Schools 9 and 5 were exceptions. School 9's leadership structure had more in common with the Non-collaborative schools while School 5 had more in common with the Collaborative schools. In both types of schools, administrators were able to articulate common visions for their schools. In all cases, the school's vision was to increase student achievement by holding students to high standards.

When asked about the monitoring of alignment between curriculum, instruction, and content standards, administrators from both types of schools indicated that it was done in several ways. Inside the classroom, monitoring was done with instructional observations, demonstration lessons, and lesson plan development. Outside the classroom, alignment was monitored through professional development and student assessment data analysis. Administrators from both types of schools also indicated that they did not worry too much about alignment because the district's curricula are supposed to be standards-based.

Many teachers in both types of schools agreed that since curricula were supposedly aligned to content standards, they did not think much about aligning instruction to the standards. Previous research in LAUSD elementary schools narrowing the achievement gap for their Latino indicated that teachers would take an active role in monitoring the alignment between curriculum, instruction, and content standards (Barela, Fernandez, & Hayes, 2005). According to teachers in both the Collaborative and Non-collaborative schools, alignment was primarily monitored by administrators and coaches. Teachers did not indicate that they took an active role in monitoring alignment. However, teachers in the Collaborative schools were not completely passive. They were much more likely to state that they actively supplemented curricula when they discovered gaps. It appears that monitoring of alignment in the AAA schools is more integrated into everyday practice than it is in the WL schools. AAA administrators and teachers engaged in this monitoring as a matter of course while the WL administrators and teachers were more passive.

Table 12. Collaborative and Non-collaborative sample schools.

	Collaborative	Non-collaborative
AAA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School 2 • School 3 • School 4 • School 7 • School 8 • School 11 • School 12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School 9
WL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School 1 • School 6 • School 10

There were differences in the quality of teacher collaboration in the two types of schools. Most teachers stated that they collaborated with others on a regular basis. However, teachers in the Non-collaborative schools were much more likely to indicate that they did not collaborate regularly their colleagues due to personality conflicts and gossip. The following quotes are from three different teachers from School 9, which reflect the attitudes of many of the teachers in the Non-collaborative schools.

Over here they're more judgmental and competitive. In the staff meetings the people are more negative and opinionated. *(Mr. Alvarez, School 9)*

Socially, I do not really prefer to socialize. I prefer to stay out of the way. I have a hard time with politics and gossip. *(Ms. Bright, School 9)*

It's cliquish. We don't have big faculty togetherness. *(Ms. Tomei, School 9)*

This difference in teacher attitudes was also evident during observed professional development meetings. Teacher behavior was markedly different between the Collaborative and the Non-collaborative schools. In the Collaborative schools, teachers were quiet and focused on the task at hand. In the Non-collaborative schools, administrators and coaches had to repeatedly

quiet the teachers down and direct them back to the discussion at hand. During Non-collaborative professional development meetings, teachers were observed taking cell phone calls, gossiping, and refusing to participate in directed activities. When Non-collaborative teachers were focused on professional development tasks, they often worked in isolation. There was little observed collaboration between Non-collaborative teachers.

Teachers in the Non-collaborative schools were also more likely to report that their relationships with administrators were colored by personality conflicts. While most teachers in both types of schools indicated that their relationships with administrators were positive and professional, a minority of teachers in each type of school noted that this relationship was less than positive. Teachers in the Collaborative schools were more likely to state that the relationship was at least professional while teachers in the Non-collaborative schools were more likely to state that the relationship was negative, and possibly harmful. The following quotes were taken from a teacher in each type of school. Neither teacher states that they had a positive relationship with their principal. However, the teacher from School 8, a Collaborative school, withheld judgment while the teacher from School 9, a Non-collaborative school, did not.

