Evaluation Brief

Evaluation of Elementary ESOL Program in Title I Schools: Survey of ESOL Teachers

Nyambura Susan Maina, Ph.D. and Trisha McGaughey

Executive Summary

This brief presents findings from the 2008 English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) teacher survey. The findings show that ESOL teachers in Title I schools were involved primarily in providing ESOL instruction and activities that support language development and academic achievement of ESOL students. Overall, the vast majority of the ESOL teachers agreed that the implementation of specified ESOL program components and requirements in their schools worked well during 2007–2008.

At the same time, the ESOL teachers faced a variety of challenges to implementing ESOL services. These challenges include limited time to collaborate with classroom teachers, adjusting to frequent interruption to instruction, aligning ESOL instruction with classroom instruction, and balancing ESOL with reading language/arts instruction. Further, the findings indicated that on average, the ESOL teachers had covered less than the expected 75 percent of the ESOL curriculum by the end of the third marking period. Moreover, less than one half reported they implemented the formative common task assessments. The top suggestion for increasing the effectiveness of ESOL instruction was to protect ESOL instructional time.

Key recommendations include:

- Intensify instruction for English language development by allotting appropriate time for ESOL instruction.
- Ensure the ESOL students' instructional schedule reflects the appropriate balance between instruction for English language development and instruction in reading/language arts.
- Implement the Montgomery County Public Schools' (MCPS) ESOL curriculum consistently, including the corresponding formative common task assessments.
- Reduce interruptions to ESOL instruction.

- Increase collaboration between ESOL and classroom teachers.
- Ensure ESOL instruction is appropriately paced.

Background

The 2008 ESOL teacher survey was part of an ongoing evaluation of the implementation of the ESOL services in Title I schools (see Appendix A, Table A1). At the beginning of the 2002–2003 school year, supplemental ESOL teachers[1] were assigned to Title I schools based on a formula aligned to the ESOL instructional level of ESOL students. The ESOL enhanced staffing is one of the strategies implemented under Goal 1, *Our Call to Action*, designed to ensure success for every student (MCPS, 2007). The enhanced staffing is intended to allow teachers to be deployed strategically to support beginning ESOL students.

Methodology

The purpose of the survey was to gather the ESOL teachers' perspective on how ESOL services were implemented in Title I schools during the 2007–2008 school year and to identify areas needing improvement. The survey was developed by staff in the Office of Shared Accountability, in collaboration with the Department of Academic Support Initiatives, Division of Title I Programs and Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs. All ESOL teachers in the 28 Title I schools were asked to complete an online survey. A total of 85 from a possible 130 teachers completed the survey, for a response rate of 65% (see Appendix A, Table A2). This response rate is high enough to generalize findings to all ESOL teachers in Title I schools.

---

[1] Supplemental allocation=[(2*number of beginning ESOL students) + (number of intermediate students) + (number of advanced ESOL students)]/50.

Respondents. Respondents' teaching experience and background information is presented in Appendix B, Tables B1–B2. The average teaching experience among the respondents was 11.7 years. The respondents had been teaching ESOL for an average of 7.4 years and had been at their current school for an average of 4.5 years. The respondents provided ESOL instruction for students in prekindergarden through Grade 5. Nearly three quarters (73%) held full-time ESOL teacher positions. Similarly, 26% of the respondents held part-time ESOL teacher positions. While the majority of the respondents were certified in more than one area, nearly all had ESOL or English as a Second Language (ESL) certification (94%). About one quarter (21%) of the respondents taught in schools implementing the Reading First Program.

Findings

Planning, Coordination, and Implementation of ESOL Instruction

Planning and coordination. The survey listed a set of activities as specified in the ESOL teacher position description and asked teachers which activities they had participated in during the 2007–2008 school year. Besides providing direct ESOL instruction, over four fifths of the respondents participated in activities pertaining to collecting or reviewing student data, discussing student needs with other instructional staff, and participating in a variety of collaborative teams (see Appendix B, Table B3). Similarly, more than two thirds of the respondents reported they planned their ESOL lessons in collaboration with other ESOL teachers (72%).

