

**U.S. Department of Education
Office of English Language Acquisition
Washington, D.C. 20024-6510**



Biennial Evaluation Report

State Formula Grants under Title III, Part A, English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement Act

(Public Law 107-110)

**CFDA NUMBER: 84.365A
FORM APPROVED
OMB NO. 1885-0553, EXP. DATE 8/31/07**

DATED MATERIAL – OPEN IMMEDIATELY

DUE DATE: DECEMBER 1, 2004

Instructions for Completing the State Formula Grant Biennial Evaluation Report

By December 1, 2004, States must complete and submit to the Department this Biennial Evaluation Report for the Title III State Formula Grant Program. This report is based on student performance data and other related information from the two-year period of fiscal year (FY) 2002-03 and FY 2003-04. Be sure to read the instructions for this document.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this State Formula Grant Biennial Evaluation Report, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, PDF file, .rtf, or .txt file. Send electronic submissions to: TitleIII.Apps@ed.gov

A State that submits **only a paper submission** should mail the submission by express courier. **Do not use surface mail.** Due to the screening process of Federal mail it may cause lengthy delays. Mail to:

Elizabeth Judd
Office of English Language Acquisition
U.S. Department of Education
550 12th Street, SW
Room PCP 10-008
Washington, D.C. 20024-6510
(202) 245-7110 or (202) 245-7155
Email: Elizabeth.Judd@ed.gov

The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 5.00 hours (or 300 minutes) per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-6510. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: OELA, U.S. Department of Education 550 12th Street SW, Room PCP 10-008, Washington, D.C. 20024-6510.

Evaluation Elements	
----------------------------	--

1	Types of language instruction educational programs used by subgrantees to teach LEP students [SEC. 3121(a)(1) p.1701, 3123(b)(1) p.1704]
2	Critical synthesis of data reported by subgrantees [SEC. 3121(a) p.1701, 3123(b)(3) p.1704]
3	Effectiveness of Title III programs and activities in assisting LEP students to make progress in attaining English language proficiency and meeting State academic content and student academic achievement standards [SEC. 3116(c) p.1698, 3123(b)(1) p.1704, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]
4	Professional development activities conducted by the State and by subgrantees[SEC. 3115(c)(2) p. 1698, 3116 (c) p.1701, 3123(b)(5) p. 1705,]
5	Description of State level activities conducted and technical assistance provided to subgrantees [SEC. 3111(b)(2)(c) p.1691,3123(b)(4) p. 1705]
6	Number of programs or activities that were terminated for failure to reach program goals [SEC. 3121(b)(8) p.1702, 3123(b)(7) p.1705]
7	Number and percentage of LEP students transitioned out of language instruction educational programs into classrooms where instruction is not designed for LEP students [SEC. 3121 (a)(4) p. 1701, 3123(b)(7) p.1702, 3123(b)(8) p. 1705]
8	Description of the activities that provide enhanced instructional opportunities for immigrant children and youth. [SEC. 3115 (e)(1)]
9	Optional

State Response for Meeting Title III State Formula Grant Biennial Evaluation Reporting Requirements

Instructions

States are to provide detailed information for each of the nine elements required for the State Formula Grant Biennial Evaluation Report. States should respond to the items listed under each of the elements. Some elements require more than one response. Please respond in the space labeled, "State response." If any of the information requested is not available, please explain why it is not available and provide a timeline for submitting the information to the Department.

This document includes items and tables for information that must be submitted in this biennial report and in future biennial reports. There are items that are also placeholders for future responses, and these items have deferral instructions.

Please note the following:

- Specific instructions for each item are shown in bold type and enclosed in parentheses.
- Several items may not be applicable.
- Responses are required for all portions of items and tables that are not deferred or are not applicable at this time (see labels or instructions in the items).

This document is written in rich text format [rtf] for the purpose of making the document format more user-friendly and to reduce the chance of table distortion. **Please do not use another format other than the one provided. This data collection package has been approved by the Office of Management and Budget, and responses will only be acceptable through this approved package.** The page breaks will automatically provide sufficient space for response. Provide narrative responses in the spaces as indicated.

