

**Review of the English as a Second Language Program  
Monticello School District  
Report of Findings and Proposal for 3-year Program Development Plan  
August, 2010**

The Mid Hudson BETAC received a request from the Monticello CSD to assist the district in reviewing the ESL program. The district expressed concern about a lack of continuity in the ESL program and instruction across the districts and among the school buildings. There was also concern in the administration that the ESL students were not achieving English language proficiency as quickly as they should. The district requested BETAC's assistance in reviewing the program and making recommendations for program modification and professional development.

On May 3, 2010 two staff members of the Mid-Hudson BETAC at Ulster BOCES conducted 30 to 40-minute observations of six ESL lessons in Monticello's ESL program at Monticello High School, RJK Middle School, KLR Elementary School, and Cooke Elementary School. All of these were pull-out lessons in which the ESL teacher taught the ESL students in his/her own classroom. Because of scheduling constraints, the BETAC staff did not observe any of the push-in ESL instruction that was practiced at that time. Three teachers were not observed on that day because of unforeseen circumstances. The purpose of the observations was to supplement interview data that had been gathered from all ESL teachers in the district in order to make recommendations for improvement of the program.

This report serves as a summary of the salient issues raised through this review process. It is by design that no teacher names are used. The findings are couched in terms that will best inform future program development. It is important to keep in mind that the findings represent conclusions drawn from only one day visiting ESL classes, one ESL faculty-wide interview, review of curriculum descriptions submitted by each ESL teacher and paper reviews of past district-generated ESL program descriptions by BETAC staff. The latter were conducted

by instruction from the NYSED Office of Bilingual Education and Foreign Language Studies (OBE-FLS), to ensure compliance with NYSED and Federal regulations regarding the education of ELLs. An important criteria of compliance and delivery of research-based instruction is that the ESL program be a high-quality freestanding program, with ESL instruction delivered by high-quality teachers.

Data collection through observations was guided by criteria that research has shown to be best practices in ESL education. The observers sought out evidence of these criteria in their classroom visits, though, since these criteria are not exhaustive, evidence of effective instruction not mentioned on the list was noted.

- Evidence of ESL standards
- Evidence of content curriculum connection
- Content of lessons – subject areas, academic rigor
- Evidence of student work and projects
- Evidence of long-range projects or language learning activities connected to student achievement objectives
- Differentiation by proficiency level
- Language learning objectives
- Level of cognitive demand
- Instructional materials and resources
- Evidence of collaboration with classroom/content teachers
- Literacy instruction
- Student interactivity/active engagement

### **Program Strengths**

- It was evident that some teachers put great amounts of thought, time, and effort into preparing and delivering ESL instruction.
- Some teachers made extra efforts to find supplementary materials to help lower proficiency students in the content areas.

- Language instruction, when observed, tended to differentiate according to English language learners' (ELLs) English proficiency.
- In two notable classes student work was abundant, authentic, and purposeful.
- Many ESL classes appeared to have a variety of educational resources, many of them acquired through teachers' own initiative.

### **Considerations for Building the Monticello ESL program**

Overall ESL instruction in the district can be characterized in four ways:

1. Teachers teaching English language skills with no context. It was observed, and confirmed through several written curriculum descriptions, that students in at least one building ESL classes spend a great deal of time studying *about* the language than studying how to *use* the language. Grammar lessons using materials such as Side by Side were the main focus of the lesson and of the instructional approach in general, rather than the supplements they were designed to be. There was little cognitive challenge evident in this lesson. Especially in the upper grades, ELLs require content-based application of English, with occasional targeted grammar instruction that stems from the language of the content areas.
2. Teachers teaching academic content with no language focus. It was observed, and confirmed through written curriculum descriptions, that some ESL classes were so focused on the students' academic subjects – notably Social Studies – that language instruction was completely left out of the lesson. Students were observed doing written assignments for other classes while the teacher provided assistance. No lesson plans per se were evident, nor were content or language objectives for lesson.
3. Teachers teaching language through academic content, but with no short-term or long-term structure. While some lessons were impressive in their

language goals, student work, student engagement, and purposeful use of language, it was apparent that the lessons or lesson units were isolated. There was no connection over time, no progression of language skills and knowledge. Teachers across all buildings have no English language scope and sequence or curriculum on which to base their planning.

4. ESL teachers supporting the instruction of their students in their content or mainstream classrooms in a “push in” model that is not research-based. Based on past reviews of the district’s Comprehensive Plan for the education of English language learners, BETAC has noted that in some buildings ESL teachers “push in” to their students’ mainstream or content area classes to deliver ESL instruction. The descriptions of the “push in” model do not meet the standards of best practices in ESL instructional programs, with no evidence of team teaching or inclusion of language development in the instruction. In addition, this model does not meet the requirement of NYSED CR Part 154 that ESL be a freestanding academic program.

Other observations were made that are important to a more thorough picture of the ESL program district-wide.

- In most ESL classes observed, there is a need for higher academic rigor and student engagement in meaningful learning activities to develop the academic English language proficiency they need to meet higher expectations and achieve grade-level performance.
- Little student work was observed overall, with some notable and impressive exceptions.

- While an average of 4 computers were in each classroom, it was observed that only two students in two different classes used them. In many classes the computers were not turned on.
- The district's ESL program lacks both horizontal and vertical consistency. That is, despite some impressive lessons and projects, there is no clear direction for language development that can guide the teachers' planning and the students' learning. Lessons were not seen to systematically build language skills over time.
- The kindergarten/1<sup>st</sup> grade ESL class was indistinguishable from a reading class. Despite the wide-ranging levels of English proficiency, all students took part in a phonics lesson on onsets. Some low proficiency students had little understanding of their individual assignments; there was no assessment to check comprehension. No language objectives were evident. Student work in this classroom, as evidenced by an examination of random students' folders, was almost exclusively worksheet-based. Little authentic language use was observed.
- Articulation between the ESL teachers and classroom/content teachers, when apparent, did not inform ESL instruction. Academic content that was observed in one classroom was the exclusive material that students worked on; there was no language teaching in this lesson.