One half or more of the respondents reported they worked with classroom teachers to determine when ESOL students required adjustments to essential learnings (54%) or coordinated instruction with special education teachers (51%) (see Appendix B, Table B3).

Findings revealed that less than one half of the respondents had implemented common task assessments (41%), a key component of the implementation of the MCPS ESOL curriculum. Likewise, only 39% reported they examined the scope and sequence of ESOL curricula at grade-level meetings.

Implementation. The respondents taught students at the three levels of ESOL instruction—beginning (83%), intermediate (96%), and advanced (75%). During a typical semester, the respondents provided ESOL instruction to an average of seven ESOL instructional groups or sessions per week. The frequency with which each teacher provided

instruction varied by the instructional level and number of ESOL groups instructed. Close to one half of the respondents provided ESOL instruction to several groups of students several times a day (48%) whereas one third provided instruction once a day (33%) (see Appendix B, Tables B4–B6).

The findings revealed that on average, the respondents used the MCPS ESOL instructional guide to plan for the two thirds or more of the ESOL lessons (67%). Further, the median value signifies that more than one half of the respondents used the MCPS ESOL curriculum to plan for over 80% of their lessons. This finding indicates an increase in the use of MCPS ESOL curriculum compared with a mean of 60% and median of 60% in 2007 findings (Maina, 2008a). At the same time, the respondents used the reading language arts instructional guide to plan for about 36% of their ESOL lessons. This finding indicated that some teachers used a combination of the MCPS ESOL and reading language arts guides to plan for ESOL instruction. However, its unclear from the findings how the reading language arts guide was adapted for English language development instruction.

The average use of either the MCPS ESOL instructional guides by teachers in Reading First schools (41% for ESOL curriculum; 37% for reading language arts) was lower compared with the use by their peers in non-Reading First schools (74% for ESOL curriculum; 29% for reading language arts) (see Appendix B, Table B7). ESOL students in Reading First schools usually only receive ESOL instruction through a plug-in model using the Houghton Mifflin curriculum. In a typical plug-in model, the ESOL teacher instructs students in the general education classroom. This may include co-teaching the whole class, instructing small groups of ESOL students during center time, or modeling/guiding instruction for the classroom teacher (MCPS, 2008). Findings about the MCPS Reading First schools indicated that the schools manage ESOL instruction within Reading First differently because adherence to the Reading First guidelines limits the use of the ESOL curriculum (McNary, 2007).

In general, the proportion of ESOL curriculum completed at each grade level is less than the 75% that is expected by the end of third marking period. The findings indicated that the respondents had completed 37–60% of the ESOL curriculum by the third marking period (see Appendix B, Table B8). The proportion of MCPS ESOL curriculum completed varied by grade level with students in kindergarten (60%) and Grade 1 (59%) completing the largest proportion. The respondents who taught Grades 2–5 had completed an average of about 50%

or less of the ESOL curriculum by the end of the third marking period.

Access to achievement data on ESOL students. Nearly all of the respondents reported they had access to student-level achievement data for their ESOL students in a variety of formats (see Appendix B, Table B9). While more than three fourths (79%) had access to data for individual students in their ESOL groups, less than one half reported that they had access to data that were disaggregated by skill areas of listening, reading, writing, speaking, comprehension skills (42%). At the same time, one third reported that they had access to data summary for all students at each grade level (33%). This finding implies that teachers could not readily assess how their ESOL students were doing relative to other ESOL or non-ESOL students at their respective grade level or in specific skill areas. The respondents used the data primarily to evaluate student progress, adjust instruction, or identify students not making progress (see Appendix B, Table B10).

Challenges to implementation of ESOL instruction. The ESOL teachers reported a variety of challenges to implementation of ESOL instruction (see Appendix B, Table B11). The most frequently reported challenges were: a) limited time to collaborate with classroom teachers (63%), b) interruptions to ESOL instruction which resulted in missed lessons and limited opportunities for direct English language instruction (55%), c) difficulty aligning ESOL instruction with regular classroom instruction (51%), d) not enough time to plan for ESOL instruction (50%), and e) difficulty balancing instruction for English language development and instruction in reading language arts (45%).

