



Report to the Legislature:
English Language Acquisition
Professional Development

Line-item 7027-1004
May 2009

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu



This document was prepared by the
Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Members

Ms. Maura Banta, Chair, Melrose
Ms. Harneen Chernow, Jamaica Plain
Mr. Gerald Chertavian, Cambridge
Mr. Andrew "AJ" Fajnzylber, Chair, Student Advisory Council, Brookline
Dr. Thomas E. Fortmann, Lexington
Ms. Beverly Holmes, Springfield
Dr. Jeff Howard, Reading
Ms. Ruth Kaplan, Brookline
Dr. Dana Mohler-Faria, Bridgewater
Mr. Paul Reville, Secretary of Education, Worcester
Dr. Sandra L. Stotsky, Brookline
Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D., Commissioner
and Secretary to the Board

The Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, an affirmative action employer, is committed to ensuring that all of its programs and facilities are accessible to all members of the public.

We do not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, national origin, race, religion, sex or sexual orientation.

Inquiries regarding the Department's compliance with Title IX and other civil rights laws may be directed to the Human Resources Director, 75 Pleasant St., Malden, MA 02148 781-338-6105.

© 2009 Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Permission is hereby granted to copy any or all parts of this document for non-commercial educational purposes. Please credit the "Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education."

This document printed on recycled paper.

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
75 Pleasant Street, Malden, MA 02148-4906
Phone 781-338-3000 TTY: N.E.T. Relay 800-439-2370
www.doe.mass.edu





Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

75 Pleasant Street, Malden, Massachusetts 02148-4906

Telephone: (781) 338-3000
TTY: N.E.T. Relay 1-800-439-2370

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner

May 2009

Dear Members of the General Court:

I am pleased to submit this *Report to the Legislature: English Language Acquisition Professional Development* pursuant to Chapter 182 of the Acts of 2008, line-item 7027-1004 that reads in part:

“For English language acquisition, professional development to improve the academic performance of English language learners and effectively implement sheltered English immersion as outlined in chapter 386 of the acts of 2002; provided, that the department shall only approve professional development courses and offerings with proven, replicable results in improving teacher performance, and which shall have demonstrated the use of best practices, as determined by the department, including data comparing pre-training and post-training knowledge...”

and M.G.L. Chapter 69 sec. 1I

“The commissioner annually shall analyze and publish data reported by school districts under this section regarding English language learners programs and limited English proficient student....”

The Legislature appropriated \$470,987 in FY09 to support professional development for educators of English language learners implementing sheltered English immersion and teaching English language acquisition, which was reduced to \$468,161 by 9C cuts. Sheltered English immersion is the program model required for most English language learners in Massachusetts public schools since the change in the law in 2002 and has two components, English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction and sheltered content instruction taught in English, with all printed classroom materials in English.

The majority of classroom teachers in Massachusetts did not acquire the skills and knowledge required to effectively teach English language learners and shelter content instruction during their teacher preparation programs. The change in our state law mandating that schools adopt a sheltered English immersion (SEI) instructional model, and the legal requirement that English language learners be taught by teachers with appropriate qualifications, created an urgent need for teachers of English language learners to acquire new skills and knowledge.

Over the five-year period FY05-09, the Department received a total of \$3.3 million dollars in the state budget to offer professional development to teachers of English language learners. Those funds have been used to design professional development curricula and train teams of teachers to deliver these curricula in their home districts. All of the professional development designed and delivered with these funds has been aligned with the four categories of teacher knowledge/skills which are detailed in the report.

Teachers from 60 school districts, in association with 15 educational collaboratives, have received services supported by these funds. Three of these collaboratives participated for the first time in FY09. The Department estimates that 6,500-7,500 teachers need training. To date we have trained the equivalent of 4,350, leaving roughly 2,150-3,150 additional elementary and secondary content teachers still to be trained. We note that due to retirements and the high rates of turn-over in many high need schools/districts, this is likely a conservative estimate of our state's unmet need for additional ELL teacher training.

During the 2008-2009 school year, the Department has used a combination of state and federal funds to support the third year of the Massachusetts English Language Teacher Initiative (MELT), designed to provide instruction, support and mentoring to 40 licensed teachers currently employed in Boston Public Schools and Worcester Public Schools, who wish to become licensed ESL teachers. The curriculum of this initiative is based on the competencies as contained in the Massachusetts teacher licensure regulations. Participants spend a total of 13 days in face-to-face classes, do weekly assigned readings, and submit weekly online summaries of reading and responses to reflective prompts. There are also formal written assignments. At the conclusion of the training programs, each participating teacher engages in a mentored practicum followed by a clinical classroom evaluation.

In its FY10 budget recommendations, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education requested \$470,987 which would enable the Department to continue training elementary and secondary content teachers of English language learners to shelter content instruction as required by state law. We estimate that we could provide training to 2,000 teachers with this level of funding. It would also permit us to continue and expand the MELT initiative and prepare 40-60 additional licensed teachers to become qualified ESL teachers, and would enable us to develop and implement a much-needed professional development initiative on content-based ESL curriculum development and content-based ESL instruction, to enhance the capacities of ESL teachers throughout the state. With these funds, we could develop a professional development curriculum on content-based ESL and provide high-quality professional development to approximately 100 ESL teachers during 2009-2010. At the FY10 House and Senate proposed budget appropriations at \$397,937 some of this work will be curtailed.

If you have additional questions please feel free to contact me or Julia Phelps, Acting Associate Commissioner.

Sincerely,

Mitchell D. Chester, Ed.D.
Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
	Background	
	Research on Professional Development for Educators of English Language Learners	
II.	Educators Implementing English Immersion: Elementary and Secondary Content Teachers of English Language Learners.....	3
	Gaps in Knowledge	
	Use of Funds	
	Future Need	
III.	Educators Implementing English Immersion: English as a Second Language (ESL) Teachers.....	6
	Need for ESL Instruction	
	Use of Funds: Massachusetts English Language Teacher Initiative (MELT)	
	Future Need	
IV.	Budgetary Requests.....	9
V.	English Language Learners in Massachusetts: October 2007.....	10
VI.	Appendix A	
	Attachment 1 Selected Bibliography of Research on Professional Development ofEnglish Language Learners.....	12
	Attachment 2 Commissioner’s Memorandum of June 2004.....	13
	Attachment 3 SEI Professional Development 2004-2008.....	16
	Attachment 4 Districts Receiving SEI Professional Development: 2004-2009.....	18
	Attachment 5 Collaboratives Receiving SEI Professional Development.....	20
	Attachment 6 Guidelines for Using MEPA Results to Plan Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) Instructional Programming.....	21
	Attachment 7 English Language Learners in Massachusetts: District and Program Type: October 2008.....	28
	Attachment 8 English Language Learners in Massachusetts: First Language: October 2008.....	37
VII.	Appendix B	
	Chapter 182 of the Acts of 2008.....	47
	M.G.L. Chapter 69 section 1I.....	48