## **Recommendations**

The Mid Hudson BETAC recommends a comprehensive 3-year plan to increase the capacity of all educators of ELLs to meet the linguistic and academic needs of the students. These recommendations are also informed by the district's current and ongoing efforts to reduce achievement gaps by increasing academic rigor and expectations in the ESL department.

In addition to proposed professional development and ESL program development, Mid Hudson BETAC will represent the English language learners in the regular monthly meetings of the High School Restructuring Team, in particular with regard to increasing academic rigor and expectations to support students in achieving college and career readiness.

The most pressing need of Monticello's ESL program is to develop a curriculum map that would form the blueprint for a scope and sequence of language goals within subject area contexts. Teachers require guidance to help them plan lessons, develop projects, articulate expectations, and prepare for the NYSESLAT. Language demands of the content areas cannot be adequately addressed by ESL teachers without a well-crafted plan. A curriculum map should lay out language goals over time and incorporate these goals into curriculum units that are informed by the content areas.

District-wide ESL instruction should be delivered in a pull-out model that is rigorous, interactive and designed to increase student engagement and language development. This will ensure that all ELLs receive research-based ESL instruction and achieve the academic language in all modalities that they need to access the district curriculum.

The ESL teachers and administrators, as a department, should select instructional and student materials and technology that support a research-based ESL curriculum across the grades and English proficiency levels.

Professional development for ESL teachers is also recommended. Professional development aims would include but not be limited to project-based teaching, academic language teaching and learning and methods of evaluating program effectiveness and student progress.

## Three-Year Program Development Plan Proposal

BETAC proposes a 3-year plan of comprehensive curriculum development, program evaluation and related professional development, delivered by a second-language/ESL professional through a contract with Ulster BOCES, outlined as follows:

Year 1 (2010-2011)

### Summary of Year 1 Proposed Initiatives and Objectives

- ESL teachers will receive professional development in planning and delivery of research-based ESL instruction. Teachers will develop a curriculum framework aligned with the State's ELA and ESL standards, drawing from the district's curriculum, and a related series of content-based thematic units that will be aligned with ESL and ELA learning standards and use academic content as the context in which students develop English proficiency. The unit instructional activities will be planned to meet the needs of students at all English proficiency levels. The thematic units will be planned to include language objectives, interactive classroom activities, student products, formative and summative assessments. Further professional development activities will be designed to increase the ESL teachers' and administrators' capacity to support high academic and linguistic achievement by ELLs across the district's curriculum.
- School building administrators and ESL administrators will receive professional development in the needs of ELLs and research-based ESL curriculum, instruction and assessment.

Year 1 proposed timeline:

August, 2010

Teachers will develop a prototype thematic unit while gaining an understanding of curriculum development. The program will be presented by Dr. Devin G. Thornburg, Professor in School of Education, Adelphi University and facilitated by NYS Mid Hudson BETAC.

September – June, 2010

ESL teachers will continue to develop outcomes-based thematic units and begin to develop an ESL curriculum map. This work will be based on analyses of ELL student data and identified areas of weakness and will emphasize assessments aligned with program goals. Teachers should have access to Monticello district curriculum in all academic areas to help provide grade-level appropriate contexts for their ESL units. Year 1 will include further PD as described below.

September/October – PD for ESL teachers in studying and interpreting student data, including performance on the NYSESLAT and other NYS assessments, to identify students' needs. PD in creating and applying formative and summative assessments aligned to program goals.

PD for administrators in research-based ESL curriculum, instruction and assessment to meet the needs of ELLs.

Development of administrators' and teachers' understanding of measures used to identify students potentially at risk of academic failure that are valid or invalid for ELLs.

October/November - Further observation of ESL classes, other classes which include ELLs and former ELLs, and study of ELL student data by ESL teachers, district administration and BETAC staff to gather evidence of instructional practice and student and program success and challenges. Data to be reviewed to include: performance on NYS assessments of ELLs and former ELLs; rates of ELL and former ELL student success in mainstream/content classes; attendance and

graduation rates of ELLs and former ELLs. The data will inform the work over the 3-year period and may be measured for evidence of increased student achievement.

November/December – PD for ESL teachers in developing academic and cross-content vocabulary and refining language objectives of their instructional units.

January/February – Intensive guided work on development of formative and summative assessments within the thematic units that teachers have developed.

March/April – ESL teachers to receive PD in infusing inquiry and higher-order thinking into their thematic units and strategies to promote student engagement in the learning activities.

May/June – Individual and departmental review of thematic based units and status of ESL curriculum development. ESL teachers to organize their units sequentially over the year based on this review and identified grade-level objectives.

Throughout the process of curriculum development, teachers and administrators will increase their knowledge and capacity to better meet the needs of subgroups of ELLs, including SIFE, long-term ELLs, MS/HS students at risk of dropping out and former ELLs.

Year 2 (2011-2012)

Summary of Year 2 Proposed Initiatives and Objectives:

ESL teachers will further develop a globally comprehensive ESL curriculum aligned to the Common Core Standards and district content curriculum. ESL

teachers will engage in continuous refinement and expansion of thematic units and development of new units as needed to complete the curriculum objectives.

ESL teachers will receive turnkey training to develop their capacity to collaborate with content and mainstream teachers and other educators to meet the linguistic and academic needs of ELLs in their classes.

Content area and mainstream classroom teachers will receive PD in instructional and assessment strategies to meet the needs of ELLs in every classroom.

Development of a pilot program for some content/classroom teachers and some ESL teachers to work collaboratively. With approval of district administration, BETAC will identify a school building and cohort of teachers to begin developing a model of collaboration/co-teaching in the education of ELLs. PD in this initiative will include team teaching, ESL strategies for the content/classroom teachers, and improved instructional strategies for the ESL teachers.

ESL teachers and administrators will collaboratively discuss and/or receive professional development on establishing criteria for evaluation of the effect of the ESL curriculum and programmatic changes on student progress. Teachers and administrators will then conduct ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the curriculum work and make modifications as recommended and/or warranted.

Year 3 (2012-2013)

Summary of Year 3 Proposed Initiatives and Objectives:

ESL teachers and administrators will continue with ESL curriculum development and alignment with core standards and district objectives of raising rigor and student engagement.