Overview of ESOL Services. Overall, the ESOL teachers agreed that the various aspects of ESOL services worked well during 2007–2008. In particular, the vast majority of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the procedures for identifying new ESOL students (98%) and procedures for pulling-out students from mainstream class to take to the ESOL classroom (95%) worked well. Similarly, the ESOL teachers reported they had opportunities to implement newly learned ESOL instructional approaches (89%). Notably, the component with lowest level of agreement was balancing ESOL instruction and reading language arts instruction (57%) (see Appendix B, Table B12).

The responses to each open-ended item were analyzed and summarized in Appendix B, Tables B13–B18. Major findings for each survey item are presented below. Typical of open-ended items, not all the respondents provided comments and the response rate varied from item to item.

Changes to ESOL Instruction

A variety of changes in planning and implementing ESOL instruction during 2007–2008 were reported (see Appendix B, Table B13–B15).

Changes in instructional strategies. As a result of their participation in professional development, the respondents cited a variety of changes they made to their instructional practices (see Appendix B, Table B13). The most commonly mentioned changes included a) increased application of a variety of instructional strategies to ESOL instruction, particularly differentiation of the ESOL curriculum (n=23 or 37%) and b) increased focus on reading, writing, and vocabulary development (n=17 or 27%).

Changes in working with classroom teachers. The respondents mentioned that more time was provided for ESOL teachers to plan and collaborate with classroom teachers and to attend more teacher/team meetings in 2007–2008 than in previous years (n=19/44%). In addition, ESOL and classroom teachers worked collaboratively to review students' needs and progress than in previous years. ESOL teachers also provided or modeled teaching strategies for teachers of English language learners (ELLs) (n=13/35%) (see Appendix B, Table B14).

Changes to ESOL instructional services at the school level. Nearly one half of the responses elicited for this item indicated there were no changes made to ESOL instructional services at the school level during the school year (n=19/48%). A few teachers reported increased use of the plug in model of instruction (n=6/15%) and the increased use of the MCPS ESOL curriculum (n=5/13%) (see Appendix B, Table B15).

Successful Aspects of ESOL Instruction

The most frequently cited successful aspects of the ESOL instructional program included: the structure and coordination of the ESOL program at their school, increased collaboration among teachers, and increased focus on instruction for English language development.

Structure of the ESOL instructional program. Open-ended responses yielded an assortment of comments relating to the aspects of the design and structure of the ESOL program that made it successful (n=28/36.3%). Specific comments related to a) use of data to support grouping, planning, and instruction, b) minimizing transition time through increased use of plug-in model, c) co-teaching, and d) use of flexible small groups. Also the perception that ESOL services helped students make progress, catch up with non-ESOL peers, and become better

prepared for content area instruction were expressed (see Appendix B, Table B16).

Increased collaboration. One third of the respondents (*n*=20/25.9%) reported increased collaboration with classroom teachers as well as across ESOL teams.

Increased focus on English language development and use of MCPS ESOL curriculum. Nearly one fifth of the responses cited increased schoolwide emphasis on instruction for language development (*n*=15/19.4%) as a successful aspect of the ESOL instructional program. Specific comments included: a) the ESOL program was valued by the administration, b) students were receiving daily or consistent ESOL instruction, and c) there was increased and consistent use of the MCPS ESOL curriculum for planning ESOL lessons.

Nearly one half of the responses elicited indicated that the reported successful aspects of ESOL services were supported by student performance data (*n*=26/47.2%). In addition, several comments supported the observation of an increased focus on achievement of ESOL students (40%). This focus was characterized by ongoing communication among instructional staff, formal and informal teams related to ESOL students' achievement, increased collaboration among ESOL teachers and classroom teachers, and increased classroom teachers' familiarity with the ESOL program (see Appendix B, Table B17).

