

Grants Pass School District 7 (#2054)

EL Plan 2017 – 2019

Section 1. District Demographics

Grants Pass School District 7 is located in the Southern Oregon city of Grants Pass and boasts a mild climate at a posted elevation of 935 feet. The school district encompasses 24.6 square miles and much local activity happens in and around its feature attraction, the Rogue River. One can't be in town long before noticing the city's famous sign, "It's The Climate".

(Q1) Size of district, including number of schools

(Q2) Enrollment of district, including data date (i.e., spring membership)

(Q3) District's ethnic diversity (% or #)

School	Enrollment as of 11/1/17	# Am. In AK Nat	# Asian Pac Is	# Black	# Hispanic	# White	# Multi
Allen Dale Elementary	482	3	2	1	52	389	35
Highland Elementary	469	7	0	2	50	391	19
Lincoln Elementary	464	8	14	1	83	328	29
Parkside Elementary	466	5	0	0	50	375	36
Redwood Elementary	499	1	1	2	94	366	32
Riverside Elementary	445	5	4	5	52	341	38
North Middle School	796	9	9	4	140	586	48
South Middle School	667	5	4	3	86	516	52
Grants Pass High School	1842	12	14	7	242	1442	121
District Total	6130	55	48	25	849	4234	410

(Q4) Number of different languages represented in the EL population (chart recommended)

In D7, there are 20 different languages represented. English is one. All others are represented in the chart.

Language	Total Number EL
Spanish	221
Chinese	12
Hindi	4
Thai	4
Gujarati	2
Hmong	2
Amharic, Chuukese, Filipino, Haitian Creole, Japanese, Navajo, Nepali, Philippine, Pilipino, Sign Language, Tagalog, Vietnamese, other	1 of each

(Q5) Number and percentage of EL students enrolled in district (could include number per school)

There are 130 (2%) active EL students. There are 253 (4%) ELs including monitoring status as well as Former ELs.

School	Total EL
Allen Dale Elementary	0
Highland Elementary	3
Lincoln Elementary	38
Parkside Elementary	4
Redwood Elementary	37
Riverside Elementary	10
North Middle School	18
South Middle School	7
Grants Pass High School	13
District Total	130

(Q6) Number of ELSWDs (have IEP)- provide by primary disability. Include number of ELs with 504 Plan

EL Students	Total w/IEP	Hearing Impaired	Comm. Disorder	Emotional Disturbance	Other Health Impaired	Autism Spectrum Disorder	Specific Learning Disability	SLD, Comm. Disorder	SLD, OHI, Comm. Disorder
Active	14		4		3	1	4	1	1
Declined	6	1	2		2		1		
Monitored	5		2	1			2		
Former	3				1		2		

There are zero ELs with a 504 plan

(Q7) Number of ELs enrolled in Talented and Gifted program

There is one Former EL student enrolled as Talented and Gifted.

(Q8) A list of schools, identified by Title 1-A Targeted Assist, Title I School-Wide, Alternative Programs, Charter schools, CTE, etc. (districts can choose buildings with specific programs for ELs)

School	Title One Schoolwide	Title One Target Assisted	EL Program	SPED Site Based	Alternative Education	CTE
Allen Dale Elementary	Y			Y		
Highland Elementary	Y					
Lincoln Elementary	Y		Y			
Parkside Elementary	Y			Y		
Redwood Elementary	Y		Y			
Riverside Elementary	Y			Y		
North Middle School		Y	Y	Y	Y	
South Middle School		Y			Y	
Grants Pass High School			Y	Y	Y	Y

(Q9) The number and percentage of ELs showing growth on ELPA21 from 2015-16 to 2016-17 (disaggregate by all ELs, ELSWD, and ELs identified for 5 or more years).

122 students participated in ELPA21 in the 2015-2016 to 2016-17 school year.

ELs	Number	Percent
All ELs	44	36%
ELSWD	3	2%
ELs 5 or more years	12	10%

(Q10) Number and percentage of ELs exiting as proficient in 2016-17

30 students (23% of ELs) exited as proficient in the 2016-17 school year.

(Q11) Number of students in monitor year 1

(Q12) Number of students in monitor year 2

(Q13) Number of students in monitor year 3

(Q14) Number of students in monitor year 4

(Q15) Number of former ELs (not in current EL or monitoring status)

School	Total EL	Active	Declined	Total Monitor	Monitor Y1	Monitor Y2	Monitor Y3	Monitor Y4	Former EL
Allen Dale Elementary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highland Elementary	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lincoln Elementary	38	36	2	13	7	1	4	1	0

Parkside Elementary	4	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	1
Redwood Elementary	37	35	2	13	9	2	1	1	0
Riverside Elementary	10	1	9	1	1	0	0	0	0
North Middle School	18	14	4	26	7	5	5	9	3
South Middle School	7	0	7	8	4	0	1	3	5
Grants Pass High School	13	8	5	14	2	0	5	7	38
District Total	130	94	36	76	31	8	16	21	47

(Q16) Number of students who have re-entered the ELD program after exiting for proficiency

No students have re-entered the ELD program after exiting for proficiency.

(Q17) Number and percentage of monitored students meeting/exceeding state academic assessments for each of the four years of monitoring (disaggregated by each year of monitoring for all monitored students and for ELSWDs in monitor status)

Subject	Monitor Y1		Monitor Y2		Monitor Y3		Monitor Y4	
	All	M/E	All	M/E	All	M/E	All	M/E
ELA	14	2	8	2	15	9	16	10
Math	13	4	7	2	12	6	16	6
Science	4	2	0	0	5	4	7	4

Subject	Monitor Y1		Monitor Y2		Monitor Y3		Monitor Y4	
	ELSWD	M/E	ELSWD	M/E	ELSWD	M/E	ELSWD	M/E
ELA	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Math	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Not reporting on percent as it would be less than 1%.

(Q18) Number and percentage of ELs who have not reached English proficiency having been identified for 5 years or more (disaggregated by all ELs and ELSWD for each year 5 and greater)

There are 28 ELs (less than 1%) who have been in the program 5 or more years who have not reached English proficiency. 14 of those have declined services. 5 are active SPED. 19 are still active in the program.

(Q19) Number and percentage of the district ELs who have a waiver for ELD services.

There are 36 students (less than 1%) who have a waiver for ELD services.

Section 2: School District Information on Program Goals (OCR Step 1)

(Q20) Describe the district’s educational approach(es) (ELD, Bilingual, etc.) for educating ELs. Include a description for each educational approach used within the district. This information could be placed in a chart listing each school and the educational approach(es) for English language acquisition and core content.

Grants Pass School District’s approach to educating ELs is represented in the chart below. Due to the small number of identified ELs in the district, a magnet program is used at elementary and middle school. Students are provided with transportation. The Pull-out ELD program is used at both elementary schools where students get no less than 30 minutes of ELD instruction daily in a small group setting. At the secondary schools, students are scheduled in a class period for ELD services. In addition to these pull-out models, students are provided with qualified teachers in the classroom who are trained in Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) strategies.

School	Type of ELD service
Lincoln Elementary	Pull-out ELD
Redwood Elementary	Pull-out ELD
North Middle School	ELD class
Grants Pass High School	ELD class

(Q21) Include the relevant research that supports each of the district’s educational approaches for educating ELs (note: only citation for research is needed)

District 7 uses the Systematic English Language Development (SELD) and Constructing Meaning Instructional units published by EL Achieve to ensure our EL students acquire English language proficiency^[1](Dutro & Moran, 2003). These models correlate to the Oregon ELD Standards, incorporate language functions and forms, and facilitate a focus on language fluency (Dutro & Moran, 2002). The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) is a research-based observation instrument that has been shown to be a valid and reliable measure of sheltered instruction (Guarino, Echevarria, Short, Schick, Forbes, & Rueda, 2001). District 7 continues its efforts to support annual SIOP training opportunities for instructional staff through the SOESD and in-district trainers.

(Q22) Describe the district’s educational goal for English language proficiency. (Ensure this is a SMART goal that includes annual language proficiency expectations for each specific EL group of students enrolled in the school (elementary, secondary, SIFE, ELSWD, Recent Arrivers-elementary/secondary))

Grants Pass School District’s goals for English language proficiency are intended for all EL student groups; elementary, secondary, SIFE, ELSWD, and Recent Arrivers, both elementary and secondary. Our population is not large enough to establish meaningful goals for each student group.

- AMAO #1: Annually, GPSD7 will have at least 50% of EL students making progress toward language proficiency.
- AMAO #2A: Annually, GPSD7 would expect to have 20% of its EL population attaining EL proficiency who have been in the program less than 5 years.
- AMAO #2B: For students who have been identified as EL for 5 or more years, our goal would be to have at least 20% attain language proficiency.

(Q23) Describe the district’s educational goal for core content knowledge. Break down into elementary and secondary SMART goals specific to ELs enrolled in the district.

For both Elementary and Secondary, district ELs will be at 85% meeting state content standards for ELA, Math, and Science as measured by Smarter Balanced Assessments. This will mean an increase of at least 5% annually until this goal is achieved.

(Q24) Describe how the district will measure the effectiveness of the program based on the goals stated in Q22. What specific measure(s) will be used to determine the effectiveness of English language proficiency? This can include district formative assessments.

Progress toward this goal is measured by annual ELPA21 scores and students’ regular report cards that summarize classroom performance. Additional district-based assessments are the ADEPT, and Constructing Meaning units published by E.L. Achieve. ELD Teachers also use a formative assessment bank based on language forms and functions from Systematic ELD materials.