[The principal is] trying to be very accommodating and pleasing. I can't say anything more than that. He does everything by the book. He has taken away planning time for longer meetings. That I don't like. We'll see in a year what our test scores are like. (*Mr. Goldman, School 8*)

It's a relationship out of fear. I don't think the principal respects the teachers. She is out to look for mistakes. If we make small mistakes we will be reprimanded, sometimes in front of our students. I think the principal is a bad leader. She has no care or concern for the morale of the teachers. The morale is bad so she doesn't realize or care for it. She has no intention to make things good. She wants to attack us when he can. This will have a negative impact on the teachers, which will impact the students. It's a domino effect. We're not motivated to teach and I think this type of principal should not be placed in a Title I school. (*Ms. Chow, School 9*)

Teachers in both types of schools had similar perceptions of administrator support. Most teachers in both types of schools indicated that they felt supported by their administrators. They had open door policies and were approachable. The following quotes are from teachers in School 12, which was Collaborative, and School 10, which was not. They commended their administrators on being accessible and on providing helpful and relevant support.

He is supportive. He gives me compliments and constructive feedback. He offers suggestions on how I can improve, he also provides books so that I can reference. We talk briefly once a week. The most I have gone without speaking to him has been three weeks. *(Mr. Jeffries, School 12)*

She's helpful, open. All of us felt that we could go and talk to him about anything. She's more supportive and provides the organization we need, safe, structured environment, rather than instruction. *(Ms. Davis, School 10)*

Teachers in the Non-collaborative schools were more likely to indicate that their administrators were not accessible and did not provide helpful support. They reported that they were rarely observed by administrators and that the provided feedback was either irrelevant or negative. The following quote from a teacher in School 1 represents the frustration expressed by several of the teachers in the Non-collaborative schools.

[The principal] visited my classroom once. When [the principal] was here I got negative feedback. I'd like to hear what I was doing right as well as where I could improve because I work so hard. I really care. *(Mr. Smithson, School 1)*

It is also important to note that while teachers from three of the four Non-collaborative schools noted this, several teachers from School 3, a Collaborative school, also claimed that they received negative feedback from their administrators. Unlike the Non-collaborative schools, the administrators in School 3 appear to be improving. The following is from a teacher in School 3, who commented on the principal's feedback style.

I think most of the feedback is about how you can do better instead of what you did that was great. It's about what you're doing wrong. It's gotten better. She highlights the low instead of the high. She always wants to know what we're going to do instead of what you did do. It's what are you doing wrong. *(Ms. Martinez, School 3)*

Administrators viewed the services they received from their local districts as helpful. The most common resources cited by administrators in both types of schools were trainings and general advice. It was reported that the local districts provided trainings related to instructional professional development, ELD, and Title I policies. Many administrators in both types of schools also noted that they viewed their local districts as a general resource, particularly with policy implementation. Administrators from both types of schools noted that staff from their local districts (coordinators, program directors, and Title I advisors) provided literacy and math

coaches and other instructional specialists. Only four administrators, two from Collaborative schools and two from Non-collaborative schools, stated that they did not receive any support from their local districts. However, other administrators at each of these schools disagreed.

Summary

AAA and WL administrators brought a similar amount of experience to their schools. The average number of years of administrative experience for both AAA and WL administrators was 4.46 years.

Most of the AAA schools were classified as Collaborative and most of the WL schools were classified as Non-collaborative. It was expected that these two types of schools would exhibit markedly different cultures of leadership. In fact, the differences were subtle. Teachers held similar positive perceptions of administrator feedback. Administrators in both types of schools also readily received support from their local districts and found it to be helpful. Administrators and teachers in both types of schools engaged in limited monitoring of the alignment between curricula, instruction, and content standards. However, in the Collaborative schools, this monitoring was viewed as a matter of course while in the Non-collaborative schools, administrators and teachers were more passive in their monitoring.

While the administrators at the two types of schools tended to behave in similar ways, Collaborative and Non-collaborative schools differed with respect to teacher culture. Teachers in the Collaborative schools were more likely to work with one another and were much more focused during professional development activities. Teachers in the Non-Collaborative schools were more likely to cite personality conflicts as barriers to collaboration. They were also observed to be unfocused and argumentative during professional development activities.