Finally, the respondents identified specific changes they would make to improve the effectiveness of the ESOL program. The top suggestion was related to intensifying instruction for English language development (*n*=26/43%). This would include ensuring that the instructional schedule provides dedicated and adequate time for ESOL instruction. Further, increased implementation of the ESOL curriculum and corresponding use of the ESOL teachers primarily to provide instruction for language development were suggested. Likewise, teachers suggested that schools continue to allow flexibility in the use of various ESOL instructional models such as pull-out and plug-in so as to accommodate varying needs of their students. Another suggestion concerned increasing opportunities for collaboration between ESOL and classroom teachers (*n*=17/22%). In particular, respondents suggested the collaborative input of ESOL and classroom teachers in the scheduling of ESOL instruction for their students (see Appendix B, Table B18).

Conclusions

In reviewing the survey responses, the following conclusions were drawn. Overall, schools used the ESOL teacher positions as designed—primarily to provide ESOL instruction. In addition, the ESOL teachers participated in a variety of activities that support the planning and coordination of the instructional program for ESOL students.

While the use of the MCPS curriculum for planning ESOL lessons has increased since 2006 and 2007, the proportion of the ESOL curriculum completed at each grade level is lower than expected by the end of the third marking period. Furthermore, less than half of the respondents implemented the corresponding common task assessments in 2007–2008 compared with 77.2% in 2006–2007 (Maina, 2008a). These findings suggest that the challenges of frequent interruptions to ESOL instruction and the imbalance between the emphasis on English language development and R/LA impact greatly on the proportion of ESOL curriculum covered by the end of the school year.

The top suggestions for improving the effectiveness of ESOL instruction pertain primarily to protecting the English language development focus of the ESOL program. Specifically, school level structures need strengthening: a) to ensure that the instructional schedule reflects the appropriate balance of instruction for English language development and instruction in other subjects and b) to enable increased collaboration among ESOL and classroom teachers.

Finally, there is a striking corroboration between the findings reported in this study and related findings from the 2008 surveys of non-ESOL classroom teachers, 2007 ESOL teachers, and Title I principals. In particular, the findings from the Title I principals, non-ESOL teachers, and ESOL teachers agree that: a) balancing ESOL and reading language arts and b) allotting adequate time for ESOL instruction are persistent challenges to consistent implementation of the ESOL instruction (Maina, 2008a; Maina 2008b; Maina, 2008c). There also is consensus about the need to protect ESOL instruction time, align ESOL instruction to general curriculum, and for concerted collaboration between ESOL and classroom teachers. In addition, the findings from ESOL teachers and Title I principals concur that schools are still working to achieve full implementation of common task assessments.

Recommendations

- Intensify focus on English language development by allotting adequate time for instruction using the MCPS and ESOL curriculums.
- Ensure instructional schedule accommodates an appropriate balance between English language development instruction and reading/language arts.
- Reduce interruptions to ESOL instruction.
- Ensure ESOL teachers are utilized as specified in the position description—to provide ESOL instruction and coordinate activities that promote language development of their students.
- Accommodate flexibility in the use of plug-in and pull-out groups to meet the needs of the students.
- Increase collaboration between ESOL and classroom teachers.
- Review the instructional guides to determine if the pacing of ESOL instruction is appropriate to ensure the ESOL curriculum content is covered by the end of the school year.
- Examine reasons for the low implementation of common task assessments; then establish structures to support the implementation of the common task assessments.
- Increase implementation of the common task assessments at all grade levels.

References

Maina, S. N. (2008a). *Title I Elementary ESOL Program: 2007 ESOL teacher survey results. Internal Memorandum, February, 2008*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools. Unpublished document.

Maina, S. N. (2008b). *Title I Elementary ESOL Program: Results of 2007 Principal Survey. Internal Memorandum, February, 2008*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools. Unpublished document.

Maina, S. N. (2008c). *Title I Elementary ESOL Program: Survey of Non-ESOL teachers in Title schools.* Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools. Unpublished document.

McNary, S. (2007). *Evaluation of Reading First in the Montgomery County Public Schools 2003–2006.* Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools.