(Q25) Describe how the district will measure the effectiveness of the program based on the goals stated in Q23. What measure(s) will be used to determine the effectiveness of the core content knowledge goal? This can include district progress monitoring assessments.

The measurable effectiveness of core content knowledge instruction will be based on student outcomes as recorded in teacher grade reports for both elementary and secondary students. Additionally, the district

measures outcomes based on state assessment results for ELA, math and science. District core content goals are for all students and are not specific to ELs enrolled in the district.

District Improvement Goal: Annually, we will increase the number of students graduating within 4 or 5 years with a high school diploma (regular, modified, extended) and increase our overall completion rate for both the 4 and 5 year cohorts. In addition, we will expand opportunities for students seeking a regular diploma beyond the 5th year in an effort to help more students complete.

Goals	Action Steps	Data Measures	Who is Responsible	Target Dates
1. By the end of the school year, the district will meet or exceed the goal of 85% of all 3rd grade students reaching the DIBELS reading standard and DORF outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Data review and analysis as part of RTI system b. Increase Title One reading intervention support c. Individual student plans developed in IPM meetings for those students not on track (Student Individual Plan) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increasing grade level composite scores b. Analysis of T1 time/support c. Number of IPM meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RTI teams ● Director of Elementary Education 	January check in and end of year results, annually
2. 5th grade math benchmark outcomes on SBAC will increase by 5% or more each year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Math adoption, review core curriculum, breaking down the standards and reporting back to grade level teams b. Number sense training for K - 5 c. Increase Title One intervention support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Core curriculum recommendation b. Training completed by June 2018 c. Analysis of T1 time/support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Math Leadership team ● RTI teams ● Director of Elementary Education 	June 2018
3. 8th grade math benchmark outcomes on SBAC will increase by 5% or more each year.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review the standards using test blueprints b. Math professional development/training c. Math 180 implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Student growth results Fall to Spring, Math course outcomes, Algebra I outcomes in high school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Math teachers ● MS Admin ● Director of Secondary Education 	Check progress data January and May annually
3. By the end of their 9 th grade year, 90% or more of freshman will meet the On Track standard; specifically, students will earn 6 credits including the required components of the diploma.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Freshman team, targeted intervention for at risk b. Check and Connect mentoring c. Freshman Success meetings d. Freshman study hall e. Freshman home visits f. Explore freshman advisory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Freshman interventions b. Check and connect data c. Freshman On Track Data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Attendance Support Supervisor ● Check and Connect Coordinator ● Administrators 	Check progress data November, January, March, and May annually

	g. Plan for freshman summer school activities			
4. Increase the rate of regular attenders to ensure that 90% or more are attending regularly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continue with district Attendance Matters Procedures focusing on preventative programs b. Invest in A2A program c. Invest in Attendance Support Supervisor to monitor and provide feedback on student attendance d. Invest in Graduation Coach for Alternative Education programs e. Partner with College Dreams in the “Whatever It Takes” grant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of letters delivered b. count of student individual/family meetings held c. count of number of individual student plans developed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Drop Out Prevention Coordinator ● Graduation Coach ● Building administration ● Directors of Elementary and Secondary Education 	<p>check in data in November, January, March, and May</p> <p>Annually review progress</p>
5. Reduce overall student behavior referrals annually; identified at-risk behavior groups will receive targeted, evidence-based interventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. student individual intervention plans (PEP) b. increase mental health supports, increase OPTIONS times with schools c. CLEAR project and ACES training d. parent engagement/parent training partnering with Allcare, DHS and other community groups e. JCCN and coordinated care team for alternative education, systems of care 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Student PEP e. Evaluation of support time f. Training evaluations g. Parent feedback from trainings h. Feedback surveys from key stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Building administration ● Director of Technology and School Improvement ● Building teams 	<p>November, January, March, and May</p> <p>Annually review progress</p>

(Q26) Describe the frequency the district will progress monitor the established goals.

Progress monitoring for student growth in core content knowledge coincides with formal progress reporting periods during the school year. Elementary schools monitor student academic progress three times during the academic year on a trimester schedule. Secondary schools monitor student academic progress twice each year on a semester schedule. In addition to these progress monitoring activities for all students, monitoring of ELs for academic progress will coincide with the progress reporting periods described here.

(Q27) Describe how these goals compare to the district’s educational goals for non-EL students. Be specific to include all EL groups of student enrolled in the district.

Goals are the same for non EL groups as they are for EL groups (see question #23 above).

(Q28) Describe how these goals will prepare ELs to meet the district goals for its overall educational program, graduation, and the college/career ready standards.

The district’s main goal is to ensure students complete high school with either the 4 or 5 year cohort. Students may complete with either a regular diploma, modified diploma, alternative certificate, or GED. The sub goals the district has established are checks along the way of a K - 12 educational continuum to ensure a student is on track for completion. ELs are included in the district goals and the overall educational program. The EL program goals support language acquisition as a foundation to students being on track for high school completion.

Section 3: Identification of Potential EL Students (OCR Steps 2 and 3)

(Q29) Describe the district’s procedure which includes a step to administer the Language Use Survey to all students. Include the school year the district will begin using the state-approved Language Use Survey.

The district Language Use Survey is included in the district’s online registration process used for all students. Currently the district is using the state-approved LUS. If any of the LUS questions indicate language use or understanding of a language other than English, ELD staff are notified by an email alert that a potential EL has completed registration. ELD staff will begin the screening process to determine eligibility for participation in the EL Program. Until such time as the ELPA21 Screener is made available, the district will use the Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey-Revised (WMLS-R) as its approved identification assessment for potential ELs.

(Q30) Describe the district’s procedure to include a timeline for each step or the identification process and the name/title of the person responsible for each step.

Screening procedures, parent contact/notification, and appropriate student placement will be completed within **30 days** at the beginning of the school year and within **two weeks** during the school year. The following steps will occur:

1. Notification of potential EL registering is done automatically by the registration system and by office managers upon completion of online registration process
2. After notification, the elementary ELD teacher is responsible for the two elementary magnet locations (Lincoln and Redwood) and the ELD coordinator is responsible for all other locations.
3. The teacher/coordinator will:
 - Review available documentation regarding prior school enrollment, ELD services, English proficiency data (if any), birthplace
 - Contact parent to investigate language use (primary language may not be English) OR verify Native American/Alaska Native status
 - Administer screener

(Q31) Describe the district’s procedure to include a process to identify Native American students who may be ELs.

For identification of potential ELs that are Native Americans, students checking “tribal or native language” on the LUS or “only English” and choose the ethnicity code of Native American or Alaska Native and items 5-7 on the LUS indicate a significant impact of a language other than English, the district’s screening tool will be administered as described in Q30.

(Q32) Describe the district’s procedure for identifying potential ELs with a disability (i.e., interpreter, special education, refugee, etc.)

Special student or family circumstances (interpretation needs, mobility issues, etc.) are addressed by ELD staff in collaboration with other school personnel. This includes transition meetings for students entering public school with early childhood service plans that address receptive/productive language issues. Specific programs of service for these students are determined by a transition team that includes EL Program and SPED Programs representation.

(Q33) Describe the district’s plan using one of the State’s approved assessments for identifying ELs; include what sections are used to ensure all domains of the English Language are assessed. Include the agreement to use the state approved fluency scores at each grade level.

District 7 uses the Woodcock Muñoz Language Survey – Revised (WMLS-R) to assess the English proficiency of students who may qualify for the EL Program. District 7 uses the Broad English Ability level to determine eligibility for EL services. Subtest scores may be used to inform teachers of possible areas for academic intervention but cannot be used as separate criteria for program qualification. The district uses the state approved fluency scores for each grade level.

Grade Levels	Meets Criteria for ELL Program	Does Not Meet Criteria for ELL Program
K-12	Broad English Ability below Level 4	Broad English Ability above Level 4

(Q34) Describe the district’s plan for having students assessed by a trained assessor.

The WMLS-R is administered by trained personnel from, or in cooperation with, ELD Program staff. Trained assessors are available for both elementary and secondary student screening. Training is scheduled as necessary and is available through the SOESD or in-district.

(Q35) Describe the district’s plan to include the procedures for collecting the assessment data, and sharing the results with teachers.

Current assessment data is scored using WMLS-R software and stored on a district share file available to ELD staff and program administrators. Teachers are notified regarding the English proficiency level of each EL student and program services available to them for the current school year. The district student data system stores and tracks all data and activity for each student for which teachers have access.

(Q36) Describe the district’s plan to include a description of where and how the assessment data will be stored.

Assessment data and information are stored electronically on the district data base. This data includes state assessment results (ELA, Math, Science) and language assessments (ELPA21). In addition, screening data is kept in the electronic portfolio. Per ODE directive, annual ELPA21 assessment results and screening assessments will be filed in the CUM file.

(Q37) Describe the district’s plan to include a timeline, person responsible, and template for the required parent notification letters for eligibility as an EL or initially fluent students

ELD staff, with collaboration of other district personnel, are responsible for having screening procedures, parent contact/notification, and appropriate student placement completed within **30 days** at the beginning of the school year and within **two weeks** during the school year, including special student or family circumstances (interpretation needs, mobility issues, etc.). Parent Notification letters are updated/revised annually to include the most recent guidance from ODE. Parents of *Initial Fluent* students will be notified by letter that their student does not qualify for ELD services based on the district screening tool used.