I. Introduction

Pursuant to Chapter 182 of the Acts of 2008, Section 2, line-item 7027-1004, and pursuant to M.G.L C. 69 s.9I, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education respectfully submits the following report addressing the following provisions:

“For English language acquisition, professional development to improve the academic performance of English language learners and effectively implement sheltered English immersion as outlined in chapter 386 of the acts of 2002; provided, that the department shall only approve professional development courses and offerings with proven, replicable results in improving teacher performance, and which shall have demonstrated the use of best practices, as determined by the department, including data comparing pre-training and post-training knowledge...” (line-item 7027-1004)

and,

“The commissioner annually shall analyze and publish data reported by school districts under this section regarding English language learners programs and limited English proficient students. Publication shall include, but need not be limited to, availability on the department’s worldwide web site. The commissioner shall submit annually a report to the joint committee on education, arts and humanities on such data on a statewide and school district basis, including, but not limited to, by language group and type of English language learners program. (M.G.L. C.69 s.11)

The Legislature appropriated \$470,987 in FY09 through line-item 7027-1004 to support professional development for educators of English language learners implementing sheltered English immersion and teaching English language acquisition. In FY08 the Legislature appropriated the same amount, and in FY07 appropriated \$500,000 through the same line-item. In FY05 and FY06 \$1,000,000 was appropriated each year through line-item 7061-9404 for a similar purpose.

Background

Sheltered English immersion is the program model required for most English language learners in Massachusetts public schools since the change in the law in 2002. This new law was implemented in school districts beginning in September 2003. Sheltered English immersion (SEI) has two components, English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction and sheltered content instruction taught in English, with all printed classroom materials in English.

The change from Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) to sheltered English immersion has had a substantial impact on the skills and knowledge needed by elementary and secondary content teachers of English language learners. Under TBE, most English language learners had the opportunity to learn content, (e.g., mathematics and science) through instruction in their first language while they were taking classes to develop proficiency in English. With the Commonwealth’s SEI mandate, English language learners must now learn content through instruction delivered in English, with all printed materials in English. Content teachers must

adjust, or “shelter”, their instruction to make it comprehensible to students not yet proficient in English. Few teachers in Massachusetts knew how to do this when the new law took effect.

Another consequence of the new law has been that English language learners must acquire academic levels of English proficiency more quickly than before. If they don't, their ability to successfully comprehend content instruction delivered in English will be compromised. This calls for an emphasis on improving the quality and quantity of ESL instruction, and has led to the recognition that we have a critical shortage of licensed ESL teachers in the state.

Research on Professional Development for Educators of English Language Learners

There is growing consensus in the literature regarding both the elements of effective professional development for all teachers, and the additional elements necessary for teachers of English language learners. To be effective, professional development must provide an opportunity for timely application of new skills and knowledge, and be integrated into the context of the daily experience of a teachers' work. Also, high quality professional development must be internally coherent, rigorous, and aligned with the principles of effective teaching and learning.

In addition to embodying these more universal characteristics of high quality professional development, professional development for teachers of English language learners must include specific knowledge relevant to teaching English language learners, including the basic tenets of bilingualism and second language acquisition, definitions of language proficiency, the role of first language and culture in learning and teaching, and the demands of academic language, spoken and written, in content classrooms (Clair, 1993). A short bibliography of this research is included as Attachment 1.

II. Educators Implementing English Immersion: Elementary and Secondary Content Teachers of English Language Learners

The majority of classroom teachers in Massachusetts did not acquire the skills and knowledge required to effectively teach English language learners and shelter content instruction during their teacher preparation programs. The change in our state law mandating that schools adopt a sheltered English immersion (SEI) instructional model, and the legal requirement that English language learners be taught by teachers with appropriate qualifications, created an urgent need for teachers of English language learners to acquire new skills and knowledge.

Gaps in Knowledge

After reviewing relevant research and consulting with leaders in the field of English language learners, educators in Massachusetts and nationally, and Department staff identified the most common gaps in the knowledge and skills of educators implementing English immersion. In a Memorandum in June 2004, *Qualifications of Teachers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students in Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) Classrooms*, the commissioner of education described the skills and knowledge required to effectively shelter content instruction (see Attachment 2). They were organized into four categories, and the appropriate number of hours of professional development needed to cover each topic in sufficient depth was identified:

- Category 1** Second Language Learning and Teaching
10-15 hours of professional development
- Category 2** Sheltering Content Instruction
30-40 hours of professional development
- Category 3** Assessing Speaking and Listening
10 hours of professional development
- Category 4** Reading and Writing in the Sheltered Content Classroom
15-20 hours of professional development

Use of Funds

Over the five-year period FY05, FY06, FY07, FY08 and FY09, the Department received a total of \$3.3million dollars in the state budget to offer professional development to teachers of English language learners. Those funds have been used to design professional development curricula and train teams of teachers to deliver these curricula in their home districts. All of the professional development designed and delivered with these funds has been aligned with the four categories of teacher knowledge/skills described above. A chart detailing the professional development delivered to date is presented below. A more extensive accounting is provided in Attachment 3.

SEI Professional Development Category	Trained 2004-2009		Number of hours of training provided	
Category 1 for Teachers		9,292	Teachers	111,504
Category 1 for Trainers		160	Trainers	6,400
Category 2 for Teachers		5,662	Teachers	198,170
Category 2 for Trainers		176	Trainers	10,560
Category 4 for Teachers		1,559	Teachers	23,385
Category 4 for Trainers		129	Trainers	5,160
Totals	Teachers	16,513	Teachers	333,059
	Trainers	465	Trainers	22,120
	Total	16,978	Total	355,179

Teachers from 60 school districts, in association with 15 educational collaboratives, have received services supported by these funds. Three of these collaboratives participated for the first time in FY09. Attachments 4 and 5 list the districts and collaboratives that have participated in at least one of these professional development opportunities.

Future Need

English language learners are widely distributed in schools and districts throughout Massachusetts. At present, there are 57 districts that have reported an enrollment of 100 or more English language learners, while 301 districts report at least one English language learner (ELL). Districts that enroll fewer than 100 English language learners are often referred to as “low incidence” districts, and within these low-incidence districts there may be 10 or 20 English language learners distributed across all grades and all schools within the district. It is within this complex context that we must attempt to estimate future need for SEI teacher training.