Montgomery County Public Schools. (2007). *Our Call to Action: Pursuit of Excellence: The Strategic Plan for Montgomery County Public Schools 2007–2012.* Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools.

Montgomery County Public Schools. (2008). *ESOL curriculum and instruction: elementary school scheduling guidelines.* Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools.

THIS PAGE WAS LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

Appendixes

Appendix A: Evaluation Activities, Title I Elementary ESOL Program

Table A1
Evaluation of Title I Elementary ESOL Program, Activities, and Data Sources

Activity/Data Source	Year		
	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008
ESOL teacher survey	X[a]	X[b]	X[c]
Non-ESOL teacher survey	--	--	X[c]
Title I principal survey	--	X[b]	--
ESOL services log	X[a]	X[d]	X[d]

[a] Evaluation briefs available from http://sharedaccountability.mcpsprimetime.org/reports; [b] Disseminated through Memorandum to principals, March 7, 2008; [c] Evaluation briefs in progress; [d] Data available in OASIS

Table A2
Number and Percentage of Response Rate by Elementary Schools

School Name	ESOL teachers* N	Respondents n	Response Rate %
Arcola	5	4	80.0
Broad Acres	7	2	28.6
Burnt Mills	4	2	50.0
East Silver Spring	3	0	0.0
Gaithersburg	6	6	100.0
Georgian Forest	3	2	66.7
Harmony Hills	7	4	57.1
Highland	9	3	33.3
Kemp Mill	7	3	42.9
Montgomery Knolls	5	4	80.0
New Hampshire Estates	6	5	83.3
Oak View	5	1	20.0
Rolling Terrace	2	2	100.0
Roscoe Nix	6	4	66.7
Rosemont	5	5	100.0
Sargent Shriver	9	9	100.0
South Lake	6	3	50.0
Summit Hall	5	4	80.0
Twinbrook	6	2	33.3
Viers Mill	6	6	100.0
Washington Grove	5	5	100.0
Weller Road	7	4	57.1
Wheaton Woods	6	4	66.7
Total	130	85	65.4

* Source Division of ESOL/Bilingual Programs

Appendix B: Findings from the ESOL Teacher Survey

Table B1
Teaching Experience

Years teaching	Full time[a]			Part time[a]			Total		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Total years teaching	62	12.0	8.4	22	11.1	6.0	85	11.7	7.8
Years teaching ESOL	62	8.0	6.6	22	6.0	4.5	85	7.4	6.2
Years at current school	62	4.8	4.6	22	3.8	3.9	85	4.5	4.4

[a] One respondent provided no indication as to whether full or part-time teacher.

Table B2
Number, Percentage, and Background Information of Respondents

Background Information	N	%
Types of certifications (multiple responses)[a]		
ESOL/ESL education	79	94.0
Elementary certification (Grade 1–8)	25	29.8
Early childhood education (pre-K–3)	14	16.7
Special education	7	8.3
Reading specialist	3	3.6
Provisional certification or not currently certified	2	2.4
Miscellaneous (e.g., TEFL, Foreign language (Spanish, French), Bilingual, Speech/Language pathology)	13	15.5
Grade Levels Taught (multiple responses)[a]		
Pre-K	25	29.8
Kindergarten	41	48.8
Grade 1	39	46.4
Grade 2	33	39.3
Grade 3	28	33.3
Grade 4	27	32.1
Grade 5	18	21.4
Self-contained ESOL (METS) class	2	2.4
Other (e.g., Head Start, PEP, students with interrupted education, combined grade levels)	5	6.0
ESOL teacher status[b]		
Full time	62	72.9
Part time	22	25.9
Reading First[c]		
No	65	76.5
Yes	18	21.2

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response. [b] One respondent provided no indication as to whether full or part-time teacher. [c] Two respondents provided no indication as to whether in a Reading First school.