Responses to portions of the following questions or tables are deferred until 2006:

Question/Item	Part/All	Title
Table 2.2a	Part	Number and percentage of students making progress in learning English
Table 2.2b	Part	Number and percentage of students attaining English language proficiency
Table 2.3a	Part	Number and percentage of students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on State administered mathematics assessments

Question/Item	Part/All	Title
Table 2.3b	Part	Number and percentage of students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on State administered reading/language arts assessments
Table 2.3c	Part	Number and percentage of Title III served LEP students scoring proficient on math
Table 2.3d	Part	Number and percentage of Title III served LEP students scoring proficient on reading/language arts...
Item 5.4	All	Were any subgrantees required to develop an improvement plan under Title III...
Item 5.5	All	Did the State conduct or sponsor any scientifically based research studies...
Table 7.1	Part	Number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned...
Table 7.2a	Part	Number and percentage of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring proficient on math...
Table 7.2b	Part	Number and percentage of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring proficient on reading/language arts...

1. Types of language instruction educational programs used by subgrantees to teach LEP students [SEC. 3121(b)(1) p.1701, 3123(b)(2) p. 1704]

1.1 What types of language instruction educational programs were implemented by Title III subgrantees during school years 2002-03 and 2003-04? [SEC.3121(a)(1) p. 1701, SEC. 3123(b)(1) p.1704]

Check all that apply:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>Bilingual Programs</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dual language</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Two way immersion</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transitional bilingual</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Developmental bilingual</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Heritage language</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain)</p> | <p>English as a Second Language Programs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Sheltered English instruction</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Structured English immersion</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Content-based ESL</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Pull-out ESL</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain)</p> |
|--|--|

State response 1.1: (Provide narrative here. Provide a brief description of the programs checked. Include information regarding intensity and duration of instruction, and, if using more than one language, instructional time in each language. Include other information as needed.) Descriptions of the programs listed can be found on NCELA’s website: <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>

- a. There are 15 school districts that offer two-way bilingual programs. All are Spanish-English programs except one, which is Portuguese- English. Though there is some variation from district to district, most are K-5 and use an alternating week schedule – i.e. Week A in English, Week B in Spanish. These are full-day programs covering the entire curriculum.
- b. There are eleven districts that offer transitional bilingual programs (TBE). All of these programs are at the secondary level and instruction covers the entire curriculum. The amount of instructional time in English and the native language depends on the English language proficiency level of the students enrolled. Therefore it is possible for some students to be enrolled in bilingual classes for the whole day, and for others to be in a general classroom for part of the day and in TBE for the other part of the day.
- c. Most LEP children in Massachusetts are educated using sheltered or structured English immersion (SEI). These two terms are used interchangeably within the state. As noted above, some LEP children are also enrolled in two-way bilingual and TBE programs. A new state law passed in November 2002 required SEI for all LEP children unless they

were participating in a two-way program or had received a waiver to participate in a TBE or other bilingual program. SEI is designed and delivered differently from district to district, depending on the number and distribution of LEP children within the district. In all cases, however, regardless of whether there are a few students or thousands of students, all designs must be comprehensive and full-day, and must include both English language instruction and sheltered content instruction. As the state's schools have only been implementing SEI for one full school year, it is not yet possible to more specifically describe the various implementation models.

1.2 NCLB requires that language instruction educational programs be based on scientific research and proven to be effective. Describe how Title III subgrantees implemented language instruction educational programs that are scientifically based and proven to be effective. [SEC.3115(c)(1) p.1698, SEC. 3123(b)(1) p. 1704, SEC. 9101 (37)]

State response 1.2: (Provide narrative here.)

Sheltered English immersion (SEI) As stated earlier in this report, a state law passed by ballot initiative in November 2002 mandated that all LEP children in the state be educated in sheltered English immersion or two-way bilingual programs, unless the parents requested and the district granted a waiver to participate in transitional bilingual education (TBE) or other bilingual programs. For this reason, the majority of LEP children in Massachusetts are being educated using SEI.

Two-way bilingual programs All districts that had two-bilingual education programs prior to the passage of the new state law continue to offer these programs. One additional district has implemented a new two-way program. All of these districts cite the substantial and growing body of research supporting the efficacy of two-way bilingual or two-way immersion education. The recent, comprehensive longitudinal study by Thomas and Collier (2002) concludes that two-way immersion programs are the only programs found to date that assist students to fully reach the 50th percentile in both their native language and English in all subject areas and to maintain that level of achievement, or reach even higher levels through the end of their schooling. The fewest dropouts come from these programs. This and other research is used by districts to support and guide their program development in this area, and these programs have long waiting lists in all districts in which they exist.

Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) Beginning in the 2003-2004 school year, one district has offered a TBE program at the elementary school level, and 11 districts offer TBE programs at the secondary level. The district that offers TBE at the elementary level maintains local performance data that indicates a high academic success rate for students who participate in its TBE program.

The 11 districts that retain TBE at the secondary level do so to enable LEP students who enter during middle and high school to receive content instruction, particularly mathematics, in their native language to enable them to pass the state mathematics exam (MCAS) and meet one of the requirements for receiving a high school diploma.

2. Critical synthesis of data reported by subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a)(1) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1) p.1704]

2.1 Provide a synthesis of data presented in the tables in Section 2. Summarize Title III served LEP students' progress toward meeting Title III AMAOs. [SEC. 3121(a)(1-2) p. 1701]

State response 2.1: (Provide narrative here.)

State response 2.1: (Provide narrative here.)

1. Among the *Not Yet Approaching Transitioning* cohort from 2002-03 whose records could be linked to 2003-04, 30% made progress. Similarly, 36% of the *Approaching Transitioning* cohort made progress. Both figures were below the state's "making progress" target, which was 70% for each of the cohorts.
2. The state exceeded its target of having at least 2% of the students who were *Not Yet Approaching Transitioning* in 2003 performing at the *Transitioning* or *Proficient* level in 2004. In the matched data set, 11% of the students improved their English Proficiency from *Not Yet Approaching Transitioning* to *Transitioning*.
3. Students in the *Approaching Transitioning* cohort fell short of the target of having 70% reach the *Transitioning* (Proficient level) 36% of the students in the matched data set moved from the *Approaching Transitioning* to *Transitioning* levels between 2003 and 2004.
4. The state did not achieve its AMAOs.

Note: The data in these tables summarize the performance of students in grades 3 through 12 who participated in the reading, writing, speaking and listening assessments in both 2002-03 and 2003-04 and who had not achieved the *Transitioning* or proficient level in the baseline year. Students missing data from one or more domains, and students who were not enrolled or not tested in one of the years were excluded from these results. There are some other factors to consider when reviewing this data, especially in understanding the relatively low number of students in the matched group.

- The 2002-03 school year was the first year that Massachusetts required all districts to assess Limited English Proficient students using the LAS Reading and Writing and Massachusetts English Language Assessment – Oral (Speaking and Listening) assessments.
- Speaking and Listening assessments in 2002-03 were not completed for 40 percent of the students who participated in the Reading and Writing assessments, since training in administering the MELA-O (speaking/listening) assessment had not yet been completed for teachers in all schools
- Between 2002-03 and 2003-04 at least 8,544 of the state's tested LEP students were re-classified as former Limited English Proficient. Former LEP students were not required to participate in the 2003-04 English proficiency assessments, this

- includes approximately 27% of the students who had been in the “Approaching Transitioning” cohort.
- Historically, approximately 5,000 LEP students move in and out of Massachusetts per year. Of the 3rd through 12th graders tested in 2002-03, 4,763 could not be linked to 2003-04 enrollment records.
 - MELA-O speaking scores were based on the lowest of four speaking sub-domains, so a student who exhibits fluency but still speaks with an accent similar to a non-fluent student would receive the lowest score. Data for students in the Approaching Transitioning cohort show that 940 students failed to make progress because their speaking scores did not increase from 2002-03 to 2003-04 though their listening, writing and reading scores did improve enough.

2.2 Demonstrate through the data in Tables 2.2a and 2.2b how Title III subgrantees met the Title III annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress in learning English [Table 2.2a] and for attaining English proficiency [Table 2.2b].) [SEC. 3121(c)(1)(A-B) p.1702, SEC. 3121(a)(3), SEC. 3121(d)(3) p.1702]

Instructions for Tables 2.2a and 2.2b:

- Provide State-level aggregated data for the Number and percentage of Title III served students making progress in learning English and attaining English proficiency.
- In the column labeled “cohort,” indicate the cohorts as defined in the State’s latest submission under the Consolidated State Application (CSA). This may be by grade span, individual grades, or another cohort as described in the approved CSA.
- “Baseline” data is data collected in school year 2002-03, and reported in the latest submission to the CSA.
- The “AMAO target” for 2003-04 is the target set by the State in the CSA as its goal for the school year.
- “Performance data” for 2003-04 refers to actual numbers/percentages from the 2003-04 testing period. **Responses for other years are deferred until future biennial reports; these columns have been shaded to indicate that no response is needed at this time.**
- “Making progress” is defined as meeting the State’s AMAO targets for making progress as established by the State in the latest submission to the Consolidated Application.
- “Attaining proficiency” is defined as meeting the State’s AMAO targets for attaining proficiency as established by the State in the latest submission to the Consolidated Application.