ESL and other teachers of ELLs will further their collaborations, including development of learning communities and the potential for some units in which they co-teach for part of the year.

The district will develop and promote a parent education program within the district, delivered in Spanish and English, with translators for other languages, with the objective of increasing parents' literacy and awareness of how they can help their children to achieve in school.

ESL teachers and administrators, with BETAC support, will conduct ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the curriculum and collaboration work and make modifications as recommended and/or warranted.



NYS MID-HUDSON BETAC AT ULSTER BOCES  
175 ROUTE 32 NORTH, NEW PALTZ, N.Y. 12561  
PHONE: (845) 255-1402 EXT. 1356  
FAX: (845) 255-3836  
BETAC@ULSTERBOCES.ORG  
WWW.MIDHUDSONBETAC.ORG

**November 2010 Addendum to:**

***Review of the English as a Second Language Program***

***Report of Findings and Proposal for 3-year Program Development Plan  
August 2010***

***Monticello Central School District***

# Table of Contents

---

Clarifications and additions to original report.....Page 1

Appendix A: Regulatory Policy.....Page 5

## Appendix B: Evaluation Tools

B-1: Sample Classroom Walk-Through Tool.....Page 9

B-2: NYSED Performance Evaluation Tool (PET).....Page 14

## Appendix C: Sample Data Analysis Tools

C-1: AMAO Data Results Templates.....Page 16

C-2: NYSESLAT Data Results Templates.....Page 20

Appendix D: Suggested Professional Resources- Books.....Page 24

## Appendix E: MCSD Professional Development

E-1: Professional Development Outcomes.....Page 27

E-2: Workshop Dates & Descriptions.....Page 28

**BETAC's November 2010 Addendum to:**

***Monticello Central School District, Review of the English as a Second Language Program, Report of Findings and Proposal, August 2010***

**Clarifications requested by Monticello School District Leadership Team**

**1. Report page 4, *Consideration* section, #4:**

**"This model does not meet the requirement of NYSED CR Part 154 that ESL be a freestanding academic program."**

**Clarifying Comment:**

CR Part 154.2 defines a *free-standing English as a second language program* in sections (d), (d) (1), (d) (1) (ii), and (d) (2) as follows.

**What is an English as a Second Language program?**

**(CR Part 154.2)(d).**

(d) For grades kindergarten through twelve, *free-standing English as a second language program* shall mean a program of instruction composed of two components: a language arts instructional component and a content area instructional component. Such instruction shall take into account the first language and culture of such pupils.

**What is meant by the Language Arts instructional component?**

**(CR Part 154.2)(d)(1)**

(1) the language arts instructional component shall include English language arts instruction and English as a second language instruction. The learning standards for English language arts (ELA) and English as a second language (ESL), and key ideas and performance indicators for such standards, shall serve as the basis for the ELA and ESL curriculums, respectively.

**What is meant by second language instruction within the language arts component?**

**(CR Part 154.2)(d)(1)(ii)**

(ii) English as a second language instruction shall be designed to develop skills in understanding, speaking, reading, writing, and communicating in English through the integration of academic content appropriate for the pupil's age, grade level and English language skills.

**What is meant by the content area instructional component?**

**(CR Part 154.2)(d)(2)**

(2) The content area instructional component shall provide grade and age level English as a second language methodologies, employed in a systematic and structured way, and shall be designed to develop cognitive skills of limited English proficient pupils.

Refer to Appendix A: Regulatory Policy.

**2. Report page 6, *Recommendation* section, paragraph 2:**

**“The most pressing need of Monticello’s ESL program is to develop a curriculum map that would form the blueprint for a scope and sequence of language goals within subject area contexts.”**

**Clarifying Comment:**

New York State’s adoption of the national Common Core Standards will inform this work. The Common Core will ensure that ELL students are exposed to world-class standards. Special attention needs to be given to the supports or bridges built to provide ELL students with access to the grade-level content knowledge included in the standards. The high-level content of the standards must be introduced to ELL students simultaneously with language proficiency development goals. Thus the scope of the work involves distinguishing the language function demand embedded in the cognitive learning task for the subject area (English, social studies, science, and math).

**3. Report page 6, *Recommendation* section, paragraph 3:**

**“District-wide ESL instruction should be delivered in a pull-out model that is rigorous, interactive and designed to increase student engagement and language development.”**

**Replacement:**

Whether ESL instruction is delivered in a pull-out or push-in model, it needs to be rigorous, interactive and designed to increase student engagement and language development.

**4. Report page 6, *Recommendations* section, closing paragraph:**

**“Professional development aims would include...methods of evaluating program effectiveness and student progress.”**

**Additional information:**

Refer to Appendix B: Sample Classroom Evaluation Tools, and Appendix C: Sample Data Analysis Tools .

**5. Report page 7, *Year 1 (2010-11)* section, paragraph 1:**

**“Teachers will develop a curriculum framework aligned with the State’s ELA and ESL standards, drawing from the district’s curriculum, and a related series of content-based thematic units that will be aligned with ESL and ELA learning standards and use academic content as the context in which students develop English proficiency.”**

**Replacement information:**

High expectations for achievement will be evident in providing access to grade-level content, materials and tasks. Teachers will differentiate MCSD core units of instruction to meet ELL student language development needs in order to provide students access to content knowledge and assessments. The units will be aligned to New York State’s Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy and will use academic content (what students know) and academic language (content-specific vocabulary with related concepts and discourse structures) as the context in which students develop English proficiency (what students can do linguistically). Using MCSD core curriculum units as the basis for ELL Teacher instruction builds a foundation for mainstream and ELL teachers’ collaborative work to provide meaningful instruction using one curriculum.

**6. Report page 7, *Year 1 (2010-11)* section, paragraph 1:**

**“The thematic units will be planned to include language objectives, interactive classroom activities, student products, formative and summative assessments.”**

**Additional comment:**

Units will also include ESL strategies, literacy strategies, and preparatory reading component instruction.

Refer to Appendix D: Professional Resources.

**7. Report pages 8- 9, *Year 1 Proposed Timeline* section**

**Additional information:**

Refer to Appendix E: Year 1 Professional Development Outcomes and Workshop Descriptions.