Table B3

Number and Percentage of Respondents Participating in Specified Activities

During the 2007–2008 School Year

Activities [a] in which ESOL teachers reported participation (multiple responses)[b]	Yes	
	N	%
Discussed academic needs of ESOL students with classroom teachers	82	96.5
Discussed progress of ESOL students with classroom teachers.	82	96.5
Reviewed ESOL student data in the four skill areas (reading, writing, listening, and speaking)	80	94.1
Shared and discussed teaching methods with other ESOL teachers	79	92.9
Participated in grade-level team meetings	76	89.4
Shared and discussed ESOL student work with other ESOL teachers	75	88.2
Collaborated with classroom teachers about reclassifying or exiting students from ESOL services	74	87.1
Attended ELL team meetings	72	84.7
Completed ESOL services logs	68	80.0
Planned ESOL lessons in collaboration with other ESOL teachers	61	71.8
Worked with classroom teachers to determine when ESOL students required adjustments to essential learnings	46	54.1
Coordinated instruction with special education teachers	43	50.6
Worked with classroom teachers to determine when ESOL students need accelerated instruction.	36	42.4
Implemented common task assessments in ESOL	35	41.2
Examined scope and sequence of ESOL curricular topics at grade-level team meetings	33	38.8
Observed ESOL instruction in other ESOL classrooms	28	32.9
Met regularly with the school administrators to discuss ESOL programming matters	26	30.6
Participated in cross-grade-level team meetings	26	30.6
Participated in the development of the school's master schedule	20	23.5
Worked with the Bilingual Assessment Team regarding students referred to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) Team	19	22.4
Coordinated instruction with staff who provide accelerated instruction and services for identified Gifted and Talented and highly able students	15	17.6
Other types if activities	12	14.1

[a] The list was developed from position description of roles and responsibilities for ESOL teachers.
[b] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B4

Summary Statistics for Number of ESOL Groups Taught Per Typical Semesters (N=78)

Number of ESOL groups	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
ESOL groups	78	6.7	6	4.1

Table B5
Frequency with Which Respondents Provided ESOL Instruction

Instruction per week	*N*	*%*
Several times a day	41	48.2
Once a day	28	32.9
2–3 times a week	15	17.6
No response	1	1.2

Table B6
Number and Percentage of ESOL Levels of Students
Provided ESOL Instruction

ESOL levels provided ESOL instruction (multiple response)	*N*	*%*
Beginning	70	83.3
Intermediate	81	96.4
Advanced	63	75.0

Note. The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B7
Extent of Use of the MCPS ESOL and Reading/Language Arts Instructional Guides

Teacher status	MCPS ESOL Guide				Reading/Language Arts Guide			
	n	Mean	SD	Median	*n*	Mean	SD	Median
Position status[a]								
Full time	62	66.7	35	83	62	34.5	35	20
Part time	22	69.8	33	80	22	35.8	32	25
Reading First[b]								
Non-Reading First	65	73.6	33	90	65	36.7	33	25
Reading First	18	41.3	33	32	18	28.9	38	0
All respondents	84	66.7	35	80	83	35.0	25	25

[a] One respondent provided no indication as to whether full time or part-time teacher. [b] Two respondents provided no indication as to whether in a Reading First school.

Table B8
Number of MCPS ESOL Curriculum Completed at the end
of Third Making Period by Grade Level

Grade Level	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
Pre-K	24	37	33	50
Kindergarten	39	60	34	75
Grade 1	35	59	32	75
Grade 2	26	51	36	65
Grade 3	24	51	35	63
Grade 4	24	47	32	50
Grade 5	21	46	37	50

Table B9
How Achievement Data is Accessed for ESOL Students

Achievement data accessed (multiple responses)[a]	N	%
Individually for all students in my group(s)	66	78.6
Individually for all students in the school	40	47.6
Disaggregated by specific skill areas for all students in my ESOL group(s)	35	41.7
A summary of all students across each grade level	28	33.3
No access to any data for my students	4	4.8
Miscellaneous (e.g., KPA, DIBELS, Reading 3D, reading and math unit assessments, writing samples)	4	4.8

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B10
Use of Assessment Data Available