(Q38) Include the process for ensuring parent notification letters are provided in a language parents can understand

Parent notification letters are currently provided in both English and Spanish. Other languages needed for parent notification are determined on a case by case basis. District ELD staff determine the potential need for notification in another language during online registration and through screening activities in the first 30 days of school and take steps to provide appropriate notification. Arrangements for interpretation will be made for parents requiring notification in a language other than English or Spanish. District 7 networks with regional school districts and the SOESD when this need arises.

(Q39) Describe where the original Language Use Survey, identification screener results, and original parent identification communication will be stored

The original LUS, identification screener results, and parent identification communication will be stored in the student CUM file per OAR 116-400-0060(10) (12), (26). All items will be included in the CUM record as applicable:

1. Initial Language Use Survey (LUS)
2. Initial identification screener results
3. Initial EL program placement letter, if student qualifies for EL services.
4. "Initial Fluent" letter, if student does not qualify for EL services
5. "Waiver of service" letter, signed by parent/guardian
6. Annual state English language proficiency assessment results
7. "Exit-as-proficient" letter, when student has reached English proficiency
8. "Completion of monitoring" letter, when student has been monitored for all four years
9. Re-entry into EL program during monitoring letter

Section 4: Program of Service for English Learners (OCR Step 4)

(Q40) Describe the district program of services for ELs. Include how and where the services will be provided and by whom for each program of language instruction available to ELs in the district. Consider putting this information in a chart- school, grade, grade level (include EL programs for all groups of ELs; SIFE, Recent Arriver, ELSWD, etc.)

(Q41) Describe the methods and services the district will use to teach English language. Break this out by each different English language program.

School	Grade Level	Person Responsible	Program Source	Description
Lincoln Elementary School (Students who qualify for program and reside within Lincoln, Highland, Parkside, and Riverside Elementary School boundaries)	K - 5th grade	ELD Certified teacher and educational assistant	Systematic ELD (Olsen, Jaramillo, McCall-Perez, & White, 1999)	Students are pulled for up to thirty minutes daily for direct instruction in ELD. ELD is scheduled outside of core and special programs instruction. Subgroups-SIFE, Recent Arriver, ELSWD, etc. receive support within ELD schedule.
Redwood Elementary School (Students who qualify for	K - 5th grade	ELD Certified teacher and educational	Systematic ELD (Olsen, Jaramillo, McCall-Perez, &	Students are pulled for up to thirty minutes daily for direct instruction in ELD. ELD is scheduled outside of core

program and reside within Redwood, Allen Dale, Parkside, and Riverside Elementary School boundaries)		assistant	White, 1999)	and special programs instruction. Subgroups-SIFE, Recent Arriver, ELSWD, etc. receive support within ELD schedule.
North Middle School	6th - 8th grade	ELD Certified teacher	Champion of Ideas, SELD, Constructing Meaning	ELD class period within master schedule. Subgroups-SIFE, Recent Arriver, ELSWD, etc. receive support within ELD schedule.
Grants Pass High School	9th - 12th grade	ELD certified teacher	Champion of Ideas, SELD, Constructing Meaning	ELD class period within master schedule (elective credit). Subgroups-SIFE, Recent Arriver, ELSWD, etc. receive support within ELD schedule.

(Q42) Describe the methods and services the district will use to ensure that ELs can meaningfully participate in core instruction and special programs (music, career, technical, etc.). Include all groups of ELs (SIFE, Recent Arrivers, ELSWD, etc.).

EL Students receive a full schedule with core content classes and access to elective course offerings. At the elementary school, the principal, Title I Coordinator, ELD teacher, and classroom teacher work to develop a schedule that minimizes conflict with core instruction and ELD support while affording opportunities for student learning. Students participate in PE and Music programs including the opportunity for ELs to participate in strings and band programs starting in 4th and 5th grade. For the middle and high school, students are afforded choices in their elective course offerings. All students are required to participate in Career Academy at Grant Pass High School, most commonly during the sophomore year. Counselors review class schedules with all students to ensure appropriate courses are in place. Core content placement is with SIOP or SEI trained teachers whenever possible.

(Q43) Describe the professional development support for core content teachers that ensure ELs' ability to participate meaningfully in core instruction. Include how the district will measure the effectiveness of this professional development.

There are 104 current Grants Pass School District staff who have been training in SIOP. There are two district administrators, 96 teachers, and 6 paraprofessionals. In addition, there are 8 staff who have completed constructing meaning training and 4 who have completed interpreter training. In-district efforts to provide ongoing staff development include mini SIOP sessions to certified and classified staff. These sessions, begun in 2015-16, are facilitated by two in-district SIOP trainers. The district measures the effectiveness of this professional development through teacher survey and follow up during each school year.

(Q44) Describe the standards and/or criteria the district uses to determine the amount and type of language development services provided. Include the process to determine the appropriate amount and type of services. Include how the district will measure the effectiveness of these services.

Elementary students are grouped according to proficiency level or grade level within the schools' master schedule. Scheduling is done to ensure students have access to all core content (LA, math, science and social studies) as well as additional programs (Title I, music and PE). Students, who are newcomers or are determined to need extra support, may receive additional services in the form of additional SELD, reading intervention programs, or technology based support. Secondary EL students in both middle and high school receive a regularly scheduled ELD class within the school's master schedule. Language development services outside of the ELD class can be delivered during Intervention Time (IT) at the high school by the ELD teacher. The high

school uses an on-demand teacher request system to provide student intervention. This system is meant to provide teacher access to all students, including ELs, on a weekly basis. The process for determining additional intervention services at the middle school is determined by school IIP teams during weekly meetings. Teacher grade level teams coordinate student nominations for intervention actions. Effectiveness of these services is measured annually by reviewing student data and outcomes. Adjustments are made if needed.

(Q45) Describe the district’s plan to address the language and content needs for each of the following groups of students: ELSWD-with significant cognitive disabilities, ELSWD-emotional disability, ELSWD-behavioral disability, ELSWD-deaf/hard of hearing, ELSWD-blind/vision impaired, Recent Arriver/SIFE. Include the program options, how the district will determine the program for both elementary and secondary students. Consider making a chart. Ensure the program of service, both EL and access to content includes a plan for timely graduation.

EL Students	Total w/IEP	Hearing Impaired	Comm. Disorder	Emotional Disturbance	Other Health Impaired	Autism Spectrum Disorder	Specific Learning Disability	SLD, Comm. Disorder	SLD, OHI, Comm. Disorder
Active	14 total		4		3	1	4	1	1
Declined	6	1	2		2		1		
Monitored	5		2	1			2		
Former	3				1		2		

Students, who are determined to need additional services outside regularly scheduled EL instruction, are identified at the site level by the school’s student intervention team. This is the Individual Intervention Planning (IIP) at elementary and middle schools and Student Study Team (SST) at the high school. Students with identified disabilities may be referred to the school’s designated team. Such referrals will require participation by the specialist(s) currently working with the referred student. A program of services for these students is designed on a case by case basis due, primarily, to the low incidence of an ELSWD with a particular designation. Students are matched to programs that would best fit their educational needs. The team determines the individual student’s plan which includes timely graduation.

Section 5: Staffing and Resources (OCR Step 5)

(Q46) Describe the number and categories of instructional staff implementing the district’s language development program. This information could be included in a chart- name of school, program, number and type of staff (include all programs that support ELs)

The EL Program staff includes the Title III Director (aka- Curriculum Director), EL Coordinator, EL teachers, and EL Education Assistants.

School	Program	Number/Type of Staff
Lincoln Elementary	ELD pull-out class	1 ELD Teacher, 1 Instructional Assistant
Redwood Elementary	ELD pull-out class	1 ELD Teacher, 1 Instructional Assistant
North Middle School	ELD class period	1 ELD Teacher
Grants Pass High School	ELD class period	1 ELD Teacher

English/Spanish interpretation services for conferences, formal/informal meetings, and other events are provided by district staff. Both certified and classified personnel assigned to the EL Program are expected to meet district bilingual requirements in English and Spanish. Language proficiency qualifications for providing these services are determined using the Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM). Per the above

chart, district staff have all received beginning Interpreter training with two staff members qualifying for Intermediate Interpreter training. District personnel that complete interpreter training through the SOESD are rated by the Oral Proficiency Interview, computer (OPIc), a widely accepted tool associated with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).

(Q47) Describe the qualifications used by the district to assign instructional staff to the district's language development program (include teacher, instructional assistant, etc.). Include how the instructional staff meets the requirements of Oregon's OARs.

(Q48) Describe what methods and criteria the district will use to determine the qualifications of instructional staff assigned to the language development program.

ELD teachers are highly qualified per state guidelines. At present, ELD teachers are bilingual with ESOL teaching license endorsements. In addition, district ELD teachers have, or pursue, training and experience in SIOP, Constructing Meaning (elementary and secondary respective of teaching assignments), Systematic ELD, Interpreter training and/or GLAD. ELD Education Assistants are expected to meet qualifications outlined in OAR 581-037-006 in addition to demonstrating proficiency in English and Spanish (or other target language should the district EL population necessitate that support). Fundamental tasks for ELD Educational Assistants include guiding student opportunities to practice, review, and apply prior learning. Assistants trained in interpreting will also assist parent/teacher conferences and occasional office interpretation support.

(Q49) Describe the contingency plan for addressing staffing issues for the EL program (include all specialized programs supporting ELs). Include a plan for training, a schedule of training, a plan for recruiting qualified staff, and a schedule to have qualified staff in place.