We base our estimate on the following assumptions:

- 1) Each elementary and secondary educator who teaches English language learners needs to complete all four categories of professional development to develop the knowledge and skills required to effectively support English language development and deliver sheltered content instruction;
- 2) The acquisition of this knowledge and skill on average requires 70 hours of training;
- 3) Using the data provided above, if we divide the total number of hours of teacher training provided to date by 70, it can be said that the equivalent of 4,350 educators have been fully trained to date;

- 4) There are approximately 57,000 English language learners currently enrolled in MA public schools as reported by Massachusetts school districts in the October 2008 SIMS data collection;
- 5) Given the current wide distribution of English language learner students across Massachusetts districts and schools, we estimate that a fully trained teacher is needed for every 7 English language learners;
- 6) Dividing total ELL enrollment by 7 (7 to 1 average student to teacher ratio) we estimate that 6,500-7,500 teachers need training.

To date we have trained the equivalent of 4,350, leaving roughly 2,150-3,150 additional elementary and secondary content teachers still requiring training. We note that due to retirements and the high rates of turn-over in many high need schools and districts, this is likely a conservative estimate of our states' unmet need for additional ELL teacher training.

III. Educators Implementing English Immersion: English as a Second Language (ESL) Teachers

ESL Teacher Shortage

The majority of English language learners in Massachusetts must now learn all subject matter content in English. There is a resulting statewide need to provide more hours of daily ESL instruction for English language learners, and consequently a need for more licensed ESL teachers in most districts that serve English language learners.¹ The Department emphasized the need for more ESL instruction in a Memorandum of Guidance in June 2005 that made recommendations as to the number of hours of ESL instruction for English language learners at the four levels of English proficiency used in Massachusetts (see Attachment 5). An excerpt from this memorandum appears below.

English Proficiency Level: Beginning and Early Intermediate

Students at the *Beginning and Early Intermediate* performance levels include those who cannot produce or understand any English, spoken or written, as well as those students with very basic skills in English. It is important that these students be involved in English language development instruction for a substantial component of their school day.

- English language development (ELD) instruction: 2.5 hours/day–full day, delivered by a teacher with an ESL/English language learner license

English Proficiency Level: Intermediate

LEP students at the intermediate level have not yet developed academic proficiency in English, and often have different levels of proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing. Sheltered content instruction delivered by a qualified teacher can be tailored to make content instruction comprehensible and learning tasks engaging. Intermediate level students also require ELD instruction as outlined below.

- English language development (ELD) instruction: 1-2 hours/day, delivered by teacher with ESL/English language learner license
- ELA or reading instruction: 1-2 hours/day, delivered by a teacher qualified to teach LEP students

Improvement of ESL Instruction: Content-based ESL Instruction

As stated above, most of the approximately 57,000 English language learners in Massachusetts must now learn all subject matter content in English, and this has resulted in a statewide need to provide more hours of daily ESL instruction to English language learners, and consequently a need for more licensed ESL teachers throughout the state. Sheltered English immersion has also made it urgent that we reexamine and modify the role of the ESL teacher and the purpose and content of ESL instruction. Learning academic English is increasingly urgent, because subject matter content learning depends on students having relatively high levels of English language proficiency. Therefore English language teaching, i.e., ESL instruction, needs to become more

¹ Additionally, M.G.L. 71a, Section 24, mandates that by July 2008, each school district will have at least one teacher who is certified in English as a second language, bilingual education.

curriculum-based and more intentional in developing the specific academic language that students will be required to understand and use in their subject matter content classes. Content-based ESL instruction, a well-established approach to teaching English, needs to become the orientation to ESL instruction that is used in ESL classrooms in Massachusetts.

During FY09 the Department completed a web-based tool that supports districts as they develop their district ESL Curriculum. This tool, *Guidelines for Developing a Content-based ESL Curriculum* can be found at the following link: <http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/cdguide/>.

In the budgetary request included in this report we propose to support dissemination and implementation of this tool by providing financial assistance to 20 districts committed to developing a content-based ESL curriculum grounded in the Department's *Guidelines for Developing a Content-based ESL Curriculum*. We also propose to develop and implement a professional development curriculum for licensed ESL teachers that prepares them to plan and deliver content-based ESL instruction that is more efficient and effective in preparing their students to understand and use academic English.

Use of Funds: Massachusetts English Language Teacher Initiative (MELT)

During the 2008-2009 school year, the Department has used a combination of state and federal funds to support the third year of the Massachusetts English Language Teacher Initiative (MELT), designed to provide instruction, support and mentoring to 40 licensed teachers, currently employed in Boston Public Schools and Worcester Public Schools, who wish to become licensed ESL teachers.

The curriculum of this initiative is based on the competencies as contained in the Massachusetts teacher licensure regulations: linguistics, second language acquisition, sociolinguistics, second language pedagogy, literacy instruction and assessment of English language learners over a period of 10 months. Participants spend a total of 13 days in face-to-face classes, do weekly assigned readings, and submit weekly online summaries of reading and responses to reflective prompts. There are also formal written assignments. At the conclusion of the training programs each participating teacher engages in a mentored practicum, followed by a clinical classroom evaluation.

The first cohort of MELT participants took the MTEL licensure test in spring 2007. Seventy-three percent of those who participated obtained a passing rate and became licensed ESL teachers. The second cohort took the MTEL test in March 2008, and 75% obtained a passing rate.

There has been a very positive response to this initiative at both the district and teacher levels in both Boston and Worcester. Both of these districts have requested continuation of the program in FY10. In addition, Springfield Public Schools has requested our assistance in developing more ESL teachers for that district.

There is also a critical shortage of ESL teachers in non-urban districts and regions in the state, as more and more immigrant families settle in cities and towns with more affordable housing than the state's large cities.

Future Need

To estimate future need, the Department examined two datasets that look at this issue from two different perspectives. The first data set comes from the Educator Personnel Information Management System (EPIMS). According to October 2006 data, there are currently 860 licensed ESL teachers employed in 129 districts. Assuming that one licensed ESL teacher is needed for every 40 English language learners, and given that there are approximately 57,000 (Oct. 2008) English language learners in Massachusetts public schools, we estimate that the current need is 1,400 licensed ESL teachers to serve students enrolled in Massachusetts public schools. There are currently approximately 860 licensed ESL teachers working in our schools. Therefore the estimated need is 500 additional licensed ESL teachers in the state.

As reported earlier in this document, there are 303 school districts that report at least one English language learner, but as noted above, ESL teachers are employed in only 129 districts. More districts currently need ESL teachers due to changing demographics, but face a shortage of available teachers. It is noteworthy that the provisions of Section 24 of Chapter 218 of the Acts of 2002 which took effect in July of 2008, mandate that districts "shall have at least one teacher who is certified in English as a second language, bilingual education or other English language learners program(s) under Section 38G of Chapter 71 or regulations promulgated thereto."