Use of assessment data (multiple responses)[a]	N	%
Evaluate student progress	72	88.9
Adjust instruction in areas in which students encountered problems	65	80.2
Identify students not making progress	57	70.4
Place students in instructional groups	53	65.4
Review data with other teachers across grade levels	44	54.3
Inform parents of a student's progress	33	40.7
Miscellaneous (e.g., to collaborate with teachers, did not use because too difficult to access)	5	6.2

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B11

Number and Percentage of ESOL Teachers Reporting Challenges to Implementation of ESOL Instruction

Challenges (multiple response)[a]	N	%
Time to collaborate with classroom teachers	53	63.1
Opportunity to work with students due to interruptions	46	54.8
Aligning ESOL instruction with regular classroom instruction	43	51.2
Time to plan for ESOL instruction	42	50.0
Balancing ESOL and the Reading/Language Arts curriculum	38	45.2
ESOL instruction that is scheduled during guided reading time	33	39.3
Ensuring ESOL students have full access to school curriculum while receiving ESOL services.	32	38.1
Completing all the essential learnings	31	36.9
Time to work with newcomers	24	28.6
Focus on Reading/Language Arts curriculum during plug-in sessions	23	27.4
Seeing students for only 1–2 days a week	23	27.4
Providing Level 1 students with daily instruction	20	23.8
Space constraints	17	20.2
No clear benchmarks to assess progress English language development (e.g., reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension) at each grade level.	16	19.0
Data for tracking student progress is not readily accessible	14	16.7
Resources for working with students who speak no English	14	16.7
Resources for assessing language needs of ELLs	13	15.5
Support for ESOL from school administrators	13	15.5
Familiarity with MCPS ESOL curriculum resources	11	13.1
Grouping students from more than one grade level for ESOL instruction (e.g. Grades 3–5).	8	9.5
Understanding of MSDE ESOL proficiency standards	4	4.8
Criteria used to reclassify is ESOL students is poorly defined.	1	1.2

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B12
Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting Agreement with Statements on Overview of ESOL Services

Statements	Agree		Strongly Agree		Total Agreement	
	n	%	n	%	N	%
In my school, the procedures established to identify new ESOL students worked well.	58	69.9	23	27.7	81	97.6
In my school, the procedures for moving students to and from the ESOL classroom worked well.	51	66.2	22	28.6	73	94.8
In my school, I have opportunities to implement newly learned ESOL instructional approaches and strategies.	55	67.1	18	22.0	73	89.0
In my school, ESOL teachers have assigned rooms for ESOL instruction as needed.	45	53.6	27	32.1	72	85.7
In my school, the criteria for reclassifying and exiting students from ESOL services include review of students' performance on the local and state reading and mathematics assessments.	53	65.4	12	14.8	65	80.2
In my school, instructional materials are adequate to meet the English language and academic needs of my ESOL students.	37	44.6	28	33.7	65	78.3
In my school, the ESOL instruction is aligned with grade-level standards as students move through the ESOL instructional levels.	46	59.0	15	19.2	61	78.2
In my school, the schedule for ESOL services worked well.	44	55.0	10	12.5	54	67.5
In my school, balancing ESOL instruction with the reading and language arts curriculum worked well.	41	50.0	6	7.3	47	57.3

Table B13
Changes in Teachers' Instructional Practices and Techniques (*N*=62)

Changes in teaching practices (multiple responses)[a]	N	%
Implemented a variety of strategies or techniques with students (differentiation of curriculum, new ideas to teach vocabulary, PADI, Baldrige, Skillful Teacher, ESOL strategies, use of equitable practices, collaboration with co-teachers more)	23	37.0
Focused on reading and writing skills (decoding, teaching phonics, interactive writing)	17	27.0
Miscellaneous (e.g., using data, ideas to teach vocabulary, writing notes about progress, work with co-teachers more, make sure ESOL students get proper instruction time, develop high school mentoring program, add more manipulatives to instruction, group according to student needs)	22	35.0

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B14

Changes in Practices for Working with Classroom Teachers as a Result of Participating in Professional Development Activities (*N*=52)