The district EL Program supports ongoing training in language acquisition instruction to ensure that instructional personnel are current with practices supporting the district model. Training that supports EL Program instructional materials includes SIOP, Constructing Meaning and Systematic ELD. Staff development needs are reviewed annually each spring in coordination with the SOESD. Should the district not find adequately prepared instructional personnel, a professional growth plan to train the best available candidate to meet minimum standards described above will be developed at the direction of the EL Program Director in collaboration with the Personnel Director.

(Q50) Describe the district's selected core ELP instructional materials and supplies available for the district's language development program.

District 7's EL Program uses Constructing Meaning instructional units developed by E.L. Achieve as core content for ELD instruction. These units have been developed at both elementary and secondary levels. Additional support resources for language acquisition instruction are developed from SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol), CM (Constructing Meaning), and SELD (Systematic English Language Development). Formative assessment materials aligned to SELD materials support monitoring of student progress.

(Q51) Describe the district's plan for regular and on-going review of district ELP materials and the timeline associated with the review. Include all instructional materials for all programs supporting ELs.

The district EL team conducts a program review at the beginning and end of each school year to determine the adequacy, appropriateness, and success of EL Program services. Questions to guide the program review include:

Adequacy:

- Are personnel resources adequate to continue providing instructional services?
- Are material resources adequate to continue the instructional services?

Appropriateness:

- Do current instructional strategies and resources align with instructional goals?

- Do curriculum resources support instruction designed to meet current ELD Standards?

Success:

- What program data indicates progress toward EL achievement in academic and language proficiency goals?
- What program strengths or weaknesses are evident?
- What are potential causes of program strengths or weaknesses?

(Q52) Describe the district’s contingency plan when the district does not currently have the core ELP instructional materials, resources, and supplies necessary to implement the district language development program and the plan for obtaining necessary items.

The district has adequate resources to fully implement its program of services for EL students. When it is determined through the EL team’s annual program review process that the district cannot implement its EL Program without additional resources, the team will initiate a needs analysis to identify program needs. Identified needs, including personnel or material, will be forwarded by the team to the district director responsible for the EL Program. The director will use our regional consortium as a resource through this process.

Section 6: Transition from English Language Development Program (OCR Step 6)

(Q53) Describe the district’s criteria used to determine that an EL is proficient. Include any special considerations used for ELSWD students, SIFE students, Recently Arrived ELs, etc.

EL Program students and EL students with a waiver for services are tested annually with the Oregon English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA21). Reclassification, or exit, from the program is determined by ELPA21 composite scores. ELPA 21 results are included in the district’s student portfolio database along with other summative assessment data. All parents of qualifying students (Active and waived) are notified annually of their student’s progress and opportunity for support by means of the Parent Notification letter sent near the end of September. ELPA21 results will be the primary determinant for whether an ELL student has sufficient English proficiency to exit the district’s EL Program. This is true for all categories including ELSWD students, SIFE students, and recent arrivers. A score of Proficient, or level 3, on the ELPA is the standard that demonstrates a student has progressed to a point where EL services are no longer needed.

(Q54) Describe the district’s procedure for promoting ELs who did not score Proficient on ELPA21, and the procedure for those ELs that the district does not have an ELPA21 score. Include considerations for ELSWD, and Recently Arrived ELs, etc.

If a student scores Level 2 on the ELPA21 in multiple years consecutively, and a school-level team believes that the student has gained sufficient proficiency in English to benefit from participation in the regular education program without assistance from the EL Program, he/she may be promoted out of the EL Program. The school team will examine a portfolio of evidence that may support a decision to promote. Information in the portfolio may include, but is not limited to, data from the following sources:

- Ongoing language proficiency assessments such as ELD classroom assignments, projects, and quizzes.
- All available ELPA and ELPA21 scores with subtest scores.
- Language proficiency samples in comprehension (reading, listening) and production (speaking, writing)
- Content teacher feedback regarding student’s English proficiency and academic performance indicating that student can fully benefit from instruction in the regular classroom without EL support. (Teacher Survey Rubric in appendix of forms).

The school level team will contribute findings to a summary report to recommend promotion or retention. This report will be prepared by the EL Coordinator/Teacher responsible for the identified student. Parents/guardians will be included in the decision to promote or retain a student as recommended by the school team. This

procedure will be the same for all categories including ELSWD, recent arrivers, etc. For those students not having an ELPA21 score, teams would review all other evidence and documentation as outlined above to determine if the student should be exited or promoted.

(Q55) Describe the staff responsible and their role in the exiting process.

An EL Coordinator/Teacher oversees the exit process for qualifying students as follows:

1. Student qualifies for exit from the EL Program by scoring ELPA21 Proficient (level 3) or recommendation by a school team
2. Students and parents are notified (in a language they understand) of the exit from EL services.
3. Parent meetings may be conducted in person or other method (phone, email, etc.) to allow for full discussion of the student's exit, future monitoring activities, and available instructional supports.
4. Complete EL Exit Form and update district database
5. EL Coordinator/Teacher maintains records, distributes documents (student CUM file record), and disseminates student updates to school staff.

(Q56) Describe how and where the documentation of the district's exiting procedures will be maintained, and who is responsible for maintaining the documentation.

District exiting procedures and related documents are collected in the ELL Share File in a file labeled Exiting/Monitoring/Promotion Forms. Documents are organized by school year. For example, students exiting this year will be found in the 2017-18 folder. EL Program staff, specifically EL Coordinators/Teachers, create these records. Access to documents is determined by the ELD Director. In addition, documentation is recorded in the district electronic portfolio. The exit letter is filed in the student's CUM file as well.

(Q57) Describe how parents are included in exiting decisions, and how the district communicates with parents that their student has obtained English proficiency or not.

Exiting students from EL Program services at both elementary and secondary levels is a team process. At a minimum, the exit team will include a parent, teacher knowledgeable about the student and the ELD Teacher.

(Q58) Describe the district's monitoring plan for each of the four years a student is in monitored status (who is responsible, what is the frequency, is the frequency different depending on the student's academic progress or monitoring year, what documentation is reviewed, how and where is the documentation collected and stored).

Monitoring procedures described below begin in monitor year 1 and do not change for monitor years 2-4. Further, the district will monitor all ELs (Active, Waiver, Monitor, Former, ELSWD, etc.) through high school graduation.

The persons responsible for establishing the monitoring schedules and coordinating participants are the designated ELD Teachers. At elementary schools, the monitor team will consist of an ELD Teacher, a student's teacher, specialists when necessary and possibly the administrator. At secondary, an ELD Teacher and school counselors (possibly an administrator) conduct the initial monitor activity. Administrators and specific teachers are involved when further investigation into student performance or behavior warrants such. The frequency established for monitoring is determined by formal grading periods. Elementary schools report on a trimester so monitoring occurs after each trimester. Secondary schools use a semester system so monitoring occurs twice each year.

Should interventions or other student support be recommended following scheduled monitoring activities, the frequency and type will be determined by staff participating in the recommended support/intervention.

Evidence of student performance reviewed during monitoring includes academic reports, attendance, behavior reports and any other supporting documentation that may support a comprehensive evaluation of student performance, both academic and social. Documentation is recorded in the district electronic portfolio which will be a reference to support Completion of Monitoring or Re-entry forms. These two forms, if/when completed must be included in a student's CUM file record.

(Q59) Describe the district's procedures for determining whether a lack of student success is due to academic needs or language needs when considering returning an EL to the district ELD program for the monitored students in each of the four years.

A student experiencing inadequate academic success may be referred to school teams (IIP, SST), be noted during monitor activities, or referred by classroom teachers to EL Program staff. A review of the student's EL history will be part of any discussion to determine subsequent interventions, if any. If requested by the team, a language proficiency survey will be conducted to aid in the process.

(Q60) Describe the district's plan to provide additional academic and/or language support for monitored students not succeeding in core instruction. This support addresses monitored student's academic needs, not to determine to re-enter the student in the EL program.

Should interventions or other student support be recommended following scheduled monitoring activities, the frequency and type will be determined by staff participating in the recommended support/intervention.

(Q61) Describe the district's plan for monitoring the academic and linguistic progress of EL students with a waiver for service. Include how the district notifies parents of ELs with waivers for services about their student's progress and opportunities for support through the ELD program.

Students whose parents waive EL services are included in district monitoring procedures. Parents are notified of student progress at each trimester in elementary and at week 6, 12, and 18 at secondary through school report cards. Should interventions or other student support be recommended following scheduled monitoring activities, the school's Individual Intervention Planning team (IIP) will put in place recommended interventions. The parent will be reminded of the student's opportunity to participate in the ELD program for additional support.

(Q62) Describe the district's communication with parents of monitored ELs during all four years of monitoring, when the district is considering re-entering the student in the EL program, when the student has completed monitoring, and when the student needs additional academic support to be successful during monitoring.

Parent contact is not universal for all qualifying EL and former EL students being monitored at designated points during the school year. Parents are often included in intervention planning when it is determined a student may need additional academic support and when the district is considering re-entering a student in the EL Program.

Section 7: Equal Access to Other School District Programs (OCR Step 7)

(Q63) Describe the district's procedures for identifying ELs as having additional academic needs (pre-referral and IEP process). Include the steps, assessments, timeline, and person(s) responsible.