The second dataset examined comes from districts reporting 100 or more English language learners and that receive Title III/NCLB funds. In 2008, the Department asked districts to report the number of hours of ESL instruction received by ELL students at different levels of English language proficiency at different grades. Districts reported that:

- Approximately 8,200 English language learners receive no ESL instruction;
- Approximately 2,800 English language learners at the lowest levels of English proficiency (beginning and early intermediate) receive no ESL instruction;
- Approximately 5,160 English language learners receive 1-5 hours per week of ESL instruction.

If the expectation is that English language learners will achieve academic levels of English proficiency that enable them to reach high academic performance, there is a critical need to provide robust programs of ESL instruction. At present, this is not happening in many districts and for many students.

To address the shortage of licensed ESL teachers, and by extension the lack of adequate ESL instruction in our state, the budget requested below seeks state funds to continue the MELT initiative in Boston and expand the initiative to Springfield.

IV. Budgetary Requests

The Board of Elementary and Secondary Education in its FY10 budget proposal recommended funding this line-item at \$470,987. This would enable the Department to continue training elementary and secondary content teachers of English language learners to shelter content instruction as required by state law. An estimate is that training could be provided to 2,000 teachers with this level of funding. This level of funding would also permit us to continue and expand the MELT initiative and prepare 40-60 additional licensed teachers to become qualified ESL teachers.

Finally, this level of funding would enable the Department to develop and implement a much-needed professional development initiative on content-based ESL curriculum development and content-based ESL instruction, and to enhance the capacities of ESL teachers throughout the state. With these funds, the Department could develop a professional development curriculum on content-based ESL and provide high-quality professional development to approximately 100 ESL teachers during 2009-2010. The initiative could be expanded to reach an additional licensed 100 ESL teachers in both 2010-2011.

SEI Professional Development		\$200,000
	<u>Estimated #</u>	
Category 1 Training of Trainers	0	
Category 1 Training of Teachers	1,000	
Category 2 Training of Trainers	0	
Category 2 Training of Teachers	1,000	
Category 4 Training of Trainers	80	
Category 4 Training of Teachers	1,500	

	3,500 teachers	
	80 trainers	
MELT Initiative		\$250,000
Development of 40-60 licensed ESL Teachers		
Content-based ESL Professional Development Initiative		\$20,987
Total		\$470,987

V. English Language Learners in Massachusetts

Attachment 7 displays English language learners by number, district and by program type using October 2008 data. A brief summary appears below.

No ELL Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-way Bilingual Education	Other bilingual education	Parental opt-out (No ELL Program)	LEP Students
1,702	46,244	1,193	1,636	6,227	57,002

Attachment 8 displays data on English language learners by district, number, and first language. Discrete numbers are provided for the five most common first languages of English language learners in Massachusetts. All other languages are aggregated in the “Other” column. A complete file with all languages, disaggregated by district, is available from the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. A brief summary appears below.

Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Haitian Creole	Vietnamese	Other
30,885	4,323	2,417	2,317	2,218	14,842

VI. Appendix A

Attachment 1: Bibliography: Professional Development for Teachers of English Language Learners

Brown, H. Douglas. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, 4th Edition. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. 2000.

August, D., and Hakuta, K. 1997. Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Children: A Research Agenda. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Freeman, D. (Ed.). (1993). New ways in teacher education. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Garcia, G. Lessons from Research: What is the length of time it takes limited English proficient students to acquire English and succeed in an all-English classroom? (Issue Brief No. 5), Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 2000.

Effective reading programs for English language learners: A best-evidence synthesis by Robert E. Slavin, Johns Hopkins University Center for Research. Review of Educational Research (2003), at: <http://www.ucfed.ucf.edu>

Walqui, A. (1999, July) "Professional development for teachers of English language learners." Paper presented at an invitational conference. www.ericdigests.org/2004-1/english.htm

Clair, Nancy and Adger, Carolyn Temple Adger. "Professional Development for Teachers in Culturally Diverse Schools." CAL: Digests, October 1999. <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/profdvpt.html>

Knight, Stephanie L. "Investigating the Impact of Professional Development for Teachers of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students." Texas A&M University. Synthesis Team Executive Summary available through the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) at http://crede.berkeley.edu/research/crede/synthesis/pd/pd_exsum.html

Professional Development Guidelines. Handbook on Planning for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Student Success. Colorado State DOE, March 1997.

Frutiger, Eliso. "Selected Strategies and Activities to Provide Challenging Instruction to ESOL Students in Content Area Courses." KeKalb County School System, Decatur, GA: 1999.

Baker, Colin and Hornberger, Nancy. An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins. Multilingual Matters, Ltd., 2001.

Approaches to Writing Instruction for Adolescent English Language Learners: A discussion of recent research and practice literature in relation to nationwide standards on writing. The Education Alliance at Brown University, 2005.

Attachment 2: Commissioner's Memorandum of June 2004
<http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/sei/qualifications.pdf>

English Language Learners (excerpts from the memorandum Section 2, Attachment 1)

Guidance on Qualifications for Teachers of Limited English Proficient Students in Sheltered English Immersion Classrooms

June 15, 2004

Attachment 1: Skills and Knowledge for Teachers of Limited English Proficient Students in sheltered English immersion Classrooms

Part A: For all teachers of limited English proficient students in Sheltered English immersion classrooms.

Category 1: Second Language Learning and Teaching

Knowledge

- a) Key factors affecting second language acquisition.
- b) Implications of these factors on classroom organization and instruction.
- c) The implications of cultural difference for classroom organization and instruction.
- d) Organization, content, and performance levels in the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*.*

Skills/Observable Outcomes

- Teacher can analyze his/her own classroom as a site for second language acquisition and make appropriate adjustments.
- Teacher can use knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to modify instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning English and/or subject matter content.

Note: Suggested number of professional development hours for Category 1 is 10-15.

Category 2: Sheltering Content Instruction

Knowledge

- a. **Curriculum and Lesson Planning.** Teachers will be able to:
 1. Plan lessons appropriate for LEP students at the four levels of proficiency described in the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.
 2. Plan lessons that are guided by both language and content objectives appropriate for LEP students who are at different grade levels and different English proficiency levels, and that are aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.
 3. Plan lessons that are characterized by student interaction, students' questions, and appropriate group work.
- b. **Instructional Strategies.** While teaching, teachers will be able to:
 1. make language objectives, content objectives, and academic tasks explicit.

2. use supplementary materials, including graphic organizers, visuals, and manipulatives to make content more comprehensible.
 3. group students so that all LEP students can participate.
 4. integrate language instruction and content instruction.
- c. **Student Tasks.** Teachers will be able to:
1. plan learning tasks that have a product and that enable all students, including LEP students, to work and ask questions in small groups.
 2. provide opportunities for students to display their knowledge in various ways.
- d. **Lesson Delivery.** While teaching, teachers will be able to:
1. assess student comprehension and learning throughout the lesson.
 2. pace and organize learning activities so that students are engaged 90-100% of the time.

