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ABSTRACT
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English as a Second Language (ESL) has been an important topic throughout the history of this country. This paper examines history, laws, population demands, and current research regarding ESL education. A local ESL program is described, evaluated, and utilized as a real-world example to compare with the “ideal” program that is identified. Implications of numerous studies are outlined and ESL teacher qualifications and testing/evaluation practices are considered. Finally, important recommendations are made for current and future ESL programs.
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Introduction

Immigrants from all over the world travel to the United States each year. With them they bring new cultures and ideas to contribute to the “melting pot” that is the United States. One key aspect of being able to contribute these ideas is communication. Although it is becoming possible to exist in the U.S. without knowing English, it is essential that tools be provided to new immigrants who wish to learn the language of this country in order to be effective members and potential citizens. Estimates claim that the steadily rising Hispanic population in United States is “projected to increase to 25 percent by 2025” (“Latinos”). As Latinos grow to constitute a larger percentage of our country’s population than any other minority group, it is important to consider their educational needs. In the Supreme Court decision of *Plyler v. Doe* [457 U.S. 202 (1982)] it is written, “undocumented children and young adults have the same right to attend public primary and secondary schools as do U.S. citizens and permanent residents” (“Plyler v. Doe”).

Southwestern Ohio is not excluded from this national trend. Since the mid 1990’s there has been an influx of immigrants, especially of Hispanic descent into the area. Specifically, Hamilton City school district has had to rise to the occasion and create English as Second Language (ESL) departments in several of its schools. The district made the decision to select Jefferson Elementary as the ESL satellite school for elementary aged children. Currently, the student body which just 10 years ago had no
Hispanic students, is 30% Hispanic. The following paper will examine Jefferson in greater detail and investigate current research in the area of ESL theories and practices.
History of Bilingual Education and ESL Laws

Immigration waves are recurring phenomena in the evolution of the United States. Throughout the history of this country immigrants have come to the United States for a vast number of reasons. Almost as vast are the opinions on what kind of education Limited English Proficient (LEP) students should receive. “In 1839 Ohio became the first state to adopt a bilingual education law, authorizing German-English instruction at parents’ request” (“History”). Many other states followed suit and by the early 1900’s four percent of American students received some form of bilingual education (“History”). However, by 1920, following changes in mentality due to WWI, Ohio became the first state to ban German from elementary education because, as Governor James Cox stated, it “posed a distinct menace to Americanism” (Rothstein). Once again, other states followed, eliminating their bilingual programs. In 1923 Nebraska went too far in the opinion of the court, by attempting to make native language instruction illegal, not only in public education but in parochial schools as well. The Supreme Court declared such a law unconstitutional (Rothstein).

The Supreme Court recognized that leaving LEP students to ‘sink or swim’ in English-only classrooms made a ‘mockery of public education’ – which must be equally available to all students...[the decision] required schools to take ‘affirmative steps’ to overcome language barriers impeding children’s access to the curriculum (“History”).

The decision brought about improved conditions for non-English speaking students and influenced Congress’s Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1974, which set up the following guidelines for schools to meet. Schools were required to provide at minimum, equal educational opportunities to LEP students, in the form of:

- Adequate resources- such as staff, training, and materials- to implement the bilingual programs;
- Standards and procedures to evaluate the programs and a continuing obligation to modify a program that fails to produce results; and
- Research-based programs that are viewed as theoretically sound by experts in the field (“History”).

Although these guidelines brought about structure and supervision, they stopped short of making ESL, in the form of a bilingual education an “absolute requirement,” and failed to answer controversial questions such as “should [programs] help students to be competent in two languages and cultures [or focus solely on English instruction]?” (Escamilla).

In recent decades, debates and decisions have continued to influence ESL (English-as-a-Second-Language) education. The 1982 Supreme Court decision, Plyler v. Doe [457 U.S. 202 (1982)], declared that undocumented children, under the protection of
the 14th Amendment, could not be deprived a public education (“Plyler v. Doe”). This meant that public schools could not require families to provide proof of citizenship, or ask questions that might expose information about, students’ immigration status. In addition, “school personnel… and those involved with student intake activities should be aware that they have no legal obligation to enforce U.S. immigration laws” (‘School Opening”).

Beginning in the late 80’s and continuing into the 90’s, the “English-Only movement” began to take hold. It consisted of certain groups and organizations that wished to make English the official language of the United States thereby eliminating bilingual instruction for LEP students (Escamilla). An example of a result of this movement occurred in California in 1998 with the passage of Proposition 227. It allowed for short term “sheltered English classes” to transition LEP students, but “required all public school instruction to be conducted in English” (‘English Language”).

Most recently, President George W. Bush’s No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 proposed and put into law, “a new formula program [that] will facilitate the comprehensive planning by states and school districts needed to ensure implementation of programs that benefit all Limited English Proficient students by helping them learn English and meet the same high academic standards as other students” (Bush). President Bush’s actions were spawned by the increasing need for ESL, which is described in the following section.

In addition, the current immigration wave has brought up age-old debates. The historical information above serves to dismantle the “myth that, until recent[ly]… the
nation had always immersed immigrant children in nothing but English” (Rothstein). Indeed, bilingual education has a long-standing history and will likely continue to grow in the near future. If any doubt exits, it can be clarified by the fact that an immigrant’s legal right to an education, is alone, sufficient reason to provide ESL services. However it has been argued further, that it is “essential to capitalize on the strengths of Latino students because the economic and technological future of this country depends on their educational success…since [Latinos] will constitute an increasingly large portion of the total U.S. population by the mid twenty-first century” (Trueba & Bartolomé). Denying such a large portion of society an appropriate education would be too high a risk to take for the future of our country.

**Population Changes Necessitating ESL Services**

Between 1978 and 1998 “the enrollment of Latinos in elementary schools increased 157 percent… [bringing them to] 15 percent of the elementary school-age population” (“Latinos”), a proportion that recently qualified them as the largest minority group in the United States (Clemetson). This number is “projected to increase to 25 percent by 2025” (“Latinos”). It is for this reason that “although not all Latino students have limited English proficiency,…Latinos comprise three-quarters of all students enrolled in Limited English Proficient (LEP) programs” (“Latinos”).

Often communities, and in particular school districts are not prepared for or forewarned about the influx of immigrants that ultimately join their community.
Education administrators are forced to create assistance and education programs as the need arises, and with the resources available at that time.