Teacher (or referring staff) responsibilities

- Pre-referral form, initiate and complete
- Collect work samples, identify patterns
- Submit to school coordinator (ex. Principal, counselor)

Counselor/Psychologist/Designee responsibilities

- Review information/data
- Collect student reports (grades, progress, attendance, other)
- Interviews (if pertinent) with relevant persons

Team Coordinator responsibilities

- Coordinate meetings
- Discuss concerns, data, potential interventions and implementation
- Determine timeline to revisit, monitor, adjust interventions (if implemented)
- Referral to Special Education screening per district/school procedures

(Q64) Describe how ELD teachers are included in the IEP process during pre-referral and IEP team meetings for ELSWD.

Any EL student being considered for additional academic needs will have English Language Proficiency included in the data collection process from pre-referral through the IEP. An EL Coordinator/ELD Teacher is included in the team considering an EL, or potential EL, for Special Education services.

(Q65) Describe the process for determining the best ELD educational program is selected for each ELSWD.

District 7 recognizes that differences exist between language acquisition challenges and learning disabilities. English Learners (EL) have equal access to Special Education services, including standard referral procedures, as supported by Board Policy JB Equal Educational Opportunity. The best EL educational program for our ELSWD students is determined on a case by case basis and is folded into existing EL Program services; ELD Pull-Out class at elementary and ELD class period at secondary. EL teachers coordinate services with Learning Specialists when EL students are on both caseloads.

(Q66) Describe the district's process for ensuring any IEP meeting and IEP documents are accessible for parents of ELs in a language parents can understand.

District Learning Specialists have access to IEP documents in Spanish. The district SPED director will facilitate parent access to IEP documents in another language. IEP meetings that require interpretation in English/Spanish are supported by the district's interpreting team. Meetings requiring interpretation in another language necessitate the district resource an interpreter with support from regional schools and/or the SOESD.

(Q67) Describe the district's procedures for identifying ELs as Talented and Gifted. Include the steps, assessments, timeline, and person(s) responsible.

Board Policy IGBB-AR describes the Steps, Assessments, Timelines, Person(s) Responsible:

- Students may be referred by school staff, parents, peers, or any other community member.
- Students must achieve 97th percentile on academic math, academic reading, or intelligence (IG) test.
- Multiple pieces of support are always required. No single test is enough to qualify.
- Anecdotal records are used as supporting evidence.
- More than one piece of evidence is needed to qualify in areas of math or reading.
- Students may also qualify on potential academic math, potential academic reading, or potential intelligence (IG).
- Timelines and other steps determined by the district Curriculum Director

Tests used include Coloured Primary Ravens IG Test (Non-verbal), Kaufman-TEA (reading and math), Kaufman K-BIT (Intelligence test), Otis-Lennon (IG test), OSAT. The district also honors several other assessment tools such as the Stanford Binet, Woodcock Johnson, and WISC.

(Q68) Describe the district's plan for ensuring all ELs have equal access to the core instructional program offered by the district for all students. Include person(s) responsible if appropriate.

All students, including EL Program students, have equal access to the core instructional program as supported by Board Policy JB (Equal Educational Opportunity).

(Q69) Describe the district's procedures for identifying ELs who also qualify for support from Title I-A (targeted assisted programs).

All district elementary schools have school wide Title 1-A programs. Elementary schools with EL Programs provide equal access to Title 1-A services for qualifying English Learners. Eligible students are identified by triangulating data from DIBELS, STAR reading/math, and teacher observation plus other assessments as applicable. Both middle schools are currently targeted assisted Title I-A programs with a major focus on math. Students are identified through state assessment data, in classroom assessments, and teacher recommendations. Students receiving additional support in math utilize Math 180 as intervention.

(Q70) Describe the district's plan for EL graduation (4 year, 5 year timelines) for each of the EL groups (SIFE, Recently Arrived, and ELSWD – include plans by disability)

For each EL group including SIFE, Recently Arrived, and ELSWD, the plan for EL graduation is for students to complete with the 4 or 5 year cohort. Students and parents are included in developing the student's educational plan and profile as required for graduation. In that plan, a student identifies courses to be taken each year. Annually, students review their plan and profile to determine if they are on track to graduate.

Section 8: Parent and Community Involvement

(Q71) Describe the district's procedure, timeline, and the person(s) responsible for the dissemination of the parent program placement letters (both initial and continuing letters).

Within 30 days of the beginning of the school, potential ELs are screened. Those newly identified as qualifying for services and electing to receive EL Program services will receive a letter describing placement in the program. Newly identified students selecting to waive EL services will receive a letter verifying this choice; this includes students receiving services and those waiving services. The letter is customizable for new (initial), continuing and waiver students, all receiving an explanation of qualifying tools used, parent rights, EL Program description/expectations and our recent EL graduation rate. The dissemination of these letters is a coordinated effort between ELD teachers, ELD Assistants, the District EL Program Director and support staff.

(Q72) Describe the district's methods used to notify parents and students of available programs and services, including but not limited to: bilingual programs, alternative schools, charter schools, magnet schools, after-school supports, etc.

Parents are notified in person of EL Program options when their child is initially identified (phone, face to face) and annually thereafter by the program placement letter until their child demonstrates English proficiency. Other programs available to students, that they may qualify for, are promoted by the individual school site. Each level (elementary, middle, and high school) has a parent/student handbook that describes programs available in the district. At the high school, there is also a course catalog that details various courses available to students. The district webpage is a primary tool used for disseminating activities, events, and other important information pertaining to school participation. Our webpage includes a feature to translate contents into seven languages; Arabic, Chinese (simple, traditional), French, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish. For the past two years, student registration has been online only, the page translation feature being accessible during the process.

(Q73) Describe the district's methods used to notify parents of ELs regarding school activities communicated in a language parents can understand (i.e., progress reports, parent-teacher conferences, handbooks, fund raising, extracurricular activities, etc.). What is the process the district uses to determine which documents need to be translated? How does the district provide interpreters for parent to be able to participate in their student's education?

Our district webpage includes a feature to translate contents into seven languages; Arabic, Chinese (simple, traditional), French, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish. As a district, we are increasing the number of opportunities we have to communicate with parents in a language they can understand. Currently our progress reports and report cards are all translated in Spanish. Parent-teacher conferences include an interpreter if necessary and/or requested. Our elementary handbook is currently in Spanish and our middle and high school handbooks have various components in Spanish. Next year the middle school handbook will be fully translated. Our goal will be to have the high school one done the year after. Determining when and which documents must be translated is guided by the District EL Program Director.

The Director is also responsible for ensuring we have a viable interpreter team. Our current interpreter team is comprised of four bilingual English/Spanish staff (certified, classified). The team communicates most often internally to meet requests for interpreters. If there is a request for an interpreter for a language other than Spanish, the ELD teachers on the team network with neighboring districts, the SOESD, and our community.

(Q74) Describe the district's procedure, timeline, and the person(s) responsible for the dissemination of information regarding Title III to local private schools?

Annually (in the spring), the district provides all private schools with a consultation date and time at which the Title III program and services for EL students is described. Private schools can choose to participate or not. The ELD Program Director is responsible for this consultation meeting. At the current time, no private schools participate in services for EL students.

(Q75) Describe the district's procedure, timeline, and person(s) responsible for the dissemination of information of Recent Arrivers to private schools as required by Title III.

As described in question 74, the ELD Program Director is responsible for the dissemination of all information related to Title III including Recent Arrivers. This consultation meeting is scheduled in the spring of each year.

(Q76) Describe the progress in sharing the ODE EL Legislative Report with parents, School Board members, community members, and staff annually.

The ELD Program Director is responsible for providing the EL Legislative Report to the School Board, parents, staff, and the community annually. Annually there is a board report and then the information is posted on the district website. Parents and community are notified of the report through school newsletters and emails.

(Q77) Describe the district's procedure in recruiting parents of ELs to participate in school leadership roles. Include how the district will make these positions accessible for parents.

Recruiting parents of ELs to participate in school leadership roles proves to be challenging as our district EL population is relatively small. Administration (district and building) will reach out to parents individually as well as through mass communications about opportunities to participate in school/district leadership roles. This is done annually in an effort to increase parent participation in the district.

Section 9. Program Evaluation, Review and Improvement

(Q78) Describe the district’s program evaluation process of the implementation of district’s EL Plan. Include whether the district has followed the established plan; met the applicable procedural and service requirements – including frequency, timeliness, and documentation; does the information sources and methods for gathering information:

- **Include whether the evaluation determines if staff have followed applicable procedures and service requirements, including procedural and service requirements (frequency, timeliness, and documentation).**
- **Include the list of reviewed items: file and record review, staff interviews and surveys, input from parents/students or focus groups, and grievances/ complaints made to the district regarding district program implementation or service delivery.**

Program evaluation is done by a leadership team annually. The team consists of the EL Program Director, EL Coordinator(s) and ELD teachers. In order to evaluate our district EL Program the following are actions are completed:

- Data is collected and analyzed from multiple sources; OAKS, ELPA21, and State Report Cards, in-classroom assessments, individual student files are reviewed as well as any complaints against the district. Observation, and surveys given to staff, students, and parents are included. Other data includes:
 - Elementary assessments used to monitor language proficiency include ADEPT
 - Secondary assessments used to monitor language proficiency included the WestEd Persuasion unit essay tasks, E.L. Achieve writing tasks for the instructional units Pursuing the American Dream and Determining an Identity.
 - Systematic ELD Formative assessments tasks derived from language function tasks.
- Data is reviewed as it’s available. The review team conducts a thorough review of all data in August/September. There is another review conducted in May and early June.
- Data is compared with prior years’ EL achievement data to review student performance, determine areas of strengths/needs, and determine next year’s goals and resources needed to address them. Based on the data review, the District Improvement Team evaluates instructional strategies currently in use and makes recommendations for which strategies to continue or eliminate.
- Included with data review is our district’s procedures and timelines. As issues arise, the leadership team takes corrective action to improve on the communication and procedural requirements. This is an ongoing process.
- Parent and staff input is collected throughout the year.
- Results are reported to the school board annually.