Table 2.2a Number and percentage of students making progress in learning English [SEC. 3121(c)(1)(A) p 1702]

Cohort used for reporting	Baseline data for 2002-03		AMAO target for 2003-04		Performance data for 2003-04		AMAO target for 2004-05		Performance data for 2004-05		AMAO target for 2005-06		Performance data for 2005-06	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Students who in 2002-03 were "Not Yet Approaching Proficient"			4,113	70%	1,778	30%								
Students who in 2002-03 were "Approaching Transitioning"			2,735	70%	1,408	36%								
Total			6,848	70%	3,186	33%								

Table 2.2b Number and percentage of students attaining English language proficiency [SEC. 3121(c)(1)(A) p 1702]

Cohort used for reporting	Baseline data for 2002-03		AMAO target for 2003-04		Performance data for 2003-04		AMAO target for 2004-05		Performance data for 2004-05		AMAO target for 2005-06		Performance data for 2005-06	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Students who in 2002-03 were "Not Yet Approaching Proficient"	5,875	0%	118	2%	674	11%								
Students who in 2002-03 were "Approaching Transitioning"	3,907	0%	2,735	70%	1,408	36%								
Total	9,782	0%	2,853	29%	2,082	21%								

2.3 Demonstrate through data in Tables 2.3a - 2.3d whether LEP students receiving services under **Title III** met the State adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets in math and reading/language arts required under Title I. [SEC. 3121(c)(1)(C) p. 1702, 3121(d)(2) p.1702, 3122(3)(B) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1) p. 1704]

(Insert an “x” on the appropriate line in the table for the accommodations available to LEP students taking State achievement tests in your State.)

Accommodations to Presentation	Accommodations to Response
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment in the native language (Spanish-English only in math and science; spanish-English version will be available for Gr. 10 math only beginning in 2004-2005) <input type="checkbox"/> Text changes in vocabulary <input type="checkbox"/> Modification of linguistic complexity <input type="checkbox"/> Addition of visual supports <input type="checkbox"/> Use of glossaries in native language <input type="checkbox"/> Use of glossaries in English <input type="checkbox"/> Linguistic modification of test directions <input type="checkbox"/> Additional example items/tasks <input type="checkbox"/> Oral directions in the native language <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use of dictionaries (word-to-word only) <input type="checkbox"/> Reading aloud of questions in English <input type="checkbox"/> Directions read aloud or explained	<input type="checkbox"/> Answers written directly in test booklet <input type="checkbox"/> Answers dictated <input type="checkbox"/> Responses in native language <div style="text-align: center;">Accommodations to Timing/Scheduling</div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Extra assessment time*** See note <input type="checkbox"/> Breaks during testing <input type="checkbox"/> Administration in several sessions <div style="text-align: center;">Accommodations to Setting</div> <input type="checkbox"/> Small-group or individual administration <input type="checkbox"/> Separate room administration

Rivera, C. and C. Stansfield (2000). *An analysis of state policies for the inclusion and accommodation of English language learners in state assessment programs during 1998-1999* (Executive Summary). Washington, DC: Center for Equity and Excellence in Education, The George Washington University.

*****Test is untimed for all students**

Instructions for Tables 2.3a - 2.3d:

- In the following tables, please provide student achievement data from the 2002-03 and 2003-04 test administrations. **Responses for other years are deferred until future biennial reports; these columns have been shaded to indicate that no response is needed at this time.**
- Tables with multiple rows have been provided to accommodate the varied State assessment systems. Data may be provided by grade or by grade span.
- Provide data on the number and percentage of Title III served LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels, out of the total number of Title III served LEP students. Provide data for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2002-03 and 2003-04 school years.
- These tables include data for Title III served students only, therefore, data required in these tables differ from data submitted to Title I for the LEP subgroup. This is separate reporting specific to Title III served students required by Section 3121(a)(2).
- "Projected percent" refers to the State AYP target for the percentage of LEP students projected to score at the proficient and advanced levels on the State achievement assessments.

#1885-0553

- "Percent of students proficient and advanced" refers to the percent of Title III served LEP students, out of all Title III served LEP students, who scored at the proficient and advanced levels on the State achievement assessments.