Professional Development

Providing teachers with professional development opportunities is another important component of the Title I, Part A required services. To determine the types of professional development being offered and the usefulness of such activities, professional development meetings, both schoolwide and grade level, were observed. Also, teachers and administrators were interviewed about professional development activities at their schools.

Administrators in each of the sample schools indicated that professional development is provided by a combination of administrators, coaches, and teachers. Administrators and coaches lead Banked Time Tuesday activities while coaches and teachers lead grade level meetings. An

administrator from School 4 noted that whenever teachers attend an offsite professional development conference, he or she must present to either all staff or to his or her grade level.

Both the AAA schools and the WL schools offered a variety of professional development activities. According to administrators from nearly every sample school, professional development centered around subject matter instruction was offered. Commonly cited topics included OCR, math, and science. Other topics cited by administrators from at least four sample schools were student data analysis, ELD, special education, and Thinking Maps®. Most administrators and teachers indicated that they did not receive explicit professional development related to Title I. However, several SWP administrators noted that since everything that occurs at their schools is supposed to improve student achievement, all professional development is related to Title I. Those who indicated that they had received professional development centered around Title I noted that it concerned Title I and categorical program budgets.

Teachers from nine of the sample schools indicated that the most effective professional development exercises are those that can be implemented easily and quickly. An example of this is Thinking Maps®, which are graphic organizers that can be used by students. Teachers in both the AAA and the WL schools noted that the use of such graphic organizers could be implemented quickly into instruction in all subjects. According to a teacher in School 2, “I think that programs offered, like Thinking Maps®, things that can be utilized immediately, like graphic organizers, are great.” There was consensus from teachers who mentioned Thinking Maps® when discussing professional development that they were beneficial and useful.

According to administrators in three of the AAA schools and two of the WL schools, professional development meetings were organized around student data. Student data were more likely to drive professional development in the grade level meetings than during Banked Time Tuesday meetings. Data drove discussion in 2nd grade and 4th grade level meetings observed in four of the AAA schools and two of the WL schools. Teachers were observed discussing strategies concerning ELD levels and CELDT scores, periodic math assessment scores, and OCR assessment scores.

In the AAA schools, teachers used student data to determine areas of weakness and to develop strategies for improvement. For example, the 2nd grade teachers at School 12 examined math assessment scores and shared math games with each other to address problem areas. Also, the 2nd grade teachers at School 7 examined student OCR assessment scores and determined that

fluency was an area of weakness. The teachers decided to focus more on spelling while also working with the 3rd grade teachers to encourage them to emphasize vocabulary development.

The WL schools that were observed engaging in data-driven professional development did not approach it in the same way as the AAA schools. Activities were much less collaborative and were not directly concerned with student improvement. In School 6, teachers met to grade OCR writing assessments. Teachers graded the assessments individually and did not discuss the results. In School 5, teachers met to read over released CST sample questions. The teachers worked to determine what standards would be tested based on the passage. They were “gaming” the test rather than planning instruction based on student performance.

Administrators from six sample schools also indicated that teachers were given time to engage in joint curricular planning. Grade level meetings in five of the AAA schools were concerned with curricular planning. These planning meetings often focused on upcoming OCR units. Teachers were observed discussing strategies for effective OCR implementation. In one of the AAA schools, 2nd grade teachers discussed the use of Thinking Maps® and strategies to increase fluency in the next unit of OCR. In another AAA 2nd grade meeting, teachers were engaged in backward planning of the next OCR unit. They discussed strategies that could be used to address the standards being emphasized during the unit. Only one grade level meeting in the WL schools was observed to concern curricular planning despite the observation being conducted during the same time and duration.

Time spent on professional development also differed between the Collaborative and Non-collaborative schools. Administrators and teachers in all schools reported that professional development occurred during Banked Time Tuesdays and psychomotor time. However, teachers in the Collaborative schools were more likely to indicate that they consistently collaborated several times a week or as often as necessary. Teachers in the non-collaborative schools were more likely to report that collaboration occurred intermittently and less often.