Skills/Observable Outcomes

- Teacher can plan and conduct content classes that are based on standards contained in the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and that engage LEP students who are at different levels of English proficiency in learning throughout the duration of the class.
- Teacher can assess content learning of students who are at different levels of English proficiency.

Note: Suggested number of professional development hours for Category 2 is 30-40. Teachers with ESL and TBE licenses may possess these skills, but this cannot be assumed solely from the possession of either license.

Category 3: Assessment of Speaking and Listening

Knowledge

- a) Multiple dimensions of oral proficiency: comprehension, production, fluency, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.
- b) Concept of communicative competence and its role in assessment.
- c) The six levels of oral proficiency assessed by the MELA-O and their relation to the four levels of English language proficiency as described in the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*.

Skills/Observable Outcomes

- Teacher can place students in the six-level continuum of oral proficiency as assessed by the MELA-O.
- Teacher is a Qualified MELA-O Administrator (QMA).

Note: Teachers who have participated in 8-10 hours of MELA-O training and passed the calibration test have met all Category 3 components.

Part B: For teachers who teach English language arts to LEP students at any grade level in Sheltered English Instruction classrooms.

Category 4: Reading and Writing in the Sheltered Content Classroom

Knowledge

- d) Basic concepts of linguistics, including phonology and syntax of English.
- e) Significant theories and practices for developing reading skills and reading comprehension in English for limited English proficient students who are at different English proficiency levels.

- f) A variety of strategies for teaching vocabulary.
- g) Approaches and practices for developing writing skills in limited English proficient students.
- h) Initial reading instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension. The differences in initial reading instruction in English designed for those students who have no or limited oral proficiency in English compared to those who do have oral proficiency in English.
- i) The performance criteria and scoring system used in the MEPA (Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment) and based on the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*.*

Skills/Observable Outcomes

- Teacher can plan and deliver reading instruction appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency.
- Teacher can plan and deliver writing instruction and activities appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency.
- Teacher can use the scoring rubric and test results of the MEPA to plan reading and writing instruction for limited English proficient students who are at different proficiency levels.
- Teacher can plan and deliver early literacy instruction for students who have no or limited oral proficiency or literacy in English.

Note: Suggested number of professional development hours for Category 4 is 30-40.

Attachment 3

SEI Professional Development 2004-2009

SEI Professional Development Categories*	2004- 2009					Total Participants (by Category)
	2004-2005	2005-2006**	2006-2007**	2007-2008***	2008-2009***	
Category I Teachers	516	1,338	2,567	2,998	1,873	9,292
Category I Trainers	35	43	43	39	0	160
Total	551	1,381	2,610	3,037	1,873	9,452
Category II Teachers	712	1,199	1,378	1,373	1,000	5,662
Category II Trainers	0	36	92	48	0	176
Total	712	1,235	1,470	1,421	1,000	5,838
Category IV Teachers	36	202	276	447	598	1,559
Category IV Trainers	0	0	41	46	42	129
Total	36	202	317	493	640	1,688
Total (by Year)	1,299	2,818	4,397	4,951	3,513	
Total Teachers Trained (2004-2009)			16,513			
Total Trainers Trained (2004-2009)			465			
****Total Participants Trained (2004-2009)			16,978			

English as a Second Language (ESL) Teacher Development
Massachusetts English Language Teachers Initiative (MELT) 2006-2009

Districts	Participants
Boston	69
Worcester	67

English as a Second Language (ESL) Professional Development

Summer 2008 Curriculum Development Grant

Teachers	Districts		
65	Framingham	Holyoke	Medford
	New Bedford	Norwood	Revere
	W. Springfield	Westboro	Worcester

Summer 2008 Workshops

Participants	Completed requirements
67	46

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING:

* Category I - Second Language Learning and Teaching

Category II - Sheltering Content Instruction

Category IV - Reading and Writing in Sheltered Content Classrooms

** The 2009 Report shows an increase over the 2008 Report in numbers of teachers trained in Category 1 for 2005-2006 and 2006-2007. This is because trainers submitted their Data Entry Forms to us for these trainings over the course of this past year.

*** There is an adjustment to the data submitted in the 2008 Legislative report for the year 2007-2008. Last year's report contained projected figures, hence the difference in numbers this year. In addition, there are still some outstanding trainings and data that may eventually fall into our 2008-2009 data. As such, the data for 2008-2009 are also projected figures, as not all trainings have taken place.

**** "Total Participants Trained (2004-2009)" does not represent 16,978 different teachers. In many instances, the same teacher participated in more than one training.

Attachment 4

Districts Receiving Sheltered English Immersion Professional Development

2004-2009

Abby Kelley Foster Charter	Abington	Academy Of the Pacific Rim Charter
Acton	Acton-Boxborough	Acushnet
Adams-Cheshire	Agawam	Amesbury
Amherst Pelham	Amherst Pelham RVT	Ashburnham-Westminster
Andover	Arlington	Athol/Royalston
Ashland	Assabet Valley	Atlantis Charter
Belmont	Benjamin Banneker Charter	Berlin
Berlin-Boylston	Berkshire Hills	Beverly
Billerica	Blackstone Valley Reg	Blackstone-Millville
Blue Hills Voc	Boston	Boston Renaissance Charter
Bourne	Boylston	Boxborough
Braintree	Bridgewater	Bridgewater-Raynham
Bristol-Plymouth Voc Tech	Brockton	Brookline
Burlington	Cambridge	Canton
Cape Cod Region Voc Tech	Carlisle	Carver
Central Berkshire	Charlton	Chatham
Chelmsford	Chelsea	Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter
Chicopee	Clarksburg	Clinton
Cohasset	Concord	Concord-Carlisle
Danvers	Dartmouth	Dedham
Dennis-Yarmouth	Dighton	Dighton-Rehoboth
Douglas	Dover	Dover-Sherborn
Dudley	Dudley Charlton	Duxbury
East Bridgewater	East Longmeadow	Easthampton
Edgartown	Essex	Everett
Fall River	Fitchburg	Foxboro Regional Charter
Foxborough	Framingham	Franklin
Gardner	Georgetown	Gloucester
Grafton	Granby	Greater Fall River
Greater Lawrence RVT	Greater Lowell Technical	Greater New Bedford
Greenfield	Groton-Dunstable	Hamilton-Wenham
Hanover	Harvard	Hampden-Wilbraham
Haverhill	Hill View Montessori Charter	Harwich
Holbrook	Hopkinton	Hingham
Hyde Park	Ipswich	Hudson
Kingston	Lawrence	King Philip
Lee	Leicester	Lawrence Family Development Charter
Leominster	Lexington	Lenox
Lincoln-Sudbury	Littleton	Lincoln
Lowell	Lowell Community Charter	Longmeadow
Lunenburg	Lynn	Ludlow
Malden	Manchester Essex Regional	Malborough
Marblehead	Marion	Mansfield
Marshfield	Martha's Vineyard	Marlboro
Masconomet	Mashpee	Martha's Vineyard Charter
Maynard	Medfield	Mattapoisett
Medway	Melrose	Medford
Methuen	Middleboro	Mendon-Upton
Milford	Millbury	Middleton
Milton	Monson	Millis
Nantucket	Narragansett	Montachusett Voc Tech Reg
Natick	Nauset	Nashoba