(In Tables 2.3a and 2.3b, provide student achievement data for all LEP Title III served students who participated in the State achievement assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts respectively, with or without accommodations, including native language versions of assessments.)

Table 2.3a Number and percentage of Title III served LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on State administered mathematics assessments													
		2002-2003			2003-2004			2004-2005			2005-2006		
Grade	Grade Span	State NCLB Target	Students Proficient & Advanced		State NCLB Target	Students Proficient & Advanced		Projected %	Students Proficient & Advanced		Projected %	Students Proficient & Advanced	
			#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
	4-10	26%*	1,782	19%	26%*	1512	17%						

*The state NCLB targets in Massachusetts were set using a Composite Performance Index (CPI) rather than a strict percentage. For the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 school years the state’s mathematics target was a CPI of 60.8. Groups with CPIs within 0.1 points of 60.8 had, on average, 26 percent of their students proficient and advanced (SD=.06).

Table 2.3b Number and percentage of Title III served LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on State administered reading/language arts assessments													
		2002-2003			2003-2004			2004-2005			2005-2006		
Grade	Grade Span	State NCLB Target	Students Proficient & Advanced		Projected %	Students Proficient & Advanced		Projected %	Students Proficient & Advanced		Projected %	Students Proficient & Advanced	
			#	%		#	%		#	%		#	%
	3-10	43%*	2,346	18%	43%*	2153	19%						

*

*The state NCLB targets in Massachusetts were set using a Composite Performance Index (CPI) rather than a strict percentage. For the 2002-2003 and 2003-2004 school years the state’s English Language Arts / Reading target was a CPI of 75.6. Groups with CPIs within 0.1 point of 75.6 had, on average, 43 percent of their students proficient and advanced (SD=.04).

(In Table 2.3d, provide student achievement data only for Title III served LEP students who participated in the State achievement assessments in reading/language arts through native language versions of assessments.)

Table 2.3d Number and percentage of Title III served LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on native language versions of State administered reading/language arts assessments									
Table 2.3d		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
Grade	Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced		Students Proficient & Advanced		Students Proficient & Advanced		Students Proficient & Advanced	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
3	3-5								
4		SEE NOTE ABOVE							
5									
6	6-9								
7									
8									
9									
10	10-12								
11									
12									

3. Effectiveness of Title III programs and activities in assisting LEP students to make progress in attaining English language proficiency and meeting State academic content and student academic achievement standards

[SEC.3121(b)(2) p.1701, 3123(b)(1) p.1704]

3.1 Provide a summary of the effectiveness of Title III programs and activities in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives. [SEC.3121(b)(2) p.1701, 3123(b)(1) p.1704]

(Please fill in the figures (for each year) in the spaces provided.)

Number of Title III subgrantees	<u>57</u>	2002-03	<u>53</u>	2003-04
Number of LEP students served in Title III programs	<u>45,929</u>	2002-03	<u>48,758</u>	2003-04
Number of Title III subgrantees that met Title III AMAOS	<u>NA</u>	2002-03	0	2003-04
Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs	<u>NA</u>	2002-03	56	2003-04

State response 3.1: (Provide narrative here. Summarize which programs and activities were effective. Provide evidence of program effectiveness (defined as meeting AMAOs), and any remedies required by the State for those subgrantees that did not achieve the AMAO targets. Identify contributing factors if Title III AMAOs were not met.)

As a result of factors such as variable participation rates, unmatched student records, and other factors noted in section 2.1, the performance data related to the English proficiency of limited English proficient students that were collected prior to 2004-2005 cannot be used to evaluate program effectiveness.

The Department’s new program, the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) program became operational in 2004-2005 and will be used for evaluating program effectiveness beginning this year.

4. Professional development activities conducted by the State and by subgrantees

[SEC. 3115(c)(1)(B) p. 1698, 3123(b)(5) p. 1705]

4.1 Please provide the number of teachers working in your State's Title III language instruction educational programs in each of the categories below:

[SEC. 3123(b)(5) p.1705]

1455** Total number of certified/licensed teachers working in language instruction educational programs in the State (certificate or license may be in any area).
(Report actual number if available, if not, report estimated number, indicate if estimated.)**

6000 Total estimated number of certified/licensed teachers that the State will need to estimated staff language instruction educational programs for the next 5 years

State response 4.1: (Provide any further explanation needed for the information provided above.)