There were similarities and differences between Collaborative and Non-collaborative schools with respect to accountability for implementing professional development strategies. Teachers and administrators in all sample schools indicated that they are indirectly held accountable for their professional development through student scores. According to an administrator from a Collaborative school, the expectation was that professional development would be applied and would be reflected in student scores.

There is an expectation that what is learned during professional development will be applied because it's not theory, it's a new application, an enrichment program. For example we've had professional development on strategies for teaching [OCR] so we'll have an indication that it's been applied in the classroom when we look at performance assessments and grades. (*AP/EIS, School 8*)

The two types of schools differed on administrator observation as a form of accountability. Teachers in Collaborative schools were more likely to indicate that administrators observe their classrooms to determine if professional development activities are being implemented. Teachers in Non-collaborative schools were more likely to claim that administrators did not follow up through observation. Although there appears to be a difference in the use of observation of professional development for accountability purposes, it is unclear if this difference is meaningful. Only one administrator from a AAA Collaborative school indicated that she held teachers accountable for professional development as part of their contract with the school.

Everyone is held accountable because they must be there and they must incorporate what was talked about into the class curriculum, which is then incorporated into the evaluation process, which the teacher and I both agree upon in hiring contract. I want to see the interaction and high level of talking. (*Principal, School 2*)

Teachers' overall perceptions of professional development also differed. In the Collaborative schools, teachers were more likely to perceive professional development at their schools as positive. This was the prevailing attitude at four of the Collaborative schools. The following represents a positive teacher perception of professional development.

We had a lot of training in Into English! across grades, articulation with 1st grade teachers. We shared expectations and did visitations in other classrooms within the school. It was very helpful, for new teachers especially. Training was helpful in how to teach something better and how to grade [ELD portfolios] to help the students move up. ELD portfolios look very different in lower vs. upper grades even when students are at the same level. It is helpful to see what the grade below and the grade above expect of students. (*Ms. Torres, School 11*)

However, many teachers also indicated that professional development activities were not always useful. It depended on the nature of the activity. They were more ambivalent about professional development activities. However, the teachers who indicated this also highlighted some positive aspects of the activities at their schools. In the other four Collaborative schools,

teachers were either mostly positive or equally positive and ambivalent. The following represents an ambivalent teacher perception of professional development.

We have meetings on a weekly basis, as a whole school, and as a grade level. [What are the] best ones? Those required by the District are not always helpful. Thinking Maps® [training] was helpful. They're good when we're given time to think about how we're going to do this. Sometimes it's as simple as having time to decide. The District gives these mandates, and we aren't given time to discuss how to make changes. (*Mr. Salcedo, School 5*)

Teachers in the four Non-collaborative schools were uniformly negative in their perceptions of professional development. They indicated that the professional development activities being offered were neither useful nor were chosen with teacher input. They were often characterized as a waste of time. The following represents a negative teacher perception of professional development.

[Professional activities are] very lame. It's not discussed with us and we are not consulted on what kind of professional development activities we should have. It's not very useful in our instructional strategies. We're not held accountable for what is presented in professional development activities. Teachers don't pay attention to PD programs. (*Ms. Chow, School 9*)

Summary

In all sample schools, a variety of professional development activities were offered by administrators, coaches, and teachers. Most professional development activities focused on examination of student data and subject matter instruction. Little direct Title I professional development was offered; what was offered was related to categorical program budgets.

Differences in professional development implementation existed between AAA and WL schools. The AAA schools were more likely to develop action plans from their examinations of student data. They were also more likely to engage in collaborative curricular planning in their grade level meetings. Observed grade level meetings of the WL schools consisted of little data exploration or curricular planning. A practice CST was merely used to determine emphasized findings while planning occurred in isolation.

Differences also existed between Collaborative and Non-collaborative schools. In the Collaborative schools, teachers were more focused on the activities while Non-collaborative teachers were often uninterested or disruptive. Administrators in collaborative schools were more likely to hold teachers accountable for professional development activities through

observation. Therefore, it is not surprising that Collaborative and Non-collaborative teachers held different perceptions of professional development activities. Teachers in the Collaborative schools were either positive or ambivalent about professional development while the Non-collaborative teachers consistently held negative perceptions.