## APPENDIX A: Regulatory Policy

### Federal and State Program Mandates which shape Programs for English Language Learners

ESL program guidelines and mandates are set forth in the following documents:

- Title III, Part A Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students
- No Child Left Behind Act
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act Performance Goals
- Civil Rights
- Equal Educational Opportunities Act
- NYSED CR Part 154 Services for Pupils with Limited English Proficiency

#### **Excerpt from NCLB: Title III, Part A**

*Title III, Part A Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students* of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* requires the following [in part]:

1. A comprehensive language instruction program designed to improve the education of limited English proficient students by assisting them in learning English and meeting state content standards.
2. A language instruction program based on scientifically based research for teaching LEP students that focuses on development of English language proficiency and academic content.
3. All LEP students participate in the Standards of Learning assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.
4. A process in place for tracking the progress of LEP students in regard to attaining English proficiency and the performance

## **APPENDIX A: Regulatory Policy**

### **Federal and State Program Mandates which shape Programs for English Language Learners**

on the Standards of Learning assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.

5. High-quality professional development provided to classroom teachers (including teachers in classroom settings that are not the settings of language instruction programs), principal, administrators, and other school or community-based organizations.
6. Professional development designed to improve the instruction and assessment of LEP students, enhance the ability of teachers to meet the needs of LEP students and be of sufficient intensity and duration to have a positive and lasting impact on the teacher's performance.
7. An effective means of outreach to parents.

## APPENDIX A: Regulatory Policy

### Federal and State Program Mandates which shape Programs for English Language Learners

The purposes of *No Child Left Behind* January 8, 2002, Public Law 107-110, Section 3102 are:

- (1) To help ensure that children who are limited English proficient, including immigrant children and youth,...attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards as all children are expected to meet;
- (2) To assist all limited English proficient children, including immigrant children and youth, to achieve at high levels in the core academic subjects so that those children can meet the same challenging state academic content and student academic achievement standards as all children are expected to meet, consistent with Section 1111(b) (1);
- (3) To develop high quality language instruction educational programs designed to assist state educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools in teaching limited English proficient children and serving immigrant children and youth;
- (4) To assist State educational agencies and local educational agencies to develop and enhance their capacity to provide high quality instructional programs designed to prepare limited English proficient children, including immigrant children and youth, to enter all-English instruction settings;
- (5) To assist State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to build their capacity to establish, implement, and sustain language instruction educational programs and programs of English language development for limited English proficient children.

## **APPENDIX A: Regulatory Policy**

### **Federal and State Program Mandates which shape Programs for English Language Learners**

#### **Excerpt from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, U.S. Department of Education**

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) is the required annual reporting tool for each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico as authorized under Section 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended.

Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report collects data related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the approved June 2002 Consolidated State Application, information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA and data required under Homeless Collection (added in FY 05-06).

#### **The Five ESEA Goals**

- Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

#### **Excerpt from the Office of Civil Rights**

The January 1998 Department of Education's Civil Rights Office recommended five national principles in teaching LEP students:

1) encourage parent involvement; 2) use nondiscriminatory assessment to determine LEP students' ability and needs; 3) group students of different language skills in regular classes to the greatest extent possible and adjust their placement regularly; 4) dedicate equal shares of money, teachers and facilities to LEP students; and 5) offer equal access to all subjects, activities and career opportunities (Hoff, 1998).

**APPENDIX B-1: Classroom Evaluation Tools  
Sample Walk-Through Tool for ELL Classrooms**

<b>INTEGRATION OF LANGUAGE AND CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</b>	<b>INDICATORS</b>	<b>OBSERVED?</b>	<b>NOT OBSERVED?</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
<i>Specifies language objectives and content objectives</i>	<i>Objectives in both areas are posted in the classroom</i>				
<i>Uses authentic/culturally-relevant texts, artifacts, and materials to teach language/content.</i>	<i>Authentic/culturally-relevant materials are present/being used by teacher and/or students</i>				
<i>Focuses corrective responses on pre-determine language and content objectives</i>	<i>Scaffolds questions/statements with less complex language; uses comprehension checks</i>				
<b>CREATES RICH LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS</b>					
<i>Creates a friendly and safe learning environment for ELLs.</i>	<i>Evidence of clear routines. Students support one another and participate actively. Students experiment freely with language. Rules are posted and observed.</i>				
<i>Surrounds learner with extensive oral and written language input.</i>	<i>Evidence of using vocabulary/language patterns. Language posted. Reading corner, multimedia, learning centers...</i>				
<i>Organizes classroom so it supports learning.</i>	<i>Displays student work, languages displayed, logical material placement/seating arrangement</i>				
<b>COMPREHENSIBLE INPUT</b>					
<i>Uses body language, visuals, manipulatives to communicate meaning.</i>	<i>Uses facial, hand gestures, pictures, actual objects</i>				
<i>Solicits and draws upon prior</i>	<i>Elements from previously- taught themes visible.</i>				

<i>knowledge/ experience with new themes</i>	<i>Students use previous vocabulary in talking about new theme.</i>				
<i>Uses a range of pre- reading/pre-writing activities to make language and content more accessible.</i>	<i>Advanced organizers, concept/word charts/maps.</i>				
<i>Breaks complex information and processes into components.</i>	<i>Theme/ Information is organized into sub- units.</i>				
<i>Frequent use of comprehension checks that require learners to demonstrate understanding.</i>	<i>Comprehension checks lead to students' articulating what learned/ application of knowledge through assignment/ activity.</i>				
<i>Selects/adapts instructional materials for learners' language proficiency levels.</i>	<i>Lessons include scaffolding strategies, such as visuals, increased wait time; variety of questioning techniques.</i>				
<i>Speech/text analysis and modifications reflect proficiency levels</i>	<i>Use of questioning author, teaching idioms, choral reading, paraphrasing/ summarizing</i>				
<b>EFFECTIVE "TEACHER TALK"</b>					
<i>Articulates/ enunciates clearly</i>	<i>Students accurately repeat teacher; have good speech habits</i>				
<i>Slows down/simplifies language when developmentally appropriate.</i>	<i>Messages are repeated in different ways; students interested in what is going on.</i>				
<i>Avoids "teacher speak"</i>	<i>Students occasionally take lead in conversation; evidence of role play.</i>				
<i>Models accurate use of language.</i>	<i>Syntax/grammar accurate; parasitic phrases, like "you know" avoided.</i>				
<b>ATTENTION TO DIVERSE ELL</b>					