(Q79) Include the evaluation of the district’s identification process. Did the district meet the timelines for each step of the district’s identification process?

The district’s identification process was reviewed and updated at the beginning of the 2017-18 school year to clarify criteria for EL eligibility and avoid potential misidentification. Screening activities were changed to reflect ODE guidance regarding approved screening tools and English proficiency levels associated with each tool. The district EL Review Team reviewed screening criteria and met twice between August and September 2017 to refine initial identification procedures for possible EL screening. Problems with identification procedures included flagging students that did not meet criteria for potential EL student screening and implementing the proscribed English proficiency. These problems were identified and corrected prior to the 30-day timeline to identify any ELs after the beginning of the school year.

Following system adjustments, our online registration system appears to avoid unnecessary student screening by correctly flagging potential ELs. That noted, the Review Team is confident that current ODE screening guidance is implemented correctly and misidentification of students had been corrected quickly. Further refinements to district identification procedures will take place when the ELPA21 screener and a statewide Language Use Survey become available.

The district is meeting timelines for each step of the identification process at the current time.

(Q80) Include the evaluation of the student initial identification assessment process. Did the district administer the identification screener timely?

In the fall of 2017, we evaluated our initial identification and assessment process to incorporate guidance from ODE Executive Numbered Memo 003-2016-17: Identification of English Learners. Primary changes are interpretation of LUS questions for administering the screener and qualification scores using our adopted screening tool, the WMLS-R.

School registrars continue to forward all LUS forms, either electronically or by district courier, that indicate a language other than English to both EL Coordinators. Though areas of responsibility are clearly defined, we have found that informing both EL Coordinators supports collaboration and ensuring that potential ELs are adequately screened in a timely manner.

Three elementary schools are piloting a Google Doc table that includes additional information (contact numbers, timeline, and person making contact) to support timely screening; more information than is available on the LUS report. Feedback is positive and the district EL Team will review this effort mid-year.

The district has administered the identification screener in a timely way. We have had issue with some bilingual students qualifying whose primary language is considered to be English by their parents. We have worked to improve our screener process to eliminate this issue.

(Q81) Include the evaluation of placement in EL Program services to all students with identified language needs.

The district has a number of students whose parents waive EL services for a variety of reasons. This year the district EL Review Team is working on developing strategies on how best to extend EL services to waiver students. The table below shows the 2017-18 students qualifying for EL services; both those participating and those waiving EL services. Four schools provide ELD instruction, Lincoln Elementary, Redwood Elementary, North Middle School and Grants Pass High School. This accounts for 11 of the 32 students waiving services. Grade level is given for waiver students only. Elementary students mostly cite staying at their neighborhood school as the reason for waiving services. Secondary students waiving services express a variety of reasons for doing so. Several middle school students have elected to attend their neighborhood school in lieu of the school with EL services. This is a new circumstance this year the EL Review Team will address. Two secondary students waiving EL services have an IEP on file and another is attending an alternative site.

The EL Review Team understands that full participation in EL services by eligible waiver students is complicated given the limitations for providing ELD instruction outside of EL Program schools. We recognize that participation in the EL Programs at Lincoln and Redwood elementary schools is strong; 70 of 74 qualifying students participate in the EL Program. This supports the observation that EL participation is positive at elementary schools an EL services. Our concern, and challenge, is how to provide support to students qualifying for EL services that choose to waive these services. A district practice intended to help students waiving services

is the inclusion of all identified ELs (waiver, Former, Monitor, etc.) in monitoring procedures. This opens access to interventions and targeted supports for students that experience academic or other challenges.

School	Grade	students waived ELD	students in ELD	EL eligible students
Allen Dale Elementary	NA	0	NA	
Highland Elementary	K	1	NA	3
	1	1		
	4	1		
Lincoln Elementary	2	1	35	37
	5	1		
Parkside Elementary	4	2	NA	4
	5	2		
Redwood Elementary	2	1	35	36
	5	1		
Riverside Elementary	K	1	NA	7
	1	2		
	2	2		
	3	1		
	5	1		
North Middle School	6	2	14	16
South Middle School	6	2	NA	7
	7	4		
	8	1		
Grants Pass High School	9	1	9	14
	11	1		
	12	3		
Total		32	93	125

(Q82) Include the evaluation of adequate staff and materials that is consistent with district’s EL Program of service.

In recent years, district EL number had been experiencing a gradual decline but have grown since the beginning of the 2017-18 school year at both elementary and secondary levels. The 2015 EL Plan counted 90 students total in the table above and the 2017 EL Plan shows 125. These numbers are within the capacity for our current ELD Teachers and support staff to provide adequate services.

Systematic ELD units at elementary and CM Instructional units at secondary continue to be a fundamental piece of our EL Program. Each year to ensure classroom teachers are prepared to meet the needs of EL students we review our professional development needs and targeted trainings. During the past two years, the district SIOP trainers have been conducting 3-4 trainings each year for both previously trained teachers and impacted teachers unfamiliar with providing Sheltered Instruction for ELs. Feedback from these trainings shows that targeting staff development for our EL student population is being well received.

ELD staff distribution is detailed in the table below. The elementary ELD teacher serves participating ELs at Lincoln and Redwood elementary schools with support from a dedicated ELD assistant at each school. The secondary ELD teacher serves participating ELs through a regular ELD class at North Middle and Grants Pass High. Staffing and materials match the current needs of our student population.

The district has one or two newcomers at the secondary level each year. These newcomers don’t always stay long. There is a need to increase staffing during these time with bilingual supports in content areas.

District School	ELD Program	ELD Teacher	ELD paraprofessional	Number of students
Allen Dale Elementary	No			
Highland Elementary	No			
Lincoln Elementary	Yes	.5 FTE	6.75 hours	35
Parkside Elementary	No			
Redwood Elementary	Yes	.5 FTE	6.75 hours	35
Riverside Elementary	No			
North Middle School	Yes	.25 FTE		14
South Middle School	No			
Grants Pass High School	Yes	.25 FTE		9
Total		1.5 FTE	13.5 hours	93

(Q83) Include the evaluation of district exiting/reclassification process for students transitioning from the EL Program.

Exit criteria are based primarily on annual state ELPA21 scores. The District will continue to focus on ELPA21 scores driving exiting efforts while acknowledging the need for EL Plan language that facilitates reclassifying an EL student without ELPA21 scores. That language has been added to Section 4, Question 58:

The school team will examine a portfolio of evidence that may support a decision to promote. Information in the portfolio may include, but is not limited to, data from the following sources:

- Ongoing language proficiency assessments such as ELD classroom assignments, projects, and quizzes.
- All available ELPA and ELPA21 scores with subtest scores.
- Language proficiency samples in comprehension (reading, listening) and production (speaking, writing)
- Content teacher feedback regarding student’s English proficiency and academic performance indicating that student can fully benefit from instruction in the regular classroom without EL support. (Teacher Survey Rubric in appendix of forms).

The school level team will contribute findings to a summary report to recommend promotion or retention. This report will be prepared by the EL Coordinator/Teacher responsible for the identified student. Parents/guardians will be included in the decision to promote or retain a student as recommended by the school team. This procedure will be the same for all categories including ELSWD, recent arrivers, etc. For those students not having an ELPA21 score, teams would review all other evidence and documentation as outlined above to determine if the student should be exited or promoted.

Exiting/Reclassification processes were disrupted in 2016 when ELPA21 scores were not made available until late in 2016. Though the district did create criteria then to exit students, some students exited did not receive Proficient scores. These students continue to be monitored and our monitoring data for these students supports the decision to exit was adequately designed. Procedures being implemented this year, specifically formal documents required to be placed in student cumulative records, are expected to support our goal of improving the 4-5 year graduation rate for ELs (including subgroups).

(Q84) Include the evaluation of the district’s monitoring practices for students who have transitioned from the ELL Program for each year of monitoring.

Monitoring procedure language has been updated to recognize the importance of academic success for students who have been identified as EL at any time during their K-12 career. These students have exited EL services and will continue to be monitored and supported as needed for the duration of their academic career in GPSD7.

The table below shows students in Monitor years 1-4 by grade level for 2017-18. We completed student portfolio (data management) updates last year that allow for review of all current and former ELs. Access to this

longitudinal information will facilitate the district in following and supporting these students through high school graduation.