Changes made in practices or techniques for working with teachers (multiple responses)[a]	*N*	%
Increased collaboration among teachers—attended more teacher and team meetings; More time to collaborate and plan with teachers.	19	44.2
Collaboration among ESOL and classroom teachers: Discussed students' progress and needs with teachers; Provided or modeled teaching strategies for teachers of ELL students.	13	34.9
Miscellaneous (e.g., worked more with students who needed more assistance, continues to be a challenge, attended assertiveness training, read and discussed ESOL book with teachers each month, face to face meetings work best, served as Collaborative Action Plan coach).	8	18.6

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B15

School Level Changes in ESOL Instructional Services during 2007–2008 (*N*=41)

School level changes in ESOL instructional services (multiple responses)[a]	*N*	%
No changes	19	47.5
Using plug-in model	6	15.0
Used ESOL curriculum more and instead of reading intervention	5	12.5
Miscellaneous (e.g., integrating ESOL standards with Reading First curriculum, lost rooms so formed ESOL suite, Dual Language instruction replaced ESOL services, cut one full time ESOL position which increased student coverage for each teacher, not servicing level 2 METS students, moved students depending on their needs)	11	27.5

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B16

Perceived Successful Aspects of the ESOL Instructional Program (*N*=77)

Successful aspects of ESOL instructional program (multiple responses)[a]	*N*	*%*
Structure of ESOL program: Data to support grouping, planning, instruction, and student needs; Plug-in program minimizes transition time and allows ESOL and classroom teacher to learn from each other; ESOL instructional program helps ESOL students make progress and catch up to other students; ESOL students appear more prepared for the regular classroom and are making progress; Small group instruction and flexible grouping helped ESOL students	28	47.8
Collaboration between ESOL and classroom teachers; Professional ESOL staff work together as a team	20	34.1
Increased focus on English language development: Allowed to teach ESOL curriculum usually through pull-out program; ESOL program valued by administration and classroom teachers; Following ESOL and MCPS curriculums; Students receiving daily/consistent ESOL instruction	15	31.2
Miscellaneous (e.g., teach one grade level and co-teach ESOL level 1 and 2 students, limit the amount of ESOL teachers working with any grade level, dual language program, students become bilingual and bi-literate, use of jazz chants and plays, offering organized plan for student development, ESOL teachers involved in "Power Group" interventions)	14	23.7

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B17

Evidence Supporting the Successful Aspects of the ESOL Instructional Program (*N*=55)

Frequency of evidence supporting the successful aspects of ESOL instructional program (multiple responses)[a]	*N*	*%*
Student performance data and students work	26	63.4
Structural changes: On-going teacher communication; Formal and informal team and individual meetings; Collaborative scheduling; Administration support of ESOL program; ESOL and classroom teachers planning time together; Classroom teacher awareness of ESOL program	22	36.7
Miscellaneous (e.g., teacher satisfaction, ESOL students did better with support of intervention strategies, team endeavors on National Boards, videos produced for Take One, grade level content maps)	7	17.1

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

Table B18

Suggested Changes to the ESOL Instructional Program to Improve its Effectiveness (*N*=76)

Frequency of suggested changes to the ESOL instructional program to improve its effectiveness (multiple responses)[a]	*N*	*%*
Provide dedicated time/more time to teach ESOL students; Provide a room assignment of designated space for ESOL; Include/teach the ESOL curriculum	26	42.6
More collaboration between ESOL teachers and classroom teachers; ESOL teachers need to provide input into scheduling/delivery of ESOL services; Scheduling/use of ESOL teachers	17	27.9
Balance use of use the plug-in model and pull out model as appropriate	13	18.6
Miscellaneous (e.g., make changes to ESOL curriculum, see level 1 kindergarten students in morning, implement effective co-teaching model, more access to special education students, continuity between ESOL and reading language arts instruction, provide testing accommodations, regularly schedule ESOL and ELL team meetings, make the school dual language, have more administrative support, acknowledge value of LAS Links[b] testing)	18	29.6

[a] The percentage of responses may exceed 100% because respondents marked more than one response.

[b] LAS LINKS= Language Assessment System