Discussion of Findings

The following section is a discussion of the study's findings in the context of the research questions. Each question will be addressed based on the analysis of collected data.

How are LAUSD's Title I Academic Achievement Award schools implementing the NCLB Title I, Part A required services (teacher qualifications, paraprofessional qualifications, proven educational methods, professional development, student assessments, parent involvement, and supplemental services)? In particular, how do these schools supplement their core practices with Title I programs?

Teacher Qualifications

It appears that teachers in both the AAA and WL schools had equivalent qualifications. Both types of schools had a higher percentage of classrooms with "highly qualified" teachers than the district average. Teachers in both the AAA and the WL schools had similar amounts of experience. There were also similar proportions of novice and veteran teachers.

The AAA and WL schools differed in the percentage of teachers with a BCLAD authorization and in a simplified measure of stability. There was a significantly higher proportion of BCLAD teachers in the WL schools. This stands to reason because the WL schools enrolled a much higher proportion of ELs, particularly ELD 1 students. Also, the AAA teachers included in the sample were more likely to have stayed at their schools than the WL teachers in the sample.

Paraprofessional Qualifications

Both types of schools earmarked much of their "4-Pot" budgets for paraprofessional pay. However, such monies typically paid for paraprofessionals for less than six hours per day. The combination of fewer paid hours and the more rigorous paraprofessional qualifications stipulated

by NCLB, it is not surprising that AAA administrators indicated that they had trouble staffing paraprofessional positions.

Proven Educational Methods

Both the AAA and WL schools used district-mandated curricula in ELA and math. Teachers and administrators in both types of schools indicated that they assumed that the curricula they were implementing were research-based. There was a passive alignment of curriculum, instruction, and standards. However, AAA teachers were more likely to adapt their instruction to meet the needs of their students.

Teachers were more likely than students to be observed using instructional technology. Such tools were often used to facilitate the presentation of material. However, AAA students were more likely to be presented with opportunities to use technology during instruction. Despite these opportunities, AAA teachers indicated that technology would be used more often if it was maintained. Although AAA schools set aside, on average, over 10% of their “4-Pot” budgets for instructional materials and equipment, it is possible that this money is not going to technology maintenance.

Professional Development

While little “4-Pot” funds were earmarked for professional development and conference attendance, AAA schools provided a variety of professional development activities for its teachers. Most professional development activities were focused on instructional strategies and student data examination.

AAA teachers were also much more focused during professional development activities. They were engaged with the material being presented and were more likely to report that these activities were relevant and beneficial.

Student Assessments

The AAA schools were observed using both district-mandated and state-mandated student assessments. Both types of schools used student assessment data to drive professional development. However, the AAA schools were more likely to develop action plans linked to student assessment performance.

Parent Involvement

No administrator or teacher indicated that there was an acceptable level of parental involvement at their school. Possible barriers cited were the language barrier and work

schedules. This prompted administrators and teachers in both types of schools to redefine parental involvement. Acceptable parent involvement included homework assistance, reading to students at home, and making sure students were well-rested, well-fed, and on-time when they came to school.

Although both types of schools expanded their definitions of parental involvement, the AAA schools offered parents more collaborative and hands-on opportunities. Parents were more likely to be involved in committees and were more likely to be vocal in the AAA schools. They were also more likely to be presented with interactive strategies for student improvement. In addition to being presented with more interactive activities, AAA parents were also given the opportunity to experience the activities for themselves under the guidance of teachers and coaches.

Supplemental Services (Interventions/Partnerships Outside the School Day)

Both types of schools offered different types of interventions for students throughout the school day as a means of extending learning time. Most were focused on ELA instruction but several math and ELD interventions were also observed. All interventions were led by either teachers or long-term subs. Before school interventions offered preteaching for the day's lesson. After school interventions were focused on reteaching and skills practice. Many schools also offered Saturday interventions aimed at reteaching. It is possible that interventions in the AAA schools were successful because of teacher collaboration observed during professional development. When instruction is aligned throughout the grade level, it would be easier to preteach and reteach.