**Purpose**

While it is necessary to put ESL programs into place as quickly and efficiently as possible, it is also important, once they have been established, to step back and consider the findings of current research: what research reveals about effective methods of teaching English and of facilitating limited English proficient students’ transitions into English classrooms, as well as to consider the implications that this research has for ESL programs. This paper will attempt to examine and evaluate those research findings that are relevant and pertain to elementary ESL instruction, taking into account a local ESL program as an example in its own regard, as well as to consider how this program compares with what current research might consider a model or “ideal” program, and to use this example to help determine the applicability of research to existing real-world situations.

**Description of ESL at Jefferson Elementary**

Even small, traditionally less diverse school districts are being affected by increasing immigrant populations. Towns that typically have not needed to provide ESL services are now learning their role in the situation. One local example here in Butler County is the town of Hamilton. The US Census Bureau in 1998 estimated the population of Butler County at 330,428 with approximately 2,151 Hispanics (of any race) county-
wide ("Demographic"). The Bureau estimated more than double that number of Hispanic residents in 2000 ("Geographic") and the Butler County Child Support Enforcement Agency estimates the current population exceeding Hispanic 5000 (Cade). Increases such as these have forced Butler County school districts to take Hispanic students’ needs into consideration and to adapt their services appropriately.

Jefferson Elementary School was designated as the ESL satellite elementary school within the Hamilton, Ohio City school district based on the fact that many of the immigrants lived within the school’s attendance area. Jefferson is one of thirteen elementary schools within the district. The school population could be categorized as low-SES, demonstrated by the fact that one hundred percent of its students participate in the school lunch program.

Jefferson hired its first fulltime ESL teacher in 1999. Since then, teachers and resources have continually been added to the ESL program with the increasing need. In addition to a combined team of half and full-day in-class ESL teachers, an ESL pullout program, and bilingual psychology services, Jefferson has recently added a bilingual Parent Communications Coordinator to translate school documents and serve as a liaison between the school and non-English speaking parents, as well as a bilingual coordinator for school transportation who deals with issues that arise on the buses.

All elementary aged students who arrive to the district and are non-English proficient, or without sufficient English skills to be mainstreamed according to the diagnostic test used within the district, are sent to Jefferson. The vast majority of ESL students at Jefferson speak Spanish as their first language. Jefferson’s uniquely diverse
population is one-third African American, one third Caucasian and one-third Hispanic, which amounts to 120 Hispanic students, slightly over half of which (seventy-five) are served by the ESL program.

Funding for Jefferson’s ESL program is provided by the school’s general fund, the principal’s budget, a grant received by the district’s ESL Instructional Services Office, as well as some state funding. These funds contribute to all aspects of the ESL services, the majority of which could be categorized as an ESL pullout set-up; that is, students spend the majority of the day in English classrooms, and are removed for an hour a day to focus on learning English. Students are removed, according to grade level, to work as a group with the ESL teachers. The number of students per grade requiring ESL instruction usually ranges from four to seven.

Students in grades 1-3 work with Miss Day, a recently certified elementary education teacher, in her first year of ESL teaching. Miss Day uses activities including individual and group reading aloud, journals, sentence repetition, spelling tests, specific task worksheets, vocabulary games, formal and informal verbal exchanges, and spontaneous conversation in an effort to improve students’ written, reading, and oral skills. In addition she provides half-day “inclusion” assistance in the first grade classroom which aids ESL students’ comprehension of the English-speaking teacher.

Two options are available for students in grades 4, 5, and 6. Newcomers who have very little or no English work with Mrs. Schneider, a former Spanish teacher who is new to Jefferson this year. Students spend the morning with Mrs. Schneider on intensive English instruction focusing around thematic units, geared towards increasing vocabulary
and English literacy. In the afternoon they return to their classrooms to participate in subject based work.

Intermediate newcomers, or those with a slightly stronger English background, work with Mrs. Butterfield. Mrs. Butterfield has worked at Jefferson in the ESL program for six years. She uses similar activities to those of Miss Day with the upper elementary grades, in the areas of Language Arts, Reading Replacement, and Content Tutoring. To assist the ESL students in Math, Social Studies and Science she participates in “inclusion,” which involves sitting in on the English-speaking classes and making sure that ESL students understand directions given by the teacher, stay on task in classroom work, and write down homework assignments. This last step is particularly important because many of the students’ parents are not fluent in English and have difficulty assisting their children in homework assignments. In addition, Mrs. Butterfield is responsible for evaluating new students to determine if the ESL program could benefit them. To do this she travels to various schools within the district and uses an assessment created by the Miami Valley ESL Consortium. The test combines verbal and written activities to determine the student’s word recognition, ability to form English sentences, and overall comprehension level (see Appendix A).

Once a child’s English competency is determined, the child’s grade level preparedness is tested. According to Mrs. Butterfield, in the Hamilton City school district, every effort is made to place the child at his or her appropriate grade level according to age. This is done in an effort to avoid placing socially mature students in lower level grades with students who are significantly younger. If a student tests below
grade level, and it is determined to be necessary, an intensive intervention on the part of
the classroom teacher, a specialized ESL teacher, and computer activities, in addition to
assistance from a peer in the “buddy system,” are provided in an effort to bring the child
up to grade level.

From the time the child enters Jefferson’s ESL program, Language Assessment
Scales- Reading/Writing tests are administered (in either English or Spanish) twice yearly
to measure students’ progress in the areas of vocabulary, fluency, reading
comprehension, and mechanics usage as well as to determine when they no longer require
ESL services (“Language Assessment”). Although students are considered on an
individual basis, on average a student receives supplementary ESL instruction for 2-3
years before being completely mainstreamed into an English-speaking classroom with
English curriculum at Jefferson, or returning to the school within the district to which
they would have been assigned according to location.

Several factors are taken into consideration when transitioning students out of the
ESL program. There is usually a consensus between the ESL teacher and the classroom
teacher that the child is able to do content based work with some degree of success,
namely C’s and B’s with little or no assistance. Often a student is given a trial period to
see whether he is able to handle a complete English curriculum on his own. If the child
does not experience success, he may continue to receive tutoring until he is ready.

Under current law, students are given a three-year grace period before being
required to participate in Ohio Proficiency tests. However with President Bush’s new
“No Child Left Behind Act” under effect, the Principal of Jefferson foresees even stricter
provisions in the future. She worries that government officials, in an effort to hold ESL students to equally high standards as those to which their English speaking counterparts are held, are creating unrealistic requirements for ESL teachers and their students to meet.

One final aspect of Jefferson’s ESL program is the bilingual kindergarten and first grade classes. The kindergarten class is made up of only Hispanic students. The classroom has two teachers; Mrs. Taylor who teaches in English and Mrs. Slaven who is bilingual and supplements English instruction with Spanish instruction for the first half of the year, before switching over to make the classroom completely in English for the remainder of the year. This set up, spearheaded by Mrs. Slaven, functions as a type of transitional program, which serves to prepare students for an English-speaking classroom the following year. They are provided with a solid basis in English so as to facilitate their success in the language, specifically, and in school in general. Resources are devoted to the youngest students early on, with the idea that a strong foundation will allow these students to continue on into the higher grades with English fluency and minimal need for further ESL assistance.