Grade	Monitor Year 1	Monitor Year 2	Monitor Year 3	Monitor Year 4
2 nd	5	0	0	0
3 rd	5	0	0	0
4 th	2	3	4	0
5 th	6	0	1	2
6 th	8	0	2	3
7 th	3	2	2	3
8 th	0	3	2	6
9 th	1	0	3	2
10 th	1	0	0	1
11 th	0	0	1	2
12 th	0	0	1	2
Total	31	8	16	21

Subject	Monitor Y1		Monitor Y2		Monitor Y3		Monitor Y4	
	All	M/E	All	M/E	All	M/E	All	M/E
ELA	14	2	8	2	15	9	16	10
Math	13	4	7	2	12	6	16	6
Science	4	2	0	0	5	4	7	4

Subject	Monitor Y1		Monitor Y2		Monitor Y3		Monitor Y4	
	ELSWD	M/E	ELSWD	M/E	ELSWD	M/E	ELSWD	M/E
ELA	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Math	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The Review Team discovered that our monitoring procedures do not provide comprehensive data that can be adequately disseminated to relevant teaching staff and supervisors. This mean we can't accurately evaluate FEL (former English Learner) students' academic progress and provide consistent interventions for the purpose of supporting FEL students through graduation. We are beginning to focus on expanding monitoring procedures for all former ELs beyond the previous two years. Coordinating a long term monitoring effort with individual schools will be needed.

(Q85) Include the evaluation of EL parent participation in school/district decision making groups and the district's recruitment practices.

At this time, there are no EL parents participating in school or district decision making teams. Although building principals and district leadership have communicated with all parents the opportunities to participate, our EL parents have not participated.

(Q86) Describe the district's rate of ELs acquiring English language skills. Is the pace consistent the with district's EL program goals or expectations?

As measured by ELPA21 and in AMAO #1, 2A, and 2B, district progress is inconsistent year to year. The Review Team can make reasonable observations regarding program effectiveness using our longitudinal ELPA21 data. The table below shows district results for the past 8 years. Our data is not consistent. With the exception of AMAO 2A from 2015-16, district ELs are demonstrating growth in English proficiency across all rated categories.

Though growth may not be as strong as our stated targets for each objective, ELs are making gains in English proficiency. Performance by our long term ELs will be an important number to follow this coming year.

School Year	LEP Count	AMAO #1	AMAO 2A	AMAO 2B	AMAO #3	Overall AMAO Designation
2009 - 2010	140	Met 62.76%	Met 16.92%	Met 28.57%	Not Met	Not Met
2010 – 2011	135	Not Met 48.91%	Met 19.84%	Met 35.71%	Met	Not Met
2011-2012	126	Met 65.52%	Met 24.6%	Met 40%	Not Met	Not Met
2012-2013	119	Not Met 36.47%	Not Met 15.97%	Not Met 26.32%	Not Met	Not Met
2013-2014	128	Met 68.89% N=65	Met 18.18% N=20	Met 33.33% N=6	Not Met	Not Met
2014-2015	122	Met 52.94% N=45	Met 12.2% N=12	Not Met 17.39% N=4	Not Rated	Not Met
2015-2016	133	45.65% N=42	0%	6.67% N=2	ESSA Waiver	n/a
2016-2017	144	39.64% N=44	6.48% N=7	11.11% N=4	ESSA Waiver	n/a

(Q87) Describe the district’s rate of language development progress compatible with the district’s objective for academic (core content) progress.

The noted SMART goals below (from Q23/25) represent the District’s core content goals that we can use to observe EL performance on state tests. Following is a table with the distribution of ELs by groups and state test performance from 2017. With this information we can begin to approximate compatibility with language proficiency progress.

By comparing English proficiency scores from grade levels 3, 5 and 8 to the core content goals here we can begin to observe whether or not a positive correlation exists between language performance and academic performance. The table below shows general EL 2017 state test results disaggregated by test and group; active, monitor years 1-4, former EL, and decline (waiver). The table is useful for observing how our different EL groups performed and can help the district look for performance trends in subsequent years. It is not intended to provide specific same student results (exceeded, met, or did not meet) across tests at any of these grades. For example, at grade 3 we can conclude the same 9 active ELs did not meet for both ELA and Math. Yet, for monitor ELs at grade 3, we cannot determine how the 5 students that Meet for Math performed on the ELA test.

grade	test	active			monitor			FEL			decline			total tested
		E	M	D	E	M	D	E	M	D	E	M	D	
G3	ELA	0	0	9	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	21
G3	Math	0	0	9	1	5	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	21
G5	ELA	0	0	5	2	6	6	0	0	1	0	0	4	24
G5	Math	0	0	5	2	4	7	0	0	1	0	0	4	24
G5	Science	0	3	2	1	11	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	24
G8	ELA	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	6	6	0	0	1	20
G8	Math	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	6	6	0	0	1	20

G8	Science	0	0	1	0	4	2	0	8	4	0	0	1	20
		0	3	33	9	33	35	0	21	18	0	4	15	65

Observations:

- Active ELs, with one exception, did not meet on these state tests
- Monitor students have scores across the performance range; 12% Exceed, 43% Meet, 45% Do Not Meet
- Former ELs are found, expectedly, mostly at grade 8. For slightly more than half of the total test scores, we see that students Meet the standard.
- Waiver students appear to Not Meet compared to Meet at almost a 4:1 ratio

(Q88) Describe how the ELs are performing in English language skills compared to the district’s goals and standards.

For the 16-17 school year, we had an increase in the number of students who demonstrated growth based on the ELPA21 outcomes. With this being a larger cohort than the year prior, the percentage dropped. Because we had a number of new students to our program, we feel that this shows strength in our program’s ability to help students gain language skills. Our number of students gaining proficiency is an area where we feel we need to target as only 11 students total gained proficiency. With the new state assessment measure, this could account for the drop in the number of students meeting the district goal. We will work to develop strategies to assist students further in gaining overall language proficiency.

School Year	LEP Count	AMAO #1	AMAO 2A	AMAO 2B	AMAO #3	Overall AMAO Designation
2009 - 2010	140	Met 62.76%	Met 16.92%	Met 28.57%	Not Met	Not Met
2010 – 2011	135	Not Met 48.91%	Met 19.84%	Met 35.71%	Met	Not Met
2011-2012	126	Met 65.52%	Met 24.6%	Met 40%	Not Met	Not Met
2012-2013	119	Not Met 36.47%	Not Met 15.97%	Not Met 26.32%	Not Met	Not Met
2013-2014	128	68.89% N=65	18.18% N=20	33.33% N=6	Not Met	Not Met
2014-2015	122	52.94% N=45	12.2% N=12	17.39% N=4	Not Rated	Not Met
2015-2016	133	45.65% N=42	0%	6.67% N=2	ESSA Waiver	n/a
2016-2017	144	39.64% N=44	6.48% N=7	11.11% N=4	ESSA Waiver	n/a

(Q89) Description of how the district’s ELs are progressing in English language skills so they will be able to successfully handle regular coursework.

From the table above (Q87), we can look at the subgroup of qualifying ELs (active, waiver) at grades 3, 5, and 8 by comparing ELPA21 results from both 2016 and 2017. Those results are in the table below. The most striking observation is that more than half of the students testing at these three grade levels repeated their ELPA21 level from 2016. That noted, 5 students with repeating scores had level 3, Proficient, for both 2016 and 2017.

Grade	Test	active			waiver			total tested
		Improve 1 level	repeat level	down 1 level	Improve 1 level	repeat level	down 1 level	
G3	ELPA21	2	7	1	1	2	0	13

G5	ELPA21	3	8	1	0	4	0	16
G8	ELPA21	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
		6	16	2	1	7	0	

(Q90) Describe how the monitored ELs continue to demonstrate English language skills that enable them to successfully handle regular course work.

(Q91) Describe how the former (not monitored, nor current) ELs continue to demonstrate English language skills that enable them to successfully handle coursework.

The district’s current monitoring procedures were developed and used during the 2016-17 school year. A team at each EL Program site reviewed all former ELs (monitor, former). Our EL Team review of last year’s monitoring notes and procedures was positive and we intend to conduct our monitoring activities this year the same. The table below shows the distribution and general monitoring results for 70 students in 2016-17. Information for the seniors is not readily available as the database rolled over to the current year before this information was collected. Positive performance means no further action was taken and intervention/other means a follow action was implemented for those students.

Grade 2016-17	# students	Positive performance	Intervention/other
3	5	5	0
4	3	2	1
5	4	4	0
6	7	5	2
7	10	5	5
8	11	8	3
9	9	7	2
10	10	3	7
11	11	8	3
12	not available from database		

Observations from this data:

- Each monitored EL had multiple data points evaluated, including their academic performance
- Students with noted concerns were the subjects of a variety of interventions/other actions (counselor action, parent contact, teacher meeting, explore additional programs of support)
- Monitored and Former EL students have not distinguishing differences in their performance. Outcomes are based on each individual student and are dealt with on an individual student basis.

The EL Team concluded that the district should monitor all ELs, both currently qualifying (active, waiver) and former (monitor years 1-4, former) using the same criteria developed during the 2016-17 school year.

(Q92) Describe how the EL students, who are currently receiving English language development services, are progressing academically relative to program goals or expectations for core knowledge.

Observations of state test performance of district ELs (LEP) over the most recent three years show the percentage of ELs meeting standards being strongest in 14/15 and weakest the following year, 15-16. The greatest number of participating students is at the elementary level with the number of participants at high school being too small to make an observation that might reflect a group characteristic. Middle school EL numbers are also small. Between elementary ELA and Math, we see similar total numbers for ELs meeting over the three-year history shown. However, the percentage gap between these two tests is closer for Math. Science scores are strongest among the three tests shown. While we can make general observations from this data, our most specific information will be found in monitoring of student progress during monitoring sessions.