February 25, 2010 *After T. Brady, Eastern Suffolk BOCES/Pasco County Schools, courtesy of Dr. Devin Thornburg*

<b>NEEDS</b>					
<i>Plans for/employs questioning techniques encouraging extended discourse/higher-order thought</i>	<i>Students participate in discussions, elementary of critical/creative thought, responses to higher-order questions given.</i>				
<i>Structures facilitates High-interest; student-centered activities.</i>	<i>Role playing, debates, presentations, group/peer work/teaching.</i>				
<i>Provides all students with opportunities to participate/speak.</i>	<i>Uses dyads, think-pair-share, small groups and output-oriented activities such as role plays, simulations, drama, debates. Presentations with ELLs having a role</i>				
<i>Promotes learning from/with peers.</i>	<i>Peer editing/tutoring, etc.</i>				
<i>Communicates clearly/consistently reinforces clear/high expectations about language use.</i>	<i>Verbalizes expectations and is consistent in reinforcing students who meet expectations; applies rules with consistency</i>				
<b>PROMOTES EXTENDED STUDENT OUTPUT</b>					
<i>Takes into account different learning strategies/helps students develop learning skills</i>	<i>Students motivated; teacher uses cooperative learning, including a range of language abilities; visual/tactile/auditory/kinesthetic approaches visible; invites sharing problem-solving/learning strategies</i>				
<i>Surveys/takes into account student interests, opinions, wishes</i>	<i>Students pick topics, order of activities, teacher brings in lesson elements of interest</i>				
<i>Makes use of wide variety of activities so students work at appropriate levels.</i>	<i>Activities organized for easier tasks first, choice of activities. Range of visual, auditory, tactile, kinesthetic</i>				

	<i>activities.</i>				
<b>INTERACTION</b>					
<i>Students given frequent opportunities to interact</i>	<i>Opportunities to talk about lesson content, clarify concepts in home language, re-represent learning in a number of ways</i>				
<i>Use of varied instructional groupings</i>	<i>Groupings by proficiency level, cooperative groups, individual needs apparent.</i>				
<b>ATTENTION TO CONTINUOUS LANGUAGE GROWTH/ ACCURACY</b>					
<i>Creates opportunity for evaluation of language/content learning (and process) during each lesson.</i>	<i>Self-evaluation, peer evaluation or teacher-directed evaluation evident.</i>				
<i>Uses a variety of feedback techniques.</i>	<i>Elicitations, clarification requests, repetition, recasting, explicit correction, body language, other non-verbals.</i>				
<i>Attends to errors in oral/written language</i>	<i>Teacher models right answer; teacher encourages self/peer-correction.</i>				
<i>Differentiates between feedback on form vs feeling</i>	<i>Students receive reinforcement or marks for content. For example, "I like that idea...how might you say it more precisely?"</i>				
<b>EFFECTIVE ESL INSTRUCTION</b>					
<i>Use of comprehension strategies</i>	<i>Use of preview/review key skills/concepts, read-alouds, focused discussion, graphic organizers, questioning techniques, translation</i>				

<i>Use of materials in English and native languages to develop proficiency levels</i>	<i>Reading and other instructional materials used in both languages</i>				
<i>Teachers collaborate in planning for instruction.</i>					
<i>Teacher use a variety of strategies to access students' prior knowledge</i>					
<i>Teacher incorporates appropriate literature/adapts content-area materials for instruction</i>					
<i>Teacher provides appropriate assessment modifications to enable students to demonstrate their understanding of a topic consistent with level of English proficiency</i>					
<i>Classroom is print-rich and encourages student interaction</i>					
<i>Students understand what is expected of them during instruction</i>					
<i>There are a variety of instructional modalities and student choice is included in lessons</i>					
<i>Both formative and summative assessments are used to assess student progress and determine future instruction</i>					

# Program Evaluation Tool Kit (PET Kit)

---

## **The P.E.T Kit:**

- ✚ The Program Evaluation Tool Kit is a comprehensive assessment tool developed to examine the quality of programs and services provided to English language learners. Currently, Academic Enterprises is under contract with the New York State Department of Education to pilot and implement the ELL Program Evaluation Toolkit (PET.)

## **Goal:**

- ✚ To strengthen/develop a culture of self-reflection, and continually re-examine all aspects of curricular and extra-curricular programs and services for ELLs.
- ✚ To self evaluate and to report the nature and extent of services provided to ELLs and to ensure that best practices are in use.

## **Benefits:**

- ✚ District/schools will be able to determine the degree to which the instructional programs for ELLs:
  - are aligned with the core New York State Learning Standards;
  - demonstrate the rigor and effectiveness of the professional development plan;
  - reflect the support teachers receive from regional and school instructional specialists on implementing best practices in the classroom;
  - comply with language allocation policies (LAP);
  - benefit from rigorous reflection and assessment; and
  - demonstrate the communication with parents and families of LEP/ELLs and foster active participation.

## **Components:**

- ✚ The toolkit includes goals, objectives, and guidelines for use by districts and individual schools to self assess the following components:

- I Student Identification/Placement
- II Leadership
- III Quality Programs
- IV Quality Instruction
- V Assessment/District/school Planning

# Program Evaluation Tool Kit (PET Kit)

---

VI Staff Qualifications

VII Professional Development

VIII Parental Involvement

IX Support Services

X Coordination of Resources

Data Forms

Resource Allocation Review

## **District/School Commitment:**

- ⬇ The PET process may take up to a year or more to complete; however, it depends on the commitment of the district and/or school self evaluating the program. The district or school may follow the sections in chronological order unless the district/school perceives a need to review a specific section first.
- ⬇ A review team needs to be established representing all stakeholders, from district staff to school based instructional staff, to parents and guardians.