Although Mrs. Hopper, the first grade teacher, speaks only English, all of her students are bilingual. The majority of the class was together last year, in the Hispanic Kindergarten. In their second year together several new members joined the class. The new students, who were now behind their peers in English ability, were welcomed into the community and found the bilingual environment comforting, and their more advanced classmates helpful. There is some debate among teachers, but it is generally thought that
the psychological benefit of having an environment in which they thrive, facilitates the English learning process. This situation has experienced both qualitative and quantitative success in the opinions of teachers and administrators, to the extent that the children will be ready next year for Immersion into several classrooms with native English speakers and will not require significant additional ESL services.

**The Theory Behind Immersion Programs**

A case study conducted by Marcia Kent Ravetta of the Department of Language, Reading and Culture at The University of Arizona, examines a week in the life of a seven-year-old Hispanic girl in the context of her English-speaking classroom. Her situation is very similar to that of many of the Hispanic students at Jefferson; she spends the majority of the day immersed in a classroom of native English speakers, with a one-hour English tutoring session daily. Her main form of communication is through her bilingual classmates and the limited English that she possesses.

While Ravetta’s study is mostly descriptive, she does go into some of the theory behind Immersion programs. She writes, “the goal of a bilingual immersion classroom is to teach in the second language and not the teaching OF the second language… It is supposed to be a ‘natural’ way of learning a language within the school environment” (Romney qtd. in Ravetta, 2). However, it is important to consider that “exposure to the language and the opportunity to use it are not enough to ensure learning. The degree of proficiency an individual reaches will depend upon a number of different factors” (Ravetta, 4-5).
A study conducted by Wong Fillmore (and cited in Ravetta) observed five students very similar to the one in Ravetta’s study (and to the ESL students who attend Jefferson), who were learning English in a bilingual school, in an effort to determine factors that influence proficiency. As a result of her study, she found that “the children who made the most progress were those who were strongly interested in socializing with their English speaking peers” (Ravetta, 4). In addition, Ravetta writes that one “crucial factor… is motivation; that is, the learner’s motivation or lack of it will have a significant effect on his/her progress” (Ravetta, 4). Therefore, significant implications for ESL programs stemmed from the research conducted by Krashen and Terrell which found that “usually performers with certain types of motivation and with good self images do better in second language acquisition…the best situations for language development seem to be those that encourage lower anxiety levels” (Ravetta, 3). One main implication is that in Immersion programs, where exposure is provided, but language learning is not necessarily incorporated into the curriculum (as in some other types of programs discussed later), it is that much more important to create an environment which fosters student motivation.

ESL Program Qualifications

In her article “ESL and Bilingual Programs and Models,” Rennie names three key factors in evaluating and determining context-appropriate ESL programs. First, she says that “District or School Demographics” should be a primary consideration. This includes the number of students requiring services, the level of instruction they require, as well as if one or more language background(s) is represented. Secondly, “Student
Characteristics” such as grade-level in their native language, experience with English, socio-economic status, cultural views on education, etc. are essential factors in deciding how to create a program that most effectively suits students’ needs. Finally, “District or School Resources” determine which ideas and services the school is capable of providing and therefore which options can actually go into effect. Knowledgeable administrators, teachers trained in ESL or Bilingual Education, facilities and supplies for ESL classrooms, as well as community and financial support all determine realistic limitations for creation and evolution of ESL programs (McKeon qtd. in Rennie).

Historically, there have been various categories to describe the majority of Bilingual Education programs. As programs evolve, so too do the terms that are used to describe them. Recently, as programs have continued to develop, and teaching methods have been tested and redesigned, new sub-categories have been created to describe numerous types of ESL services. Wide ranges exist across programs regarding intensity, time, curriculum and instructional language.

**CONTINUUM OF ESL PROGRAM TYPES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mostly English</th>
<th>Mostly Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL “Pullout”</td>
<td>Transitional Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered English</td>
<td>Two-Way Bilingual/Dual Immersion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One end of the continuum is characterized by the “pullout” style program. Similar to Krashen’s Submersion + ESL program, it occurs mostly in elementary schools and can focus either solely on linguistic aspects of language learning or provide content based instruction in addition, as a method of language teaching. Instruction in pullout
programs generally occurs in English. Programs deemed “Sheltered English,” bring together LEP students, often from various language backgrounds, and provide them with classes completely in English, tailored to their language proficiency level (Rennie).

At the other end of the continuum are completely Bilingual programs. In these programs students are taught English in their primary language. Somewhere in the middle of the continuum, are Transitional Bilingual Programs and Two-Way or Dual Immersion Programs, which use some combination of primary language and English instruction. Much recent research has focused on these two types of programs, primarily because little research has been done previously. Also, from what is known, they appear to employ effective use of resources and yield high success rates among students who participate.

Finally, Cazabon writes that Lambert made an important distinction between “additive” and “subtractive” bilingualism. “The additive case implies that an individual suffers no loss of the primary language and the associated culture, while the subtractive case implies that an individual undergoes a loss of primary language skills and general academic performance” (Cazabon, 1). Additive programs promote maintenance of the primary language through encouraging the use of that language and even continuing education within that language while subtractive programs tend to discourage or prohibit primary language use.
Specific ESL and Bilingual Programs

A study conducted by William Saunders of the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, focuses on a particular Transitional Bilingual program in a large metropolitan area of California. The study presents several views; Rossell and Baker found, “that English learners are better served by early and intensive exposure to English” (Saunders, 346) while Thomas and Collier contend, “that English learners are best served by true bilingual programs that provide effective, sustained instruction in students’ primary language and in English throughout the years” (Saunders, 346).

However, the program under observation in the study is based on the belief that “if transition is handled too abruptly, subsequent achievement tends to stall or decline” (Saunders, 347). It compares the multi-year transition program, which, in its additive approach encourages both English and Spanish literacy, to the traditional one-year transition program within the district that aims at mainstreaming LEP students into English speaking classrooms.