Supplementation of Core Program

It appears that AAA schools supplemented their core programs mostly by using their categorical and Title I funds to purchase support personnel. An average of 63.3% of AAA school "4-Pot" budgets were used to pay for categorical program advisors/coordinators and for paraprofessionals. Both positions served to support administrators and teachers so they could perform other important tasks.

Categorical program advisors/coordinators were responsible for coordinating activities linked to categorical funds, such as Title I. Many categorical program advisors/coordinators had a role in the development and revision of their school's Single Plan. They can be seen as

providing support to school administrators with respect to categorical programs, giving them more time to attend to other important duties.

What practices exist in LAUSD's Title I Academic Achievement Award schools that may explain their success? Special consideration will be given to those practices targeted at Special Education students and English Learners (ELs).

Leadership

AAA and WL administrators brought a similar amount of experience to their schools. The average number of years of administrative experience for both AAA and WL administrators was 4.46 years.

Most AAA sample schools could be characterized as Collaborative. Administrators engaged in limited monitoring of the alignment between curriculum, instruction, and standards. This can be viewed as an action that would allow teachers to teach with limited administrative interference. It is also possible that, because of this, teachers held mostly positive views of their administrators. They also made use of local district resources.

Teachers were also more collaborative in these schools. They were regularly observed working with each other during professional development activities. Teachers in the Collaborative schools were also more focused during these activities and viewed them as relevant and beneficial.

According to the Education Trust (1999), effective Title I schools should be using content standards extensively to design curriculum and instruction, lengthening instructional time, and implementing comprehensive systems of monitoring student performance, particularly as it relates to content standards. The AAA schools appeared to possess these characteristics. There was more observed collaboration centered on standards-based instruction. They offered interventions both during school and beyond school hours. The monitoring of the alignment between curriculum, instruction, and standards was passive but it was still observed.

Math and ELA Instruction

Both types of schools addressed a variety of standards during observed instruction. In math, the number sense and measurement and geometry standards were most likely to be addressed. In ELA, all groups of standards were covered in both types of schools. However,

with the exception of the reading comprehension standards, the ELA standards were addressed in a higher percentage of WL classrooms.

However, instructional delivery in the AAA classrooms was more dynamic. Teachers were clearer about instructional objectives and engaged students in more discussion. Students also completed many assignments in groups. There was less instructional clarity in the WL classrooms. Instruction consisted of mostly question/answer drilling and individually-completed assignments.

EL Instruction

There was little explicit ELD instruction observed in all sample schools, although there were slightly more WL classrooms using *Into English!*. The most commonly observed SDAIE strategies were visual or verbal/linguistic in nature. They were observed equally in both types of schools.

AAA schools were more likely to differentiate instruction for their ELs, both inside and outside the classroom. Paraprofessionals were used for some small group instruction and for individualized assistance. ELs were also provided with differentiated interventions/partnerships outside the school day.

DI Instruction

In the TAS schools, which had DI AYP criteria to meet, students were provided with individualized instruction both in the inclusion classroom and in the RSP classroom. AAA teachers and paraprofessionals were more likely to provide individualized instruction to DI students. TAS schools also directed fewer “4-Pot” funds to school health professionals, who could also provide services to DI students. When funds were targeted at DI students, the TAS schools appeared to direct them through the classroom.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are based on the data collected for this study. These practices were more prevalent in the AAA schools and should be adopted by WL schools as strategies for not entering Program Improvement.

Use Funds to Support Subgroups More Explicitly

Funding priorities were different in the AAA and WL schools. AAA schools were more likely to use their Title I funds for teacher and substitute pay and paraprofessional pay. These

additional teachers, subs, and paraprofessionals were observed providing individualized and differentiated instruction to students both inside and outside the classroom. This differentiated instruction was often focused on ELs and DI students.

WL schools were more likely to spend their Title I funds on school health professionals. While these professionals provide a valuable service, they do not provide individualized and differentiated instruction. They indirectly support student achievement while teachers, subs, and paraprofessionals were observed as direct supports.