**APPENDIX C-1: Data Analysis Tool**

**AMAO Results Templates**

**MCS D Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)**

<b>Percents by year</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>	<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2008-2009</b>	<b>2009-2010</b>
MCS D: Progress					
State Target: Progress					
MCS D: Proficiency					
State Target: Proficiency					
MCS D: English Performance					
State Target: English Performance					
MCS D: Mathematics Performance					
State Target: Mathematics Performance					

**Note: This table could be modified to report by-school data.**

AMAO Target Explanation

- *AMAO 1 Progress:* The percentage of LEP students making progress is determined by the percentage of LEP students in a NYS public school who have increased one English language proficiency level on the NYSESLAT.
- *AMAO 2 Proficiency:* The percentage of students who are identified as non-LEP. Non-LEP students are defined as those students who score at the proficient level on the NYSESLAT and thus formally exit the language instruction program.
- *AMAO 3 English Performance:* The designated percentage of students who should meet the state AYP target for passing the English Language Arts (ELA) state assessment.
- *AMAO 3 Mathematics Performance:* The designated percentage of students who should meet the state AYP target for passing the mathematics state assessment.

**APPENDIX C-1: Data Analysis Tool**

**AMAO Results Templates**

**AMAO 2 Proficiency : Moved from Beginner ELP to Proficient Status by School**

	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N Beg	% Prof	N Beg	% Prof	N Beg	% Prof	N Beg	% Prof	N Beg	% Prof
Monticello High School										
Kaiser Middle School										
Rutherford Elementary										
Cooke Elementary										
Duggan Elementary										
Emma Chase Elementary										

**AMAO 2 Proficiency: Moved from Intermediate ELP to Proficient Status by School**

	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N Int	% Prof	N Int	% Prof	N Int	% Prof	N Int	% Prof	N Int	% Prof
Monticello High School										
Kaiser Middle School										
Rutherford Elementary										
Cooke Elementary										
Duggan Elementary										
Emma Chase Elementary										

**AMAO 2 Proficiency: Moved from Advanced ELP to Proficient Status by School**

	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N Adv	% Prof	N Adv	% Prof	N Adv	% Prof	N Adv	% Prof	N Adv	% Prof
Monticello High School										
Kaiser Middle School										
Rutherford Elementary										
Cooke Elementary										
Duggan Elementary										
Emma Chase Elementary										

**APPENDIX C-1: Data Analysis Tool**

**AMAO Results Templates**

**AMAO 3 English Performance: State Assessment Pass Rates by School**

	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass
Monticello High School										
Kaiser Middle School										
Rutherford Elementary										
Cooke Elementary										
Duggan Elementary										
Emma Chase Elementary										
State Target										

**AMAO 3 Mathematics Performance: State Assessment Pass Rates by School**

	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass
Monticello High School										
Kaiser Middle School										
Rutherford Elementary										
Cooke Elementary										
Duggan Elementary										
Emma Chase Elementary										
State Target										

**APPENDIX C-1: Data Analysis Tool**

**AMAO Results Templates**

**Science Performance: State Assessment Pass Rates by School**

	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass
Monticello High School										
Kaiser Middle School										
Rutherford Elementary										
Cooke Elementary										
Duggan Elementary										
Emma Chase Elementary										
State Target										

**Social Studies Performance: State Assessment Pass Rates by School**

	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass
Monticello High School										
Kaiser Middle School										
Rutherford Elementary										
Cooke Elementary										
Duggan Elementary										
Emma Chase Elementary										
State Target										

**Writing Performance: State Assessment Pass Rates by School**

	2005-2006		2006-2007		2007-2008		2008-2009		2009-2010	
	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass	N LEP	% Pass
Monticello High School										
Kaiser Middle School										
Rutherford Elementary										
Cooke Elementary										
Duggan Elementary										
Emma Chase Elementary										
State Target										

**APPENDIX C-2: Data Analysis Tool**

**NYSESLAT Results Templates**

Note: NYESELAT item map templates are not included since results are available from the Regional Information Center (RIC). Use the following link to view information displayed in the 2010 NYESELAT item maps:

<http://www.p12.nysed.gov/osa/nyseslat/itemmaps/2010/home.html>.

**Number and Percentage of MCSD Students Who Took NYSELAT by Grade (2010)**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Number NYESELAT Test-takers</b>	<b>May 2010 Enrollment</b>	<b>Percent of Monticello CSD Enrollment</b>
Pre-Kindergarten			
Kindergarten			
Grade 1			
Grade 2			
Grade 3			
Grade 4			
Grade 5			
Grade 6			
Grade 7			
Grade 8			
Grade 9			
Grade 10			
Grade 11			
Grade 12			
<b>District Total</b>			

**APPENDIX C-2: Data Analysis Tool**

**NYSESLAT Results Templates**

**2010 MCSD NYSESLAT Results**

**Number and Percentage of NYSESLAT Test-takers by Top-Ten Native Languages<sup>a</sup> (2010)**

<b>Home Language</b>	<b>NYSESLAT Test-takers</b>	<b>Percent of Test-takers</b>
Spanish		
Albanian		
Portuguese		
Polish		
Arabic		
Chinese		
Korean		
Bulgarian		
Romanian		
Serbian		

**2010 MCSD NYSESLAT Results**

**NYSESLAT English Language Proficiency (ELP) Levels by Grade Band**

<b>ELP Level</b>	<b>Percents by Grade Band</b>					
	<b>Kindergarten- 1</b>	<b>2-4</b>	<b>5-6</b>	<b>7-8</b>	<b>9-12</b>	<b>District Total</b>
Beginner						
Intermediate						
Advanced						
Proficient						
	(n=)	(n=)	(n=)	(n=)	(n=)	(n=)

**APPENDIX C-2: Data Analysis Tool**

**NYSESLAT Results Templates**

**2010 MCSD NYSESLAT Results  
NYSESLAT English Language Proficiency (ELP) Levels by Schools**

<b>School Name</b>	<b>Percent Beginner</b>	<b>Percent Intermediate</b>	<b>Percent Advanced</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Number</b>
Monticello High School					
Robert J. Kaiser Middle School					
Kenneth L. Rutherford Elementary School					
George L. Cooke Elementary School					
Cornellus Duggan Elementary School					
Emma C. Chase Elementary School					
<b>District Total</b>					