The program under study consists of three levels; Pre-Transition, Transition I, and Transition II. This program moves students from the Pre-Transition level (in the second and third grades children are reading and writing at their appropriate grade level in Spanish in combination with oral practice in English), to the Transition I level (in the fourth grade introductory reading and writing in English is combined with these same activities in Spanish), and finally to the Transition II level (characterized by grade appropriate reading and writing in English) and eventual reclassification to “fluent English proficient” in the fifth grade (Saunders, 349). Each transition level includes
specific goals and methods of instruction to work towards these goals, keeping in mind throughout the process, that the framework is designed to “support students’ Spanish literacy development and draw clear connections between the processes of reading and writing in Spanish and English” (Saunders, 350). Literature is chosen to provide, what Krashen coined, “comprehensible input- language that includes slightly more sophisticated structures or vocabulary than the learner can produce on his/her own, but is still understandable” (Saunders, 352).

Student samples were matched between schools involved in the project curriculum and non-project schools, according to first grade Spanish literacy tests. During the project, both project and non-project students were administered the standardized test, APRENDA, once a year, through third grade. In fourth grade, students who qualify, take the English Language test used by the district (The Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills), and, in fifth grade, all students are administered the English test. In addition, narrative comprehension and writing scores are determined according to the project guidelines (Saunders, 356-358).

Results of the study seem to suggest that the original assumption holds true. Students in the project classes scored measurably higher on the various measurements of achievement and attitudes toward reading and writing (Saunders, 361, 366). In the conclusion it is written, “results indicate the multi-year transition program is demonstrably more effective than the program students typically receive, producing higher levels of Spanish literacy, significantly higher levels of English literacy, and
important literacy related practices and attitudes for significantly larger numbers of students” (Saunders, 371).

Margarita Calderon studied another Transitional Bilingual Program in El Paso, Texas, which uses the Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (BCIRC) curriculum. This program is based on a similar premise; “limited English proficient students whose home language is Spanish [and who are] first taught to read in Spanish, ultimately become better readers in English than do similar students who are taught to read in English only” (Calderon, 1). The program encourages the cooperative learning methods studied by Slavin (1995) and student interaction or “jointly negotiating meaning and solving problems” (Krashen, qtd in Calderon, 2).

The program, designed for second and third graders, was used in three high-poverty schools, which were compared to four similarly matched comparison schools within the district (Calderon, 3). The test groups used the Macmillan *Campanitas de Oro* at the beginning of second grade and began to alternate this series with the Macmillan Transitional Reading Program in English half way through the year. The same combination was used by comparison groups. However, the test groups were taught using the BCIRC process, which consists of vocabulary building, partner reading, story mapping and story related writing, among other strategies. They also received an additional thirty-minute ESL program daily, which included speaking, listening, reading and writing (Calderon, 4-9).

Students were tested using the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TASS) at the beginning of third grade and the Norm-referenced Assessment Program for Texas
(NAPT) at the end of third grade, with Bilingual Syntax Measurement tests administered in kindergarten serving as baseline data (Calderon, 13). Students who had been enrolled in the program for both second and third grade scored highest in reading, followed by students who had been the program for one year, and then by comparison group students, although the differences were not statistically significant (Calderon, 14). However, “third-graders who had been in the BCIRC were significantly more likely than comparison group students to meet criteria for exit from bilingual education in reading and language [39% versus 21% in language and 32% versus 10% in reading]” (Calderon, 15-16). The study concludes that BCIRC “is an effective means of improving the performance in Spanish and English of students in transitional bilingual programs” (Calderon, 17).

Another type of ESL program that incorporates the use of both languages is the Two-way or Dual Immersion program. Two-way immersion programs differ from traditional bilingual programs in that they:

- group language minority students from a single language background in the same classroom with language majority (English-speaking) students [ideally, creating a] 50/50 balance…. Instruction is provided in both English and the minority language. Native English speakers and speakers of [the other] language have the opportunity to acquire proficiency in a second language while continuing to develop their native language skills. Students serve as native-speaker role models for their peers (Rennie).
This type of program is, “becoming an increasingly attractive option for schools and districts that are looking for ways to strengthen and develop the language resources of all of their students” (Howard). The goals of two-way programs are multifaceted and include, language proficiency for students of both language groups in both languages, grade level performance by all students in both languages, mutual respect for both languages and cultures, and increased self-esteem due to both groups being “experts” in their respective languages (Christian).

The Amigos Two-Way Immersion Program has been conducting classes in both Spanish and English with students in the Cambridge Public School District since 1986. Amigos, which is offered beginning in kindergarten, and continues through eighth grade, aims to have a fifty-fifty balance among student population, instructional language by teachers, and curriculum, with an ultimate goal of bilingualism for all students (Cazabon). A study of the program, conducted by Mary Cazabon, et al, purports to “examine students’ development in a two-way bilingual program by focusing on both their attitudes toward becoming bilingual (and possibly bicultural) and their school achievement in both languages” (Cazabon). Their data is based on two case studies of Amigos eighth graders, a questionnaire given to all Amigos students, as well as standardized test scores in both English and Spanish.

The subjects of the case studies are two eighth grade girls, Ana and Diana, both of whom joined the program in the second grade. Ana was born in the US and speaks a mixture of English and Spanish at home. She attended an all-English program prior to attending Amigos and considers her first language English. Diana was born in El
Salvador and considers Spanish her first language. She attended a Transitional Bilingual program for two years, prior to attending Amigos. Both girls consider being bilingual an asset and express wishes to continue their education. Both know that their families support their using and learning the two languages. Diana says that “being bilingual will help her in her career, ‘just to talk to people in both languages, so that everybody will understand. It will make my business more successful’” (Cazabon).

These students’ attitudes seem to be fairly representative of the general student population of the Amigos Program. Using a questionnaire, student opinions were gathered from grades four through eight. The results indicated that:

- The English Amigos believed that they were ‘a little better in English than Spanish’
- The Spanish Amigos thought that they were a ‘little better in Spanish than English’ or the same level in both languages, [and]
- Both groups felt that ‘just about the right’ amount of time was being spent in Spanish instruction and that they were not behind in English skills compared to those students in all-English programs (Cazabon).

Standardized test scores indicate that student estimates, are indeed, on target. Using the California Achievement Test (CAT) and the Spanish Achievement in Bilingual Education (SABE), students’ scores in the Amigos program were compared to two control groups: a native-English group from the very same building as the Amigos program and a native-Spanish group from a transitional bilingual program in the Cambridge school district, where many of the Spanish-Amigos would have been placed for 2-3 years, if they had not been enrolled in Amigos. Using measures from the
Coloured Progressive Matrices, Cazabon, et al, “compare Amigos and control groups who are as much alike as possible in nonverbal abstract reasoning ability and in the socioeconomic area in which their schools are located” (Cazabon). Data from several years of Amigos students were used in an effort to use a large enough sample to find significant results.