English Language Arts

	14/15		15/16		16/17	
Elementary	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met
Total	758	55.9	744	55	690	51.2
LEP	16	34	5	11.6	10	18.2
Ever EL	21	36.2	20	32.3	14	22.6
Middle	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met
Total	734	58.3	788	58.2	789	57.8
LEP	5	23.8	1	7.7	5	16.7
Ever EL	19	41.3	18	33.3	22	36.1
High	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met
Total	144	44	196	60.9	226	70.4
LEP	0	0	0	0	1	25
Ever EL	1	11.1	6	54.5	6	42.9

Math

	14/15		15/16		16/17	
Elementary	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met
Total	591	43.8	582	43.2	552	41.1
LEP	10	21.3	6	13.6	16	29.6
Ever EL	15	25.9	17	27	19	31.1
Middle	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met
Total	494	38.8	535	39.8	497	36.5
LEP	2	9.5	1	7.7	2	6.7
Ever EL	9	19.6	11	20.4	12	19.7
High	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met
Total	85	23.9	67	22.9	89	27.6
LEP	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ever EL	0	0	2	18.2	1	6.7

Science

	14/15		15/16		16/17	
Elementary	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met
Total	382	82.9	387	81	360	81.4
LEP	11	73.3	6	42.9	9	60
Ever EL	14	73.7	14	58.3	12	66.7
Middle	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met
Total	298	73.2	316	73.5	341	74
LEP	9	21.4	19	33.9	22	36.1
Ever EL	1	25			3	42.9
High	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met	Number Met	% Met
Total	267	71.2	250	74.4	204	73.1
LEP	1	50	0	0	0	0
Ever EL	4	36.4	5	50	2	18.2

(Q93) Describe how the current EL, monitored EL, and former EL students are doing, over time, as compared to the academic performance of all other students.

District monitored and former ELs show higher meeting percentages for ELA, Math, and Science than current ELs. Though still small number overall, we can infer that our former ELs are performing better academically due in part to higher levels of English proficiency. Note that secondary numbers are not representative of the four cohort years at high school but of the grades participating in state tests. Consistent with the 15/16 drop in overall performance for ELs, we see a similar drop for former ELs. Elementary scores are promising in that we may be looking at a narrowing of achievement between total students and the EL subgroup. Whether there is a trend developing will better determined at the end of the current school year.

(Q94) Describe what measures are being used to assess the overall performance of EL students in meeting the goals the district has established for its EL Program.

In reviewing overall performance for ELs the district has primarily maintained a focus on performance as presented in the highlighted AMAO data below. Our historical AMAO data appears inconsistent, though among AMAO 1, 2A and 2B, results show the district meeting at least half of the 8 years shown. Looking closer at our student portfolio data, we observe an opportunity to shift our broad focus on all AMAO categories to a subgroup of qualifying students, ELs with 5 or more ELPA/ELPA21 scores.

For the 2017-18 school year we have 130 students qualifying for EL services.

Active Entered: 29

Active Continued: 65

Waiver EL services: 35

30 of these students (Active Continued, Waiver) have 5 or more recorded ELPA/ELPA21 scores. That means 30 of 100 ELs will have scores reported in AMAO 2B this year. The district should look at developing strategies and interventions to move more of these long term ELs toward Proficient as reported by ELPA/ELPA21 scores.

<i>School Year</i>	<i>LEP Count</i>	<i>AMAO #1</i>	<i>AMAO 2A</i>	<i>AMAO 2B</i>	<i>AMAO #3</i>	<i>Overall AMAO Designation</i>
2009 - 2010	140	Met 62.76%	Met 16.92%	Met 28.57%	Not Met	Not Met
2010 – 2011	135	Not Met 48.91%	Met 19.84%	Met 35.71%	Met	Not Met
2011-2012	126	Met 65.52%	Met 24.6%	Met 40%	Not Met	Not Met
2012-2013	119	Not Met 36.47%	Not Met 15.97%	Not Met 26.32%	Not Met	Not Met
2013-2014	128	Met 68.89% N=65	Met 18.18% N=20	Met 33.33% N=6	Not Met	Not Met
2014-2015	122	Met 52.94% N=45	Met 12.2% N=12	Not Met 17.39% N=4	Not Rated	Not Met
2015-2016	133	45.65% N=42	0%	6.67% N=2	ESSA Waiver	n/a
2016-2017	144	39.64% N=44	6.48% N=7	11.11% N=4	ESSA Waiver	n/a

The districts current goals for the 2017-18 school year.

- AMAO #1: Annually, GPSD7 will have at least 50% of EL students making progress toward language proficiency.
- AMAO #2A: Annually, GPSD7 would expect to have 20% of its EL population attaining EL proficiency who have been in the program less than 5 years.

- AMAO #2B: For students who have been identified as EL for 5 or more years, our goal would be to have at least 20% attain language proficiency.

(Q95) List of any identified concerns based on this evaluation.

The following chart is comprised of concerns based on the questions in section 9 as well as concerns expressed during our EL Plan review committee.

#	Concern	Corrective action	Person responsible	Timeline
80	Some bilingual students with primary English have been qualified for EL services	District EL Team review screening guidance and norm intake/screening criteria	EL Coordinator, ELD Teacher, EL Program Director	September 2017 June 2018
81	Provide academic support to students waiving EL Program services	District EL Team review screening guidance and norm intake/screening criteria	EL Coordinator/ELD Teacher, EL Program Director	17/18 school year
82	Newcomers at the secondary level who are in need of translation and interpreting services during core content	District will hire support for these students.	EL program Director	17/18 school year
84	Systematic collection of usable monitoring data for students in monitor years 1 through graduation	Design data collection form to note date, participants, academic performance, recommendations.	Title III Director, ELD Teachers	January
84	Team contribution to academic monitoring of former ELs (FEL)	Schedule/include classroom teachers, content teacher representative, counselor in monitoring activity	Principals, ELD Teachers, classroom/content teachers, counselors	January and June
84	Instructional staff awareness of at-risk behaviors and academic performance of FELs	Provide actionable data and training to teaching staff and admin regarding FELs	Title III Director, Principals, ELD Teachers	January
85	There is not enough EL parent participation in school/district decision making groups.	Make more targeted and intentional recruitment efforts to include more EL parents in school site councils and district committees	Building principals, District leadership	Annually
86	Instructional initiatives within the EL Program and regular education settings aren't coordinated	Provide a venue for sharing initiatives between EL Program and regular education staff	Principals, ELD Teachers	Annually
86	EL Program goals for language acquisition have been historically the same as state ELPA targets. We recognize the need to identify specific goals for our EL student performance	Review/compare EL ELPA21 within the district population, by grade level, to identify potential issues and/or goals	Title III Director, Principals, ELD Teachers, classroom/content teachers	Annually
87	Language Arts is an area in need of improvement for academic outcomes for ELs	Work with ELA teacher to develop SIOP lessons that support the need of EL learners during content area instruction	ELD teacher, content area teachers	Annually
88	District goals don't include targets outside of those established by the state	Establish specific grade level or school goals from review of district performance data	EL Review Team	Goals set by Nov.
88	Incomplete implementation of E.L. Achieve based formative assessments	Coordinate regular use of common language function assessment tools and sharing of results	ELD Teachers	2 times per year

	for both elementary and secondary levels			
89	SLOP trained staff aren't consistent in implementation of strategies in the classroom.	Develop a specific SLOP professional development plan that includes annual refreshers and classroom walkthrough supports	Title III Director, ELD Teachers	Annually
90	Evaluation of regular classroom performance through new monitoring procedures	Review monitor procedures and intervention data between last year and this year	Title III Director, ELD staff	January 2018
93	The district has subgroup data available from longitudinal state assessment data, but it is not utilized in an effective manner.	To better evaluate district state performance data in reading & literature, mathematics, writing, and science, the district will identify/design a tool for reporting on EL/FEL subgroups' performance on state assessments	Title III Director, Principals, ELD Teachers	Annually
94	The district shows mixed AMAO results over time. Focus interventions/strategies on long term ELs (5 or more ELPA scores)	Align instructional interventions for ELs and general population students with a focus on addressing the skills/knowledge needed to prepare them for meeting performance standards as measured by state assessments	Title III Director, Principals, Test coordinators, ELD Teachers, classroom teachers	Ongoing
	There is a perception by parents and students that when a student is removed from class for ELD time, they are missing content in the classroom	Work with staff on a communication plan that ensures parents and students understand the individual student schedule	ELD teachers, building administrators, classroom teachers	Ongoing
	Identification of ELs as SWDs is complicated and staff wrestle with best ways to support ELSWD (is it a language issue, a disability, or both)	Work with others to identify best practices in supporting the needs of ELSWD	ELD teachers, building administrators, classroom teachers	Ongoing
	Finding ways to incentivize and target at risk ELs to graduate from high school.	Ideas include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and EL Scholarship 2. K – 12 Mecha Club 3. HS kids mentoring younger students 4. Involve Rotary club in mentoring 5. Train parents on how best to support their student 	Title III Director, Principals, ELD Teachers	Ongoing

(Q96) Describe how the district will address the concerns.

We are trying to better partner with the classroom teachers as they target the specific needs of each individual student. We have attempted specific, targeted professional development at both the elementary and middle school. We will continue with these efforts. The district has already implemented a timeline to utilize the GP OnTrack data collection tool to support efforts for monitoring former ELs academic progress. By specifically articulating our concerns, the Review Team believes that coordinating EL Program improvement efforts with site administrators and instructional staff will lead to better services and, ultimately, greater success for our ELs.

See chart above (question 95) for specific corrective actions.