**APPENDIX C-2: Data Analysis Tool**

**NYSESLAT Results Templates**

**2010 MCS D NYSESLAT Results  
Length of Time in LEP Program by ELP Levels**

<b>Length of Time in LEP/ELL Program</b>					
	<b>Percent Beginner</b>	<b>Percent Intermediate</b>	<b>Percent Advanced</b>	<b>Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Number</b>
Less than 1 Year					
1-Year					
2-Years					
3-Years					
4-Years					
5-Years					
6-Years					
7-Years					
8-Years					
9-Years					
10 - 12 Years					

**Note: This table could be modified to report by-school data.**

### **Research-based Strategies**

- 1) Title: Strategies for Success with English Language Learners: An ASCD Action Tool by Dr. Virginia Rojas  
Published 2007 by ASCD: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA  
ASCD Stock No: 706088  
ISBN: 978-1-4166-0383-2  
ASCD Member Price: \$99 Nonmember: \$129
  - Contains explicit strategies for English language learners, categorized as follows:
    - ESL 'time honored' strategies (based on theories of building background knowledge, scaffolding meaning, extending language, affirming identity)
    - Literacy and Language Development strategies (vocabulary, reading & writing, graphic organizers)
    - Instructional Framework strategies to provide access to content (differentiation, cooperative learning, coteaching)
  - Contains Self-Assessment Checklist and Rating Scale for responsive learning environments to address the needs of English language learners:
    - responsive programs
    - responsive schoolwide practices
    - responsive instructional strategies
- 2) Title: The Learning Strategies Handbook by Anna Uhl Chamot  
Published by Pearson Education  
ISBN: 0-201-38548-1  
Cost: \$35
  - Learning Strategies and classroom-tested lessons and activities to teach ESL students how to use the strategies with theory and research behind the use of the learning strategies
  - Same instructional sequence used in CALLA (Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach)
  - Accelerate students' language learning by means of a strategies-based approach
- 3) Title: Classroom Instruction That Works With English Language Learners Book, by Jane Hill and Kathleen Flynn  
Published 2006 by ASCD: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA  
ASCD Stock No:106009S25  
ISBN:13: 978-1-4166-0390-0  
ASCD Member Price: \$20.95 Nonmember: \$26.95
- 4) Title: Classroom Instruction That Works With English Language Learners, Facilitators Guide by Jane Hill and Cynthia Bjork  
Published 2007 by ASCD: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA  
ASCD Stock No: 108052S25  
ISBN:13: 978-1-4166-0697-0  
ASCD Member Price: \$22.95 Nonmember: \$29.95

### Developing Academic Literacy

- 1) Title: Building Academic Language: Essential Practices for Content Classrooms, Grades 5-12 by Jeff Zwiers  
Published by International Reading Association  
ISBN: 978-0-7879-8761-9  
Cost: \$25

Developing academic language involves more than acquiring content-specific vocabulary; it includes learning a wide range of utility words, figurative expressions, grammatical conventions, and discussion strategies. This book provides guidance in:

- modeling and scaffolding language used by content area experts in language arts, history, science and math
- designing effective assessments and lessons with language in mind
- strengthening the interweaving strands of language, literacy, and content learning.

- 2) Title: English Learning, Academic Literacy, and Thinking: Learning in the Challenge Zone, by Pauline Gibbons  
Published by Heinemann 2009  
Grades 4-8  
ISBN: 13:978-0-325-01203-2; ISBN: 10:0-325-01203-2  
Cost: \$29

Deep understanding, critical thinking, subject knowledge, and control of academic literacy are goals we have for all our students. The challenge for teachers is to find a way of teaching that helps everyone, including English learners, to reach these high expectations. In *English Learners, Academic Literacy, and Thinking*, Pauline Gibbons presents an action-oriented approach that gives English learners high-level support to match our high expectations. Focusing on the middle grades of school, she shows how to plan rigorous, literacy-oriented, content-based instruction and illustrates what a high-challenge, high-support curriculum looks like in practice.

Gibbons (author of *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning*) presents and discusses in detail five broad areas that enable English learners to participate in high-quality learning across the curriculum:

- engaging deeply with intellectual contexts
- developing academic literacy
- employing reading strategies and improving comprehension
- gaining writing independence and learning content-area genres
- using classroom talk to make sense of new concepts and as a bridge to writing.

- 3) Title: Building Academic Vocabulary: Teacher's Manual by Robert J. Marzano  
Published by ASCD: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA  
ISBN: 978-1-4166-0234-7  
Cost: \$26

A practical way for students to master academic vocabulary. The manual describes:

## APPENDIX D: Suggested Professional Resources- Books

- A method to determine which academic vocabulary terms are most essential
- A six-step process for direct instruction in subject-area vocabulary
- Suggestions for tailoring academic vocabulary procedures for ELLs.

Also included is a list of vocabulary terms organized into 11 subject areas and four grade-level categories.

### **Reading Instruction**

- 1) Title: The Five Components of Reading Development: A Classroom Teacher's Guide to Scaffolding Reading Instruction for ELL Students, by Socorro Herrera, et al.  
Published 2006 by The MASTER Teacher, Inc.  
ISBN: 1-58992-290-5  
Cost: \$125
- 2) Title: Teaching Reading to English Language Learners: Differentiated Literacies, by Socorro Herrera, et al.  
Published 2009 by Pearson [Allyn & Bacon Resources for Teaching English Learners]  
ISBN: 13: 978-0-13-714770-0; ISBN 10: 0-13-714770-8  
Cost: \$36
- 3) Title: Teaching Reading to English Language Learners, Grades 6-12: A Framework for Improving Achievement in the Content Areas, by Margarita Calderon  
Published 2007 by Corwin Press  
ISBN: 978-1-4129-0926-6  
Cost: \$36
- 4) Title: What's Different About Teaching Reading to English Language Learners? 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, by Dorothy Kauffman  
Grades K-8  
Published 2007 by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) and Delta  
ISBN: 9781932748567

Provides teacher trainers with a research-based curriculum to guide the professional development of classroom and ESL teachers who teach reading in classes where some or all of the students are English language learners. The 2007 edition of the Trainer's Manual contains everything needed to conduct a workshop or series of workshops for teachers of English language learners in elementary and middle schools. The complete program requires 45 hours but is easily adapted to local needs and time frames.