The results indicate that, “Spanish-Amigos scored as well as or better than the Spanish control group in reading and math at all grades…[and by Grades 7 and 8] the English-Amigos did not score significantly lower in reading than the Spanish control” (Cazabon). More impressive perhaps, are the results, which indicate, “English-Amigos scored as well or better than the English control group on the CAT. [While the] Spanish-Amigos scored no differently from the English control group in reading on the CAT and scored significantly higher… in English-language math in Grades 4 through six” (Cazabon). These results are mostly clearly illustrated in the form of a graph provided in the study:
Cazabon, et al, conclude then, that “the picture is generally favorable for both the English and the Spanish-Amigos…both ethnic groups in the Amigos program are approaching balanced skills in the two languages, in reading and math” (Cazabon).

Overview of the Data

“A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students’ Long-Term Academic Achievement: Overall Conclusions and Major Policy Implications” by Thomas and Collier looked at and compared the general success of five large school districts, who use the various program types mentioned above, over a fourteen-year period using a sample of over 700,000 student records (Thomas, “A National”, 6). The main method for comparison was a series of national standardized tests in English (Thomas, “Overall”, 326).

Five characteristics were determined which define successful ESL programs. They are, Potential quality of the type of program for ELL’s (English Language Learners), Realized quality of the type of program, Breadth of program focus, Quality of the school’s instructional environment, and Quality of available instructional time” (Thomas, “Overall”, 324-325).

The study yielded various, conclusive results. “Overall, programs for English language learners that ‘score high’ in these five major factors are long-term and enriched forms of bilingual/ESL instruction” (Thomas, “Overall”, 326). Consequently, students whose parents refuse or opt not to enroll them in the available ESL program, “showed...
large decreases in reading and math achievement by Grade 5” (Thomas, “Overall”, 326).
On the other hand, children whose parents chose to have them participate in bilingual/ESL programs reaped the benefits. Still, when examining native Spanish speakers, of all the programs studied, “90-10 and 50-50 one-way and two-way developmental bilingual education programs (or dual language, bilingual immersion)… [were] the only programs found… to assist students to fully reach the 50th percentile in both L1 and L2 in all subjects and to maintain that level of high achievement” (Thomas, “Overall”, 333). In particular, 90-10 Two-way bilingual immersion classes reached 70th percentile and by the 5th grade were significantly outperforming comparison students in Transitional bilingual programs (Thomas, “Overall”, 329).

The explanation provided by Thomas and Collier for the success of these programs, is that:

the bilingually schooled students are able to sustain the gains in L2, and in some cases, to achieve even higher than typical native-English-speaker performance as they move through the secondary years of school… In contrast, the students who have been schooled all in English (L2), tend to go back down in achievement (i.e., lose ground relative to native speakers of English) as they reach the upper grades of school. The students schooled only in L2 do not sustain the gains they made during the elementary school years, when compared to typical native-English speaker gains across the years…. Thus, the simplistic notion—that all we need to do is to teach language minority students the English language—does not address the needs of the school-age child. Furthermore, when we teach only the
English language, we are literally slowing down a child’s cognitive and academic growth, and that child may never catch up to the constantly advancing native-English speaker (Thomas, “A National”, 35, 41).

This data seems to indicate that although any program is better than no ESL, the most successful programs are ones that subscribe to an approach similar to that of the Amigos program, and the most successful begin with a 90 to 10 Spanish to English ratio and gradually phase out Spanish and phase in English until the two share equal classroom instruction time. (For questions to evaluate an ESL program see Thomas, “A National Study: How Is Your School Doing?”).

**Drawbacks of Successful Programs**

The three programs outlined above provide an overview of several types of programs that are in existence and are experiencing demonstrable success not only individually, but nationally as well. With this success they are able to contribute ideas, concepts and even entire programs to the array of ESL possibilities. Nevertheless, there are some potential drawbacks that arise from assuming that these programs should be implemented in any school that has students who require ESL services.

For one, many of the Transitional Bilingual projects’ “emphasis on a strong Spanish literacy program” (Saunders, 370), is an important goal. However, it is also a goal which is outside the realm of what many districts’ resources allow them to achieve. For example, districts whose main purpose is bringing LEP students up to a proficiency
level in which they can survive in English speaking classrooms may not be able to devote resources towards increasing Spanish literacy as well.

In addition, two of three of these programs require fully bilingual teachers. In many schools, a bilingual teacher is a rare commodity, one that is used not only to teach, but to translate school documents, parent interactions, phone calls, etc. For many districts, especially in areas that do not traditionally experience high influxes of immigrants, it is impossible to establish truly Bilingual programs, due to lack of available qualified teachers. While in her study of the Amigos program Cazabon concludes, “the suggestion in this research is that immigrant students can better learn and master English if they are simultaneously permitted to develop or maintain a high degree of literacy in their native language… [and] that education in two languages may be beneficial for all children,”(Cazabon). However Saunders admits, “it is probably a mistake to underestimate the challenge involved in implementing the program with large numbers of teachers” (Saunders, 373). These issues will be discussed in greater detail, in a following section entitled ESL Teacher Qualifications.

Saunders notes, “the issues of newcomers and transiency are major impediments to the effectiveness of transitional bilingual programs and must be taken very seriously” (Saunders, 374). A final major drawback to Transitional Bilingual programs in particular is that they work under the assumption that students will enter and remain in the program for a number of years. Experience demonstrates that all too often this is not the case. Many recent immigrants move frequently while they are establishing themselves in their new country, or even return to their country of origin before establishing permanent
residence in the U.S. This lack of stability causes students to switch school districts, programs and even instructional languages, changes that can be detrimental to the success of students in programs designed to last 2-3 years or more. Saunders writes that “it seems clear that the program does not have the capacity to fully address the needs of very low achieving students” (Saunders, 370), an essential requirement for many districts who find that their students have had little or inconsistent education even in their native languages.

**Analysis of Program Implications**

So what can be taken from these researched success stories without the costly revamping of entire programs, but rather utilizing the sometimes-limited resources that bind school districts? Saunders writes,

> Without adopting our specific program, results suggest significant payoffs might be had by (a) focusing attention on the quality of L1 language arts and oral English language development in the early grades, (b) adopting a longer-term approach to transition, (c) establishing an actual curriculum for the transition period, and (d) maintaining L1 language arts instruction during at the 1st year when English literacy is introduced (Saunders, 372).

Thomas and Collier maintain that, “of all the student background variables, the most powerful predictor of academic success in L2 is formal schooling in L1. This is true whether L1 schooling is received only in home country or in both home country and the U.S.” (Thomas, “A National”, 39). They continue by explaining that many studies have
examined numerous ESL programs and hundreds of ESL students and found that “if students do not reach a certain threshold in their first language, they may experience cognitive difficulties in the second language” (Thomas, “A National”, 41). They provide evidence that “developing cognitively and linguistically in L1 at least throughout the elementary school years provides a knowledge base that transfers from L1 to L2 [and] both languages are the vehicle for strong cognitive and academic development” (Thomas, “A National”, 41).