**The number 1455 represents the number of teachers employed in language instruction educational programs who are licensed to do so. The number requested, i.e. the number of teachers with any license working in language education instructional programs, is unavailable.

4.2 How is teacher fluency in English and in any other language used for instruction in Title III programs determined in your State? [SEC. 3116(c) p.1701]

(Insert an “x” on the appropriate line for response for all that apply)

- State required English fluency exam [oral and written communication skills]
- LEA required English fluency exam [oral and written communication skills]
- State required fluency exam for another language [oral and written communication skills]
- LEA required fluency exam for another language [oral and written communication skills]
- Other (**Please explain**)

State response 4.2: (Provide narrative if necessary)

1. A state-administered test reading and writing test , the Communication and Literacy test, is required of all license applicants.
2. Superintendents are required to annually sign an assurance that all teachers who teach in English are proficient in English. For oral proficiency, the state has designated the “Advanced Mid” level, as described in the ACTFL language proficiency scales as the level required for oral proficiency. The Department has also issued guidance for districts about how to make this determination. Options

outlined in this guidance include classroom observation, interviews, and commercial oral proficiency testing.

3. Applicants for licenses requiring instruction in a language other than English (e.g. foreign language and bilingual) must take a language proficiency test in a foreign language in order to receive a license.

required to effectively shelter content instruction. The specific approaches included the following: a. SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol training); b. ACCESS training (from the School for International Training); c. Enhancing Learning for English Language Learners (CAL) training ; d. graduate courses

2. **MELA-O teacher training:** As noted previously, the test chosen by the Department, the MELA-O, requires 10 hours of training for teachers to become reliable raters (administrators) of this test. Many districts carried out extensive MELA-O training to build the capacity required to assess all LEP students using the MELA-O.
3. **Training on Mass. English language proficiency standards:** The English language proficiency standards, contained in the document, *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes* were the focus of substantial professional development in many districts. This training included using the document to plan instruction and assessment for LEP students.
4. **Curriculum development for SEI classrooms:** Because of our new state law, districts have begun the tasks of developing content curricula that include language learning objectives, based on *the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*.

5. Description of State level activities conducted and technical assistance provided to subgrantees [SEC. 3111(b)(2)(C-D))(c), reference CSA item 8c]

5.1 During the two preceding fiscal years, what technical assistance was provided by the State to subgrantees? [SEC. 3122(b)(3) p.1703]
(Insert an “x” on the appropriate line for response for all that apply)

The State provided technical assistance to subgrantees in:

- Identifying and implementing English language instructional programs and curricula that are based on scientific research.
- Helping LEP students to meet academic content and student academic achievement standards expected of all students.
- Identifying or developing and implementing measures of English language proficiency.
- Promoting parental and community participation in programs that serve LEP children.
- Providing recognition of subgrantees that exceeded the English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives.
- Strategic Planning

State response 5.1: (Describe the outcomes of the technical assistance provided, including which activities were effective, how effectiveness was measured, and why the activities were effective.)

- a. In May 2003, the MADOE established an Office of Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement (OLAAA), and in June 2003 an administrator was selected to manage the work of this unit.
- b. In August 2003, the MADOE began a two-year strategic planning initiative, “ The Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) Implementation series. This involved 37 districts that enrolled approximately 80% of the state’s LEP students. Needs assessment, planning, and evaluation tools were developed for participating districts, and at the end of the year each district had developed a strategic plan for effectively implementing SEI, as required by our new state law, for school year 2003-2004. All except two of these participating districts chose to continue their participating into Year 2, the current school year 2004-2005.
- c. An “Emerging Programs Initiative” was designed and implemented. This consisted of a two-and-a-half day workshop for smaller districts that were new to working with LEP students. During the period covered by the biennial report, 30 districts participated. During the course of the workshop, each district team developed a district plan to be implemented during the following school year.