Establish a Collaborative Environment

In the AAA schools, administrators and teachers monitored the alignment between standards, curriculum, and instruction as a matter of course. Administrators and teachers maintained positive and constructive relationships. Teachers were more likely to collaborate with one another to develop strategies for improved student achievement.

This environment did not exist in most of the WL schools. There was little to no monitoring of alignment. Administrators and teachers were often at odds with each other. Administrators did not encourage teacher collaboration, nor were teachers as inclined to collaborate with one another.

Offer Differentiated and Dynamic ELA Instruction

In the AAA schools, teachers were more likely to adapt OCR instruction to meet the needs of their students. They did not perceive the curriculum as restrictive. Because of this, the AAA teachers addressed fewer ELA content standards. However, quantity does not equal quality. The AAA teachers were more likely to encourage student discussion and academic talk. Most observed instruction in the WL schools consisted of call-and-response questions that were not placed in context with broader instructional goals.

Monitor and Encourage Use of ELD Instruction

There was little overall usage of the ELD curriculum in both types of schools. This could have been especially problematic for the WL schools. Not only did the WL schools have far more ELs than the AAA schools, most of their ELs were ELD1. Administrators in WL schools should be monitoring the use of the ELD curriculum.

Additionally, administrators in WL schools should be encouraging the use of an ELD curriculum. The main criticism of *Into English!* from AAA teachers, who are teaching more

ELD3-ELD5 students, was that it was too easy for students. Something too easy for upper-level ELD students might be just right for ELD1 students.

Future Considerations

An unexpected finding from this study was how administrators used their Single Plans. At the start of data collection, it was expected that the AAA and WL administrators viewed Single Plan development as a formality, something to be done to meet compliance requirements. When administrators were interviewed about Single Plan usage, this turned out to be incorrect. AAA and WL administrators reflected on their allocation of funds yearly, which led to reflection on just what their schools are doing to improve student achievement.

Prior to 2005-06, schools receiving Title I funds were merely required to submit an annual budget assurances and justifications form that was supposed to be tied to their action plans. However, these action plans needed to be updated just once every three years. Starting this past school year, schools receiving Title I funding must link their annual assurances and justifications forms to their action plans. This may direct schools that have not previously done so to be much more reflective on budget and student achievement. This was already evident in the AAA and WL schools. Further study of how PI schools use this new annual updating system could provide useful and beneficial information to the Specially-Funded Programs division on how schools receiving Title I funding reflect on student achievement and create action plans to address areas targeted for improvement.

References

- Abt Associates, Inc. (1997). *Prospects: The congressionally mandated study of educational growth and opportunity*.
- Barela, E., Fernandez, A. & Hayes, K. (2005). *Research in best practices: Latino academic achievement case study (LAACS)*. (Planning, Assessment, and Research Division Publication No. 244). Los Angeles Unified School District.
- Borman, G.D. & D'Agostino, J. V. (1996). Title I and student achievement: A meta-analysis of federal evaluation results, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 18(4), 309-326.
- Carter, L. (1984). The sustaining effects study of compensatory and elementary education. *Educational Researcher* 13(7), 4-13.
- Education Trust. (1999). *Dispelling the myth: High poverty schools exceeding expectations*. Washington, DC: Education Trust.
- Kennedy, M. M., Birman, B. F., & Demaline, R. E. (1986). *The effectiveness of Chapter I services: Second interim report from the National Assessment of Chapter I*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Snow, C., Burns, M., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children: Report of the National Research Council*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century. (2000). *Before it's too late: A report to the nation from the National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teachers for the 21st Century*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education, Planning, and Evaluation Service. (2001). *High standards for all students: A report from the National Assessment of Title I on progress and challenges since the 1994 reauthorization*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education, Planning, and Evaluation Service. (2000). *Study of education resources and federal funding: Final report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- van der Klaauw, W. (2003). Breaking the link between poverty and low student achievement: Does Title I work? Manuscript, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.