Calderon makes an argument that perhaps cooperative learning should be included in the proposed ESL curriculum. She writes that although the quantitative data is not as strong as it could be, in combination with qualitative data provided by student surveys and other less testable aspects (such as student conversation and writing samples), the data does suggest that, “cooperative learning engages students in frequent cognitively complex interactions around the solution of real problems and [her study contributes to] its demonstrated achievement effects in both monolingual and ESL settings” (Calderon, 16-17). In addition, this type of approach seems to remain as “additive” (Lambert qtd. in Cazabon) as possible without actually maintaining instruction in the students’ primary language.

A study conducted by Eugene Garcia, which provides an overview of various “effective practices used with linguistically and culturally diverse students in selected sites throughout the United States” (Garcia, 2), supports Calderon’s notion. It names “Collaborative Learning” as well as “Functional Communication” and “Thematic Units” as common attributes among the effective classrooms that were investigated (Garcia, i).
Many of the classroom teachers provided activities that encouraged and necessitated student interaction, and found that, “it was during student-student interactions that most higher order cognitive and linguistic discourse was observed” (Garcia, 4).

A set-up such as this allowed for another important factor, functional communication. Garcia notes, “communication between teacher and students and among fellow students was emphasized more than might be expected in a regular classroom… teachers were constantly checking with students to verify the clarity of assignments and the students’ roles” (Garcia, 3). Classrooms emphasized small group work in “learning centers” which minimized individual work and fostered language use.

The focus on thematic units, which the students often decided on as a group, allowed “teachers to integrate academic content with the development of basic skills… [so that] students would necessarily develop basic skills as a means to appropriate this knowledge” (Garcia, 3). Teachers asked students what they wished to learn about and then catered the curriculum to both students’ desire to learn and district requirements for grade level skills.

These attributes provided by Garcia are important because they are not specific to a particular type of program and can essentially be incorporated into almost any program where the teacher has a solid understanding of the underlying concepts.

ESL Teacher Qualifications

As was mentioned above, the key to any successful ESL program is dedicated teachers. Teachers determine not only the curriculum, but the atmosphere and mind-set
of the classroom and the students. Garcia writes in his evaluation of successful programs, “teachers were highly committed to the educational success of their students [and] perceived themselves as instructional innovators utilizing new learning theories and instructional philosophies to guide their practice” (Garcia, 5). Principals, as well, “tended to be well informed and highly articulate about the curriculum and instructional strategies undertaken in their schools” (Garcia, 5).

With the need for ESL teachers rising and the short supply of bilingual teachers in many areas throughout the country, it is important to consider what qualifications define successful ESL teachers. In her book, Improving Schooling for Language-minority Children: A Research Agenda, Diane August quotes The Descriptive Study, saying that the majority of “teachers of English language learners hold regular elementary and secondary teaching certification; only small percentages are certified in bilingual education (10 percent) or ESL (8 percent)” (August, 21). The National Center for Education Statistics conducted a study in 1996 to examine teachers of LEP students across the country. “LEP-related training was defined to include both pre-service (teacher credential) training and in-service (staff development) training” (“Are LEP Students?”). The study findings indicated that, “teachers in regions with larger percentages of LEP students were more likely to have received LEP training than were their counterparts in regions with smaller percentages of these students” (“Are LEP Students?”). Accordingly, the Western region of the country had the most LEP trained teachers with 47.3% and the Midwest had the fewest with 11.6%. Considering the numbers according to classroom, of teachers whose classes were made up of more than
half LEP students, 86.7% were LEP trained. On the other hand, 19.2% of teachers with fewer than 10% LEP students were LEP trained. The study concludes that the data is promising because “higher percentages of teachers with LEP training in regions and classrooms with higher percentages of LEP students suggest that efforts are being made to address the needs of LEP children” (“Are LEP Students?”). But does training necessarily mean successful teachers?

Ideally, according to research discussed in prior sections, all LEP students would be placed in classrooms with bilingual teachers who are fully capable of communicating with students regardless of their language ability and who are able to promote bilingual literacy in an “additive” fashion. However, “a national survey of teacher placement officers ranked bilingual education as the field with the highest degree of teacher shortage and with the highest demand” (August, 252). Not to mention, “the field of teacher preparation and professional development for those serving English-language learners is relatively low… and research in the area is rather sparse” (August, 253). Guerrero argues that this creates an even deeper issue because the institutions of higher learning where teachers are being educated, “attempt to meet the language needs of prospective bilingual education teachers based on language practices with little or no demonstrated empirical support” (Guerrero, 146). Saunders adds that ideally, “all teachers have or can develop [the necessary skills], but we have not demonstrated it. Some teachers at project schools openly commented that what they saw project teachers doing was impressive, but they could not imagine investing so much time and effort” (Saunders, 373).
Despite the overall lack of research, the data that does exist provides some implications. “Contemporary teacher preparation and development efforts stress an inquiry based approach to teacher learning, which places the teacher in a more active role in the professional development process” (August, 254). These programs are designed in an effort to maximize the potential teacher effectiveness for LEP students. A study conducted by Faltis and Merino looked at “exemplary teachers’” strategies for adapting their classrooms to the benefit of bilingual and multicultural students. “They found that effective teachers who work in linguistically diverse classrooms are ‘skilled in the integration of students' work at mixed levels of linguistic and conceptual complexity’” (Constantino). Also, they “reported that exemplary teachers in these two settings tended to adjust their speech and to provide various kinds of extralinguistic support in the lesson” (Constantino). Finally, “Cummins points out that the extent to which teachers facilitate minority community participation in matters of schooling contributes to the empowerment of minority students in general” (Constantino).

**Length of Time Required in ESL Programs**

An interesting aside in the study “School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students’ Long-Term Academic Achievement,” conducted by Thomas and Collier is the notion of “catching up.”

Students who are on grade level when they arrive, [require] several years to acquire enough English to do grade-level work, which is equivalent to interrupting their schooling for 1 or 2 years. Then they have to make more gains than the average native-English speaker makes every year for several years in a
row to eventually catch up to grade level, a very difficult task to accomplish with the remaining years of K-12 schooling (Thomas, “Overall”, 334).