New Bedford	New Bedford Global Learning Charter	Needham
Newburyport	Newton	New Leadership Charter
Norfolk	North Adams	North Andover
North Attleborough	North Central Charter Essential School	North Middlesex
North Quincy	Northampton	Northbridge
Northern Berkshire Voc	Northeast Metro Voc	North Shore Reg Voc
Northboro-Southboro	Northborough	Norton
Norwell	Norwood	Oak Bluffs
Orange	Oxford	Peabody
Pembroke	Pentucket	Petersham
Pittsfield	Plainville	Plymouth
Prospect Hill Academy Charter	Provincetown	Quabbin
Quincy	Randolph	Raynham
Reading	Rehoboth	Revere
Rochester	Rockland	Rockport
Richmond	Saugus	Salem
Scituate	Seven Hills Charter	Sherborn
Shirley	Shrewsbury	Silver Lake
Smith Leadership Academy Charter	So Middlesex Voc Tech Reg	Somerset
Somerville	South Shore Charter	Southborough
Southbridge	Southeastern Reg Voc Tech	Southern Berkshire
Southwick	Southwick-Tolland	Spencer-E. Brookfield
Springfield	Stoneham	Sturgis Charter
Sudbury	Sutton	Swampscott
Swansea	Tantasqua	Taunton
Tisbury	Townsend	Tri County
Triton	Tyngsborough	Up-Island Regional
Upper Cape Cod Voc Tech	Uxbridge	Wachusett
Walpole	Waltham	Ware
Wareham	Wayland	Watertown
Webster	Wellesley	West Boylston
West Bridgewater	West Springfield	Westborough
Westfield	Westminster	Weston
Westport	Westwood	Weymouth
Whitman-Hanson	Wilbraham	Williamstown
Wilmington	Winchendon	Winchester
Winthrop	Woburn	Worcester
Wrentham		

Attachment 5: Collaboratives Receiving Sheltered English Immersion Professional Development

Assabet Valley Collaborative

Bi-County Collaborative

Charms Collaborative

Greater Lawrence Educational Collaborative

EDCO Collaborative

FLLAC Collaborative

Lower Pioneer Valley Educational Collaborative

Merrimack Education Collaborative

North River Collaborative

Pilgrim Area Collaborative

South Shore Collaborative

Southern Berkshire Educational Collaborative

Southeastern MA Educational Collaborative

Shore Educational Collaborative

READS Collaborative

Attachment 6

Massachusetts Department of Education

**Guidelines for Using MEPA Results to Plan
Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) Instructional Programming and
Make Classification Decisions
for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students**

June 2005

Guidelines for Using MEPA Results for LEP Students

Introduction

The Massachusetts Department of Education (Department) has released results of the first administrations of our newly developed Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) program. Annual assessment of limited English proficient (LEP) students' reading, writing, speaking and listening skills is mandated by state and federal law.

The guidance provided in this document is intended to assist districts in using the 2004-2005 MEPA results to plan sheltered English immersion (SEI) instructional programming and other programming, as permitted by law, for students at different English language proficiency performance levels. It will also assist districts in making decisions regarding the classification of LEP students. This guidance allows for professional judgment by teachers and others familiar with the student's academic performance.

This guidance is organized as follows:

- Overview

- Definitions and Requirements

- Guidelines for Instructional Programming and Classification

 - Step 1 – Review MEPA results

 - Step 2 – Review other district data

 - Step 3 – Plan an instructional program for the student for the next school year

 - Step 4 – Review student results on the MCAS ELA test

 - Step 5 – Classify the student as LEP or not LEP on the October SIMS report

Additional information and resources concerning limited English proficient students in Massachusetts can be found at [www.doe.mass.edu/English language learner](http://www.doe.mass.edu/English_language_learner). Comments or questions about this document should be forwarded to the Office of Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement, Massachusetts Department of Education, 781-338-3518.

Overview

The past two years have brought significant changes for limited English proficient (LEP) students and the districts that serve them. Commencing with the 2003-2004 school year, districts were required to implement the amended G.L. c. 71A, the state law governing the education of LEP students. The provisions of *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) further require that MCAS data be disaggregated for LEP students for purposes of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations, and that districts assess annually all LEP students for English language proficiency.

Definitions and Requirements

1. General Laws G.L. c.71A defines “English learner” as “a child who does not speak English or whose native language is not English and who is not currently able to perform ordinary class work in English.” For purposes of this memorandum, we use the term “LEP student” to mean “English learner.”
2. The amended law requires LEP students, with certain limited exceptions, to receive sheltered English immersion (SEI) instruction until they are proficient in English.
3. Districts must establish a process and a set of criteria to determine whether a LEP student who has been enrolled in the district during the school year is still limited English proficient at the end of the school year. Department regulations promulgated under G.L. c.71A state that the school district shall “establish criteria, in accordance with Department of Education guidelines, to identify students who may no longer be English learners.” 603 CMR 14.02(4). In determining LEP status, the most important variable is **English language proficiency**, including speaking, listening, reading and writing in both social and academic settings.
4. If a student is determined to be LEP after applying these criteria, an instructional program should be designed for the student that meets the requirements of G.L c. 71A, and the student should continue to be designated as LEP on the October SIMS data collection. For most students, with some exceptions, this instructional program will be sheltered English immersion (SEI). Guidelines for SEI instructional programming for LEP students at different English language proficiency levels are outlined in this guidance document.
5. If a student is determined NOT to be LEP after applying these criteria, the district should no longer classify the student as LEP on the October SIMS data collection.

Guidelines for Instructional Programming and Classification

A school-based team, including members familiar with the student’s English language proficiency in a classroom setting, should make the final decision about instructional programming for the student and about his/her classification as LEP. This team should use written district criteria based on the guidelines that follow in making these decisions.