### **The following titles are not specific to English Language Learners:**

- 5) Title: Teaching Reading in the Content Areas: If Not Me, Then Who? 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, by Rachel Billmeyer ISBN 1-893476-05-9 Distributed by ASCD  
Teaching Reading in the Content Areas Blackline Masters: To order copies, call 1-800-933-2723 or go to [www.ASCD.org](http://www.ASCD.org)
- 6) Title: Teaching Reading in Science: A Supplement to Teaching Reading in the Content Areas  
ISBN: 978-1-893476-03-5 Cost: \$23  
Publisher: McREL (Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning)
- 7) Title: Teaching Reading in Mathematics: A Supplement to Teaching Reading in the Content Areas  
ISBN: 978-1-893476-14-1 Cost: \$23 Publisher: McREL
- 8) Title: Teaching Reading in Social Studies: A Supplement to Teaching Reading in the Content Areas  
ISBN: 1-893476-04-9 Cost: \$23 Publisher: McREL



NYS MID-HUDSON BETAC AT ULSTER BOCES  
175 ROUTE 32 NORTH, NEW PALTZ, N.Y. 12561  
PHONE: (845) 255-1402 EXT. 1356  
FAX: (845) 255-3836  
BETAC@ULSTERBOCES.ORG  
WWW.MIDHUDSONBETAC.ORG

## APPENDIX E-1

### 2010-11 Professional Development Outcomes Monticello Central School District ELL Program

- **Differentiate units of instruction aligned to common core literacy standards**
  - Specify language objectives appropriate to the content objective
  - Establish performance indicators by English proficiency level for comprehending, speaking, reading and writing
  - Incorporate ELL strategies and literacy strategies
  - Scaffold formative and summative assessments
  
- **Develop best practices in curriculum and instruction**
  - Instruction aligned to grade level literacy and content knowledge and skills
  - Standards- based approach
  - Project-based teaching
  - Academic language instruction and learning
  - Components of reading instruction
  - Culturally responsive lessons
  - Assessment of student growth and mastery
  - Evaluation of program effectiveness
  
- **Cultivate communication pathways**
  - Collaborate with classroom teachers to provide meaningful instruction using one curriculum

#### As a result of Year 1 professional development services through BETAC, ELL teachers will:

- Use a variety of methods and techniques to develop and assess the listening, speaking, reading and writing [academic language] proficiency of ELLs;
- Recognize different models of ELL instruction and how to make adaptations to design instruction that addresses the specific strengths and needs of each student;
- Collaborate with other teachers to help students develop cognitive-academic language skills and content-area knowledge; and
- Provide students with opportunities for authentic, purposeful and meaningful interactions with the English language.

## APPENDIX E-2

### Monticello Central School District

#### 2010-2011 Professional Development Workshops for ESL Teachers

Day 1 Nov 2:

K-12 Reflect on ELL student achievement in relation to NYSELAT data to inform unit development. Create a curriculum map to illustrate K-5, 6-12 ELL teacher instruction for content, skills, and strategies by proficiency level (6 hrs).

Day 2 Dec 14:

K-12 Align English language instruction with District curriculum core area unit to be instructed in Jan 2011 by content classroom and ELL teacher. Focus on academic language objectives, instructional strategies, differentiation for English language proficiency levels and formative assessments within the context of culturally responsive education (6 hrs release time needed).

Day 3 Dec 22:

K-12 Continue alignment of core unit. Focus on higher order thinking skills, summative assessments to measure student progress, and walk-through protocol of best practices for literacy-based teaching within the context of culturally responsive education (6 hrs release time needed).

Day 4 January 12:

Grades 6-12 In-class observation and coaching (4 hrs) of ELL teacher unit implementation at the secondary level. Effective instructional strategy discussion connected to walk-through data from observations and ELL teacher self-reflection using the protocol (2 hrs p.m. release time needed).

Day 5 January 21:

K-8 In-class observation and coaching (4 hrs) of ELL teacher unit implementation at the elementary level. Effective instructional strategy discussion connected to walk-through data from observations and ELL teacher self-reflection using the protocol (2 hrs p.m. release time needed).

Day 6 January 28:

K-12 Reflect on effect of unit implementation including instructional strategies and collaboration with content classroom teacher. Review student achievement of unit's formative

Presenter: Devin Thornburg, Ph.D., Adelphi University

[www.adelphi.edu/faculty/profiles](http://www.adelphi.edu/faculty/profiles)

## APPENDIX E-2

### Monticello Central School District

#### 2010-2011 Professional Development Workshops for ESL Teachers

and summative assessments and other District benchmark data to inform instructional decisions. Focus on culturally responsive education in relation to curriculum, instruction and assessment (6 hrs release time needed).

Day 7 February 18 (Snow date 2/25/2011):

K-12 Align English language instruction with District curriculum core area unit to be instructed in March 2011 by content classroom and ELL teacher. Focus on academic language objectives, instructional strategies, differentiation for English language proficiency levels, higher order thinking skills, and formative assessments for a lesson series (6 hrs release time needed).

Day 8 Jan/Feb/March two dates to be identified by District on conference days:

K-12 integrate technology into the unit to be instructed in Jan and March. Facilitator is Ulster BOCES staff in conjunction with MCSD Technology specialist (two 3 hr days).

Day 9 March 18 (Snow date 3/25/11):

K-5 In-class observation and coaching (4 hrs) of ELL teacher unit implementation. Effective instructional strategy and culturally responsive education discussion connected to walk-through data from observations and ELL teacher self-reflection using the protocol (2 hrs p.m. release time needed).

Day 10 April 8:

6-12 In-class observation and coaching (4 hrs) of ELL teacher unit implementation. Effective instructional strategy and culturally responsive education discussion connected to walk-through data from observations and ELL teacher self-reflection using the protocol (2 hrs p.m. release time needed).