The study states that “the minimum length of time it takes to reach grade-level performance in second language is 4 years,” assuming the child has received excellent primary language schooling prior to arriving in the U.S. (Thomas, “Overall”, 334). Thomas adds that age is an important factor as well. His study found that students who arrived between ages 8 and 11, who had received at least 2-5 years of schooling taught through their primary language (L1) in their home country, were the lucky ones who took only 5-7 years. Those who arrived before age 8 required 7-10 years or more…The only difference between the two groups was that the younger children had received little or no formal schooling in their first language (L1), and this factor appeared to be a significant predictor in these first studies (Thomas, “A National”, 33).

Ravetta cites several studies that explain that, “conversational skills often approach native-like levels in about two years of exposure to English… [however], a period of five years or more is required for minority students to achieve at the level of native students in academic aspects of language proficiency” (Cummins, Krashen & Fillmore qtd. in Ravetta, 4).

Cummins labels these two different types of fluency “Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS)” and “Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)” (Cummins). Concidine explains that students who have been in an ESL environment for one to two years “appear to be quite fluent” (Concidine). When asked
conversational questions they understand and are able to answer appropriately. “That is because they have BICS. They have basic interpersonal communication skills in English” (Concidine). However, if a more academically challenging or abstract concept like "Independence" or "Democracy" is presented, these students experience much greater difficulty and have very little understanding, because they do not have CALP in English. One way of overcoming this barrier is for teachers to “introduce the concepts [in the students’] home language. That way they would be getting access to grade level core content. Otherwise, [teachers] will be trying to teach a grade level concept in English when the student doesn't have the proficiency (CALP) to comprehend it.

Cummins explains that the distinction between these two concepts is quite important when working with LEP students and that ignoring the implications has risky consequences.

Analysis of psychological assessments administered to minority students showed that teachers and psychologists often assumed that children who had attained fluency in English [BICS] had overcome all difficulties with English… Yet these children frequently performed poorly on English academic tasks as well as in psychological assessment situations (Cummins).

These seemingly contradictory results, as well as the tendency of “professionals to falsely assume that the children have language-learning disabilities” when they appear to be fluent and yet receive low scores on tests, can be explained by students’ lack of CALP (Roseberry-McKibbin).
The above findings provide imperative considerations not only for ESL teachers and programs, but for lawmakers as well. The information found in the studies seriously calls into question the realistic basis of laws regarding testing of such students. The current 3-year exemption from state testing for LEP students provided by the No Child Left Behind Act, may compromise the President’s goal of holding such students to an equally high standard by imposing unrealistic and scientifically unfounded requirements on students and their teachers.

**Returning to Jefferson**

Now that research has been discussed and data has been analyzed all the while maintaining Jefferson in mind as a measure of reality, it is time to review the program itself. Jefferson faces various challenges such as students that arrive below grade-level and throughout the year. Overall, however, Jefferson makes excellent use of its resources and attempts to efficiently enact new aspects of its program so as to benefit the students as rapidly as possible.

Although it does not have what might be termed the most advanced type Dual Immersion program, it does demonstrate many successful ESL techniques. The latest addition of a Newcomer’s program for 4th-6th graders is an example of going beyond an Immersion-dominated program to providing Sheltered English. Within the Sheltered English program, the focus on “thematic units,” exemplifies what Garcia deemed a common attribute among “effective instructional practices” nationally (Garcia, i ).
Also, the system that has been put into practice in the early grades is a kind of twist on the Transitional bilingual program, which moves the completely Hispanic class from a bilingual setting in Kindergarten, to an English-only setting in first grade. This setting would provide an interesting topic for further research. The program, which is popular within the district and seems to be quite successful so far, could provide valuable insight into the effects of keeping bilingual students together in the same classroom for a short period, before dispersing them among majority native English classrooms.

Finally, one of Jefferson’s strongest characteristics is its willingness and commitment to communicate with the parents and families of its LEP students. The hiring of a Parent Communications Coordinator, on-going parent teacher communication efforts and conferences, and strong, guided leadership by the principal, indicate this dedication. Such dedication is essential, because (as was discussed in several studies and emphasized by Constantino), community and parental involvement serve to “empower” parents, students and schools.

**Conclusion**

Time after time, throughout the research that has been examined, it is emphasized that:

There is no one ‘right’ program; schools [should] construct their particular approach to English language development from a repertoire of effective strategies that can be adapted to the local situation. The approach may range from content-based ESL and transitional bilingual programs to dual language programs
serving language majority students alongside LEP students… In the ideal case, the school has implemented a developmental sequence of English language instruction with the flexibility to adapt to the unique needs of the students being served (“The Benchmark Study”).

Overall however, research indicates that the Two-Way or Dual Immersion program is the “ideal” program. However, the more “transitional” a program is, the more success its students tend to experience. That is, the more it maintains primary language use and the more smoothly it facilitates the shift from the students’ primary language to English, the more the students benefit. Results across studies provide data which show higher test scores as well as higher general success rates and better attitudes towards education in these types of programs. In previous sections various recommendations and suggestions regarding teaching strategies, curriculum and program structures, resulting from studying these programs have been provided. It is important they be considered in creating new programs and evaluating existing ones. However, the reality is that many school districts do not have the resources to provide what might be termed the “ideal” Dual Immersion or Transitional Bilingual programs. Nevertheless, several factors can be taken from these programs.

As was demonstrated in the research, motivation is a factor that is as influential as any in the learning of a second language. One proven method of enhancing motivation that requires little more than teacher creativity is cooperative learning. “A focus on social interaction encourages students to take risks, construct meaning and seek
reinterpretations of knowledge within compatible social contexts” (Garcia, 6).

“Cooperative learning techniques enhance academic achievement and particularly so for minority students...low achieving and minority students appear to be considerably more motivated to learn in cooperative classrooms” (Ravetta, 5).

This interactive approach can also serve as a vehicle for the most essential factor revealed in the research, attitude. Attitude towards the child’s first language would appear to be an invaluable resource available to any program. Logically, a program which places value on a skill that a child possesses (which the successful types of programs inherently do), makes the child feel valued as well, this in turn promotes confidence and therefore learning. If teachers and schools show interest in what the child already knows, especially language, a skill that essentially defines the child in the school environment, it will encourage students to show interest in learning the new language in return. If programs cannot go so far as to be what Lambert termed “additive,” they can at the very least not be “subtractive” or not inhibit Spanish literacy in their pursuit of English fluency. “The instructional strategies that serve these students well acknowledge, respect, and build upon the language and culture of the home” (Garcia, 7).

So as the sea of cultures and languages continues to expand with each new wave of immigrants, so too should the on-going debate and investigation into the most effective methods of educating the newest members of this country, in ways that can benefit both them, and society as a whole.
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# ESL Student Information Form

Directions for use: Obtain information from the parent/guardian at the time of enrollment. You may need to request the assistance of an interpreter.