Step 1: Review MEPA results

The MEPA *Parent/Guardian Report, School Roster,* and the MEPA data files (which can be uploaded into TestWiz) sent to your district provide:

- Student’s overall performance level (*Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate* and *Transitioning*);
- Student’s performance (“at or above”, “approaching”, and “below”) for speaking, listening, reading and writing in English compared to a typical student performing at the *Transitioning* level.

Guidelines for Use of Spring 2005 MEPA Results by School-based Teams			
MEPA Overall Performance Level	MEPA Performance Compared to a Typical Student Performing at the <i>Transitioning</i> Level for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing	Local Academic Data and Classroom Performance	Recommended Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitioning 	“At or Above” in all 4 areas	Student's performance is consistent with MEPA results.	Probable candidate for reclassification from current LEP status. Academic performance monitored for two years if reclassified.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intermediate • Early Intermediate • Beginning 	"Below" and/or "Approaching" in all 4 areas	Student's performance is consistent with MEPA results.	Not a probable candidate for reclassification from current LEP status. Team designs SEI or other English language learner instructional programming using guidance in this document.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitioning • Intermediate 	"At or Above" in up to 3 areas	Student may or may not be reclassified from current LEP status. Decision on best instructional programming for student for coming school year is made using MEPA and all other available data.	

Step 2: Review other district data

In addition to MEPA results, other evidence of student learning, including results of academic standardized tests administered in the district (e.g., DIBELS, GRADE, Terra Nova, Stanford 9), documented teacher observation, assessments and grades, should be reviewed when developing the district criteria and making decisions about individual students. It is a useful practice to collect all relevant data for each LEP student on an individual student record or in a student folder for use by the school-based team.

The collection and careful analysis of additional school and district level data will be crucial in the case of LEP students in grades K, 1 and 2 because at this time there is no K-2 statewide assessment for reading and writing. The district should use MELA-O scores for listening and speaking, and will need to use district-level data to determine English proficiency in reading and writing.

It is recommended that, in most cases, a child designated as LEP in Kindergarten continue to be designated as LEP in Grade 1, so that substantial data on achievement in reading will be available when making the decision to reclassify a young LEP student as English proficient.

Step 3: Plan an instructional program for the LEP student. Districts should use the guidelines below to plan instructional programs for LEP students enrolled in SEI.² The guidelines are organized by English Language Proficiency Performance Levels and address both **English language development (ELD)** instruction and **sheltered content** instruction.

a. English language development (ELD) instruction

1. ELD instruction, also referred to as English as a second language (ESL) instruction, addresses listening, speaking, reading and writing standards as contained in the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*. ELD instruction is designed specifically for LEP students, and is essential if LEP students are to “catch up” to their classmates in academic content areas. A district-level ELD curriculum, based on the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*, should guide ELD instruction within the district.

Pursuant to G.L. c. 71A, districts must promote and support the rapid acquisition of English language proficiency by LEP students. Thus, districts must ensure that all LEP students receive ELD/ESL instruction, and those at the beginning and early intermediate levels of English language proficiency should receive as much as possible. The guidelines below reflect the significance of ELD instruction for all LEP students, and districts should make every effort to meet these guidelines.

² In addition to sheltered English immersion, there may be LEP students enrolled in two-way bilingual programs and transitional bilingual education (TBE) programs. Districts should make every effort to come as close as possible to meeting the guidelines for English language development (ELD) instruction described above. Content instruction should follow either the two-way or TBE program guidelines.

b. Sheltered content instruction

Sheltered content instruction is designed to make content instruction, delivered in English, more comprehensible to LEP students with an intermediate or higher level of English proficiency. It will be very challenging for beginning and early intermediate students.

Recommended Instructional Programming for LEP Students

English Proficiency Level: Beginning and Early Intermediate

Students at the *Beginning and Early Intermediate* performance levels include those who cannot produce or understand any English, spoken or written, as English language learner as those students with very basic skills in English. It is important that these students be involved in English language development instruction for a substantial component of their school day. This is particularly important because sheltered content instruction, the other component of SEI, will be very challenging for beginning and early intermediate students.

Elementary, Middle and High School

- English language development (ELD) instruction: 2.5 hours/day–full day, delivered by a teacher with an ESL or English language learner license
- Content instruction: hours available outside of ELD, delivered by a teacher qualified to teach LEP students³
- Specials/electives, e.g., physical education, art, music, same schedule as all students at grade level

English Proficiency Level: Intermediate

LEP students at the intermediate level have not yet developed academic proficiency in English, and often have different levels of proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing. Sheltered content instruction delivered by a qualified teacher can be tailored to make content instruction comprehensible and learning tasks engaging. Intermediate level students also require ELD instruction as outlined below.

Elementary, Middle and High School

- English language development (ELD) instruction: 1-2 hours/day, delivered by teacher with ESL/ English language learner license
- ELA or reading instruction: 1-2 hours/day, delivered by a teacher qualified to teach LEP students
- Content instruction: hours available outside ELD and ELA or reading, delivered by a teacher qualified to teach LEP students
- Specials/electives, e.g., physical education, art, music, same schedule as all students at grade level

³ Qualifications for teachers of LEP students in sheltered English immersion are described in the Commissioner's Memorandum of June 15, 2004. http://www.doe.mass.edu/English_language_learner/news04/0615qualifications.pdf

English Proficiency Level: Transitioning

Upper elementary, middle and high school content standards present a significant challenge for LEP students, even those at the transitioning level. This is due to the substantial and different vocabulary demands of each content area, the demanding reading requirements of content textbooks and the “lecture style” of teaching that characterizes many secondary classrooms.

Elementary, Middle and High School

- Assign students at the transitioning level to a teacher who is qualified to teach LEP students. This will enhance the likelihood of continued growth in their English language proficiency and content learning.
- Provide additional opportunities for small group instruction and learning during the school day, after school and during the summer.
- Design and implement a regular process for monitoring students' academic progress.
- Design and provide additional learning support and opportunities.
- Monitor the academic progress of former LEP students (FLEPs) for two years after reclassifying them.
- If a FLEP student fails to make academic progress, as measured by grades and assessments, during the first 3-6 months after not being classified as "LEP," and if a school-based team familiar with the student determines that this failure is due to lack of English proficiency, the student's instructional programming should be redesigned and the student may be reclassified as LEP.

Step 4: Review Student Performance on MCAS English language arts (ELA) test

In most cases, MCAS ELA results are available for LEP students⁴ and should be used to validate the preliminary decision made in the Spring regarding the student's instructional programming and whether the student continues to be LEP or not.

If the MCAS ELA results present strong evidence that contradicts the instructional program decision(s) made in the Spring (based on the student's MEPA test results and other district data) and/or the decision as to whether the student continues to be LEP, seek additional teacher consultation, input and evidence of the student's readiness to perform ordinary classroom work in English without special support.