- d. Ten districts receiving Title III funds were visited by a staff member from the Office of Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement. During the visit, onsite technical assistance was provided, and written follow-up was provided.
- e. Approximately 50 requests for assistance were received from districts, either by phone or email, and answered by OLA staff
- f. The MADOE designed and offered a series of workshops on strategic planning for teams of administrators from districts wishing to submit an NCLB Consolidated District Plan. Staff from the Office of Language Acquisition worked with district teams and facilitated discussion around Goal 2 of NCLB.
- g. MADOE developed its own approach to school improvement, Performance Improvement Mapping (PIM). The Office of Language Acquisition participated in the design of PIM, and facilitated its use by some of the state’s schools that the Department had declared “Underperforming”. Most of these schools enrolled large number of LEP students. All schools that participated in PIM training developed a school improvement plan.
- h. To meet its requirements to annually assess all LEP students in the state in listening and speaking, the MADOE has selected the Massachusetts English Language Assessment – Oral (MELA-O). This test relies on teacher observation of LEP students, over a period of time, as they are engaged in normal classroom activities. Approximately 8—10 hours of training is required for teachers and others to become reliable raters, and in order to train the number of teachers required to administer this test statewide, the Department uses a trainer-of-trainers model. Training of trainers requires approximately 25 hours of training. Trainers, called Qualified MELA-O Trainers (QMTs), train teachers in their district to become Qualified MELA-O Administrators (QMAs). During the period covered by the Biennial Report, Approximately 777 individuals were trained to be QMTs, and they in turn trained approximately 1953 teachers were trained to become QMAs. This was an enormous statewide effort.

5.2 What other State activities have been conducted during the two preceding fiscal years?
(Activities contained in the CSA item 8c)

(Insert an “x” on the appropriate line for response for all that apply)

- Planning activities
- Evaluation activities
- Administration activities
- Interagency cooperation activities
- Other (**Explain**)

State response 5.2: (Describe the outcomes of the activities checked, including which activities were effective, how effectiveness was measured, and why the activities were effective.)

1. Staff in the Office of Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement answered inquiries on all topics related to instructional services for LEP students. An estimated 50 inquiries per week were received and answered.
2. Staff in the Office of Language Acquisition worked cooperatively with Department employees in other units to develop district and school improvement planning models which addressed the instructional needs of LEP students.

5.3 Describe how the State ensured that subgrantees met parental notification and parental participation requirements under Section 3302. Describe how the State ensured that subgrantees:

- complied with parental notification provisions for identification and placement and for not meeting Title III AMAOs. [SEC. 3302(a)(8) p. 1732, SEC. 3302(b) p. 1732]
- provided parental notifications in an understandable and uniform format, and, to the extent practical, in a language that the parent can understand. [SEC. 3302(c) p. 1732-3]
- complied with parental participation and outreach provisions. [SEC. 3302(e) p. 1732-3]

State response 5.3: (Address each of the above bulleted items.)

- a. All three of the requirements listed above are included in the Department's Comprehensive Program Review, which takes place in every district every six years, followed by a mid-cycle review three years later. These requirements are part of the English Learner Education (ELE) monitoring instrument. Specifically, these requirements appear on pages 19 and 22 of this document. This instrument can be found on the MADOE website as noted below.
- b. In addition to the above, all superintendents are required to annually sign and submit an assurance that their district is in compliance with all three of the requirements listed above.

<http://www.doe.mass.edu/pqa/review/cpr/instrument/chapter71A.doc>

Responses for 5.4 and 5.5 are deferred until the second biennial report due 2006

5.4 Were any subgrantees required to develop an improvement plan under Title III, because they did not meet the Title III annual measurable achievement objectives for two consecutive years? [SEC. 3122(b)(2) p.1703] **(Insert an "x" on the appropriate line for response)**

_____ Yes

_____ No

State response 5.4: (If yes, explain the State plan to provide technical assistance towards changing this status. If no, proceed to the next item.)

5.5 Did the State conduct or sponsor any scientifically based research studies on teaching English to LEP children, or on improving the English language proficiency and academic achievement of LEP children? [SEC. 3123(b)(6) p. 1705] **(Insert an "x" on the appropriate line for response)**

_____ Yes

_____ No

State response 5.5: (If yes, provide a summary of the major findings of such studies. If no proceed to the next item.)

7.2 Demonstrate through data in Tables 7.2a - 7.2.b **monitored** LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students, and **who are no longer receiving services under Title III** met the State adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets in math and reading/language arts required under Title I.

		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
Grade	Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced		Students Proficient & Advanced		Students Proficient & Advanced		Students Proficient & Advanced	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
4		308*	20%*	672	27%				
6		490	23%	432	17%				
8		249	14%	454	21%				
10		251	29%	624	42%				

		2002-03		2003-04		2004-05		2005-06	
Grade	Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced		Students Proficient & Advanced		Students Proficient & Advanced		Students Proficient & Advanced	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
3		668*	39%*	953	41%				
4		405*	26%*	850	34%				
7		438*	30%*	819	38%				
10		199	24%	488	34%				

State response 7.2: **(Please provide any explanation necessary for these tables.)**

State response 7.2: Tables 7.2a and 7.2b track the progress of students in Title III schools who at the time of testing were no longer LEP, but who had been identified as LEP in either of the prior two school years.