**School Contact Person** __________________________  **School** __________________________  **Date** __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Sex: M F</th>
<th>Birthdate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Telephone #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Security #</th>
<th>Student Identification #</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Citizen of</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Resides With</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship - English-speaking?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siblings Enrolled in Schools</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Registration Credentials:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Arrival in U.S.A.</th>
<th>Proof of Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Departure Date</th>
<th>Birth Certificate</th>
<th>Passport</th>
<th>School Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Health Documentation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Form</th>
<th>Immunization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Free and Reduced Lunch:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free/Reduced Application</th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Reduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Educational History:


2. Have you attended school in U.S.? __________ Last grade completed __________ Year __________

3. Last school attended __________ What year? __________ Where? __________

4. Home school year begins __________ ends __________ Repensed grade __________ Skipped Grade __________

5. Literate in home language __________ Other languages __________

6. Have you studied English? __________ For how long? __________ Proficiency level __________

7. Required to maintain grade level skills in home language? __________ Mask level __________

8. Grade placement __________ Transportation __________ Bus Route __________ Time __________ Corner __________

9. Interests, hobbies, education or career goals, and family history: ______________________________

Other Proficiency and Literacy Skills:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Understands no English</td>
<td>☐ Produces no oral sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Understands a few English phrases</td>
<td>☐ Responds to “What is your name?” only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Understands some English; requires repetitions and simplification of speech</td>
<td>☐ Gives one- and two-word utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Understands English spoken at normal rate</td>
<td>☐ Uses simplified speech; uses auxiliary verbs, and/or articles, word endings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writing:

| ☐ Cannot write in first language | ☐ Uses understandable English; makes some grammatical errors |
| ☐ Know how to write in first language, but has forgotten | ☐ Has native-like fluency |
| ☐ Uses satisfactory writing skills in first language | ☐ Cannot read in first language |
| ☐ Cannot write in English | ☐ Reads in first language |
| ☐ Uses writing skills in English at proficiency level | ☐ Is not familiar with English alphabet |

Academic Evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standardized Test Scores</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Picture With Prompt Questions
(pp. 7-9)

This instrument is for observation and information gathering purposes only. You are not expected to obtain a score.

Student’s Name ___________________________ Date: ______________________

Grade _______________ School __________________________

Teacher __________________________ Program Entry Date: __________________

Checking oral proficiency:
• naming classroom objects
• talking about everyday familiar occurrences

I. VOCABULARY

Directions for Teacher Use: Allow student 10 seconds to look at the picture before asking the questions.

Test Questions

1. (Point to book.)
   Ask “What is this?”

2. (Point to clock.)
   Ask “What is this?”

3. (Point to flag.)
   Ask “What is this?”

4. (Point to globe.)
   Ask “What is this?”

5. (Point to pencil sharpener.)
   Ask “What is this?”

Teacher record student response in Space Provided ______________________

-7-
II. VERBAL PRODUCTION

Ask the following questions. Check the appropriate rating.

1. (Point to person at the board.) Ask "What is he doing?"

   ____ Unable to respond.

   ____ Uses isolated words or phrases which do not express a complete thought.

   ____ Expresses a complete thought but makes errors that a native speaker would not make.

   ____ Expresses a complete thought about as well as others in his/her grade.

2. (Point to clock.) Ask "What time is it?"

   ____ Unable to respond.

   ____ Uses isolated words or phrases which do not express a complete thought.

   ____ Expresses a complete thought but makes errors that a native speaker would not make.

   ____ Expresses a complete thought about as well as others in his/her grade.

3. (Point to picture.) Say "This is a classroom. Tell me what happens in a classroom."

   ____ Unable to respond.

   ____ Uses isolated words or phrases which do not express a complete thought.

   ____ Expresses a complete thought but makes errors that a native speaker would not make.

   ____ Expresses a complete thought about as well as others in his/her grade.
HOME WORK

\( \frac{3}{12} + \frac{1}{6} = ? \)
Literacy Skills Assessment
Grades 3-12
(pp. 11-16)

Directions for use: Please note that both pre- and post-versions are included.

I. Instruct the student to write the alphabet. If s/he is unable to complete the task, stop here. Do not proceed with the rest of the Literacy Skills Assessment.

II. Instruct the student to “Write what you hear.” Use pre- or post-dictation sentences as appropriate.

III. Give page 12 (pre-test) or page 15 (post-test), as applicable, to the student to complete.

IV. Give page 13 (pre-test) or page 16 (post-test), as applicable, to the student to complete.

II. Pre-Test Dictation Sentences — Instruct student to “Write what you hear.” Say:

1-1. The book costs $1.50. (v/n on verb/number discrimination)
1-2. Pour the milk in the bowl. (v/b discrimination)
1-3. Where is your teacher? (Spelling of “Where;” use of question mark; recognition of word order in question)
1-4. There is an apple on the table. (homonym “there”; indefinite article “an”)
1-5. He likes the United States. (v/w at end of word; use of proper noun)

II. Post-Test Dictation Sentences — Instruct student to “Write what you hear.” Say:

2-1. The candy costs $.50.
2-2. Put the money in the box.
2-3. When will you go?
2-4. Here are the papers.
2-5. The students study every day.
Literacy Skills Assessment
Pre-Test • Grades 3-12
(pp. 11-13)

Student Name __________________________ Date __________
Grade ________ School __________________________
Teacher __________________________ Program Entry Date __________

I. Write the alphabet.

________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________

II. Write what you hear.

1-1. __________________________
1-2. __________________________
1-3. __________________________
1-4. __________________________
1-5. __________________________
Pre-Test - Grades 3-12

Student Name ___________________________ Date ___________________________

III. Answer these questions in complete sentences.

1. What is your name?

2. When did you first learn English?

3. What did you do yesterday?

4. How many people are there in your family?

5. What language is usually spoken in your home?

6. How long have you lived in the United States?

7. What holidays are celebrated by your family at home?

8. What did one of your teachers ask you yesterday?
Pre-Test • Grades 3-12

Student Name ___________________________ Date ___________________________

IV. Write a sentence using all of the words. You may add other words and you may add
endings to words so that the sentences make sense.

Sample: swam / fish / little

1-1. sand / play / girl.

1-2. car / blue / go

1-3. inside / kitten / white

1-4. bought / movie / during

1-5. hope / friend / see
Circle the colors that student can identify.

red blue yellow green orange
purple black white pink grey

Circle the school objects that the student can identify.

scissors pencil glue flag chair
table desk crayons book
paintbrush puzzle/game easel
computer pencil sharpener paper
markers garbage can calendar

Circle the body parts that the student can identify.

eye mouth ear foot
head nose toes finger
hand stomach arm leg