*Note: Massachusetts began collecting LEP data at the student level in October of the 2001-02 school year. Prior to this, LEP data were collected only for students who participated in the spring 2001 MCAS (administered in grades 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 10). Therefore, data on students who transitioned out of LEP status between spring 2001 and October 2001 are available only for students who were enrolled in grades 6, 8, or 10 in 2002-03.

8. Description of the activities that provide enhanced instructional opportunities for immigrant children and youth.

8.1 Fill in figures for the information below. The number of immigrant children and youth reported is the same number reported to OELA in spring 2003 and spring 2004. The number of immigrant children and youth served is the actual number served by Title III during the two years addressed in this report.

- 21,395 Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2002-03
- 25,740 Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2003-04
- **19,743 Number of immigrant children and youth served by Title III in 2002-03
- **23,126 Number of immigrant children and youth served by Title III in 2003-04
- 11 Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2002-03
- 7 Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2003-04

** These numbers represent immigrant children served both in districts receiving entitlement funds and in districts receiving funds set aside for district experiencing a significant increase in immigrant children. The latter category is the subject of the information presented in 8.2 below.

8.2 Provide information on the activities conducted by subgrantees for programs for immigrant children and youth. [SEC. 3115 (e)]

(Insert an “x” on the appropriate line for all that apply.)

- x family literacy, parent outreach, and training support for personnel, including teacher aides, to provide services for immigrant children and youth
- x provision of tutorials, mentoring, and academic career counseling
- x identification and acquisition of curricular materials, software, and technologies
- x basic instructional services
- other instructional services, such as programs of introduction to the educational system and civics education
- activities coordinated with community based organizations, institutions of higher education, private sector entities, or other entities to assist parents by offering comprehensive community services

State response 8.2: (Summarize the most common activities conducted and the effectiveness of the activities in achieving the goals of the program.)

Districts experiencing a significant growth of immigrant students were awarded funds through the English Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement Program for Immigrant Students to develop, implement, and provide new English language instruction educational programs and academic content instruction for immigrant children and youth, provide professional development, and/or provide family literacy, parent outreach, and training activities designed to assist parents to become active participants in the education of their children.

Out of the 18 subgrants awarded 2002-2004, 13 were awarded to individual school districts and two were awarded to consortia serving 11 additional school districts. Districts used these funds to provide for increased in-school and extended day academic activities. Districts hired teachers and instructors for in-school, after-school tutoring and summer programs. Funds were also used to purchase of instructional materials. In addition, districts contracted for high quality professional development activities to assist teachers and administrators to appropriately develop curriculum and provide instruction for immigrant English language learners.

As noted above, two consortia of schools, Martha's Vineyard and Berkshire Collaborative were awarded funds to increase the capacities of these regions to serve immigrant and limited English proficient students. Districts in these consortia are located in areas isolated from other large numbers of LEP students but have emerging populations of immigrant students. These consortia provided for coordination of professional development activities and direct services for 11 districts for two years.

\$451,682 was awarded in FY2003 in eleven subgrants to nine school districts and two consortia serving 1,702 immigrant children and youth. \$142,615 was awarded in FY2004 in seven subgrantees serving 476 immigrant children and youth.

9. OPTIONAL: RESPONSES TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE NOT REQUIRED, BUT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO THE DEPARTMENT IN UNDERSTANDING SERVICES TO LEP STUDENTS IN YOUR STATE.

We appreciate your consideration of these questions.

9.1 Do LEAs provide information to the State on mobility rates? **(Insert an “x” on the appropriate line for response)**

Yes No

(If yes, please provide a range (high and low) that was reported in 2003-2004)

9.2 Does your State calculate a State LEP mobility rate?**(Insert an “x” on the appropriate line for response)**

Yes No

(If yes, please provide that rate for 2003/2004)

9.3 Does your State require a special certification/licensure/endorsement for teachers who teach in language instruction educational programs? **(Insert an “x” on the appropriate line for response)**

Yes No

Thank you for your efforts in completing this biennial report. The data will be aggregated, reported to the Secretary and to Congress, and will provide information to help us improve educational opportunities for LEP students.