Step 5: Reclassification

- Reclassify the students as proficient in English by NOT coding them as LEP on the **October** SIMS data collection. (SIMS: DOE 25 – record 00 under “LEP”).
- Notify parents/guardians of reclassification.
- Update school/district records.
- It is recommended that, in most cases, a child designated as LEP in Kindergarten continue to be designated as LEP in Grade 1, so that more substantial data on achievement in reading will be available when making the decision to reclassify a young LEP student as English proficient.

⁴ LEP students in their first year of school in the United States are not required to participate in the MCAS ELA test and, if they do participate, their scores are not used for AYP calculations.

Attachment 7**English Language Learners in Massachusetts: District and Program Type:
October 2008**

District Name	Total Enrollment	LEP Students	No ELL Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way Bilingual	Other Bilingual Education	Parental Opt-Out
Abington	2,293	35	2	32	1	0	0
Acton	2,556	67	0	67	0	0	0
Acushnet	1,029	1	0	0	0	0	1
Agawam	4,347	127	0	126	0	0	1
Amesbury	2,409	29	0	29	0	0	0
Amherst	1,382	185	0	183	0	0	2
Andover	6,123	37	0	37	0	0	0
Arlington	4,654	224	1	217	1	0	5
Ashland	2,630	51	0	51	0	0	0
Attleboro	5,937	256	0	256	0	0	0
Auburn	2,362	52	5	46	0	0	1
Avon	749	2	0	2	0	0	0
Ayer	1,202	39	0	39	0	0	0
Barnstable	4,354	181	1	179	0	0	1
Bedford	2,420	38	0	38	0	0	0
Belchertown	2,655	39	4	35	0	0	0
Bellingham	2,671	25	0	25	0	0	0
Belmont	3,863	113	0	111	0	0	2
Berkley	951	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berlin	239	1	0	1	0	0	0
Beverly	4,219	46	17	29	0	0	0
Billerica	6,100	79	0	71	0	0	8
Boston	55,923	10,579	0	5,397	339	388	4,455
Bourne	2,443	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boxborough	526	6	0	6	0	0	0
Boxford	939	4	0	4	0	0	0
Boylston	380	9	0	9	0	0	0
Braintree	5,352	101	0	101	0	0	0
Brewster	507	6	0	6	0	0	0
Brimfield	348	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brockton	15,312	2,536	466	1,402	83	384	201
Brookfield	296	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brookline	6,321	539	0	538	0	0	1
Burlington	3,650	66	20	46	0	0	0
Cambridge	5,770	412	0	352	60	0	0
Canton	3,097	44	6	38	0	0	0
Carlisle	720	14	0	14	0	0	0
Carver	1,908	2	0	2	0	0	0
Chatham	687	12	1	11	0	0	0
Chelmsford	5,548	86	1	68	0	14	3
Chelsea	5,602	951	0	951	0	0	0
Chicopee	7,774	319	1	313	0	0	5
Clarksburg	198	0	0	0	0	0	0

District Name	Total Enrollment	LEP Students	No ELL Program	Sheltered	Two-Way Bilingual	Other	Parental Opt-Out
				English Immersion		Bilingual Education	
Clinton	2,025	157	0	121	0	0	36
Cohasset	1,466	0	0	0	0	0	0
Concord	1,875	28	0	28	0	0	0
Conway	169	0	0	0	0	0	0
Danvers	3,581	22	10	11	0	0	1
Dartmouth	4,092	61	0	61	0	0	0
Dedham	2,857	98	0	98	0	0	0
Deerfield	484	7	4	3	0	0	0
Douglas	1,759	3	2	1	0	0	0
Dover	579	6	0	6	0	0	0
Dracut	4,190	49	0	49	0	0	0
Duxbury	3,370	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Bridgewater	2,425	1	0	1	0	0	0
Eastham	224	3	0	3	0	0	0
Easthampton	1,651	47	47	0	0	0	0
East Longmeadow	2,857	0	0	0	0	0	0
Easton	3,929	32	7	25	0	0	0
Edgartown	332	25	1	21	3	0	0
Erving	191	0	0	0	0	0	0
Everett	5,613	509	65	231	0	0	213
Fairhaven	2,025	4	1	3	0	0	0
Fall River	9,985	705	0	550	0	0	155
Falmouth	3,769	32	0	32	0	0	0
Fitchburg	5,155	567	0	567	0	0	0
Florida	112	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foxborough	2,922	28	1	27	0	0	0
Framingham	8,154	1,170	0	494	216	401	59
Franklin	6,255	41	0	40	0	0	1
Freetown	511	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gardner	2,727	91	0	91	0	0	0
Georgetown	1,701	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gloucester	3,398	72	1	71	0	0	0
Gosnold	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grafton	2,880	10	0	10	0	0	0
Granby	1,110	13	6	7	0	0	0
Granville	166	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greenfield	1,527	52	0	51	0	0	1
Hadley	672	10	0	10	0	0	0
Halifax	684	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hancock	33	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hanover	2,721	8	0	8	0	0	0
Harvard	1,281	3	1	0	2	0	0
Harwich	1,350	45	0	45	0	0	0
Hatfield	418	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haverhill	6,840	397	3	391	0	2	1
Hingham	3,964	13	0	13	0	0	0
Holbrook	1,184	22	0	22	0	0	0
Holland	285	1	0	1	0	0	0
Holliston	2,902	36	0	35	0	0	1

District Name	Total Enrollment	LEP Students	No ELL Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way Bilingual	Other Bilingual Education	Parental Opt-Out
Holyoke	6,025	1,460	0	1,460	0	0	0
Hopedale	1,324	3	0	3	0	0	0
Hopkinton	3,452	27	1	26	0	0	0
Hudson	2,982	130	38	92	0	0	0
Hull	1,213	4	3	1	0	0	0
Ipswich	2,118	12	2	10	0	0	0
Kingston	1,173	4	4	0	0	0	0
Lakeville	770	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lanesborough	280	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lawrence	12,221	2,791	411	2,372	0	0	8
Lee	864	17	0	17	0	0	0
Leicester	1,874	14	1	13	0	0	0
Lenox	816	3	1	2	0	0	0
Leominster	6,233	598	10	588	0	0	0
Leverett	156	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lexington	6,235	297	0	297	0	0	0
Lincoln	1,126	27	0	27	0	0	0
Littleton	1,653	0	0	0	0	0	0
Longmeadow	3,133	37	0	36	0	0	1
Lowell	13,400	4,227	28	4,144	0	4	51
Ludlow	3,103	33	1	32	0	0	0
Lunenburg	1,739	7	0	7	0	0	0
Lynn	13,273	3,419	10	2,951	0	27	431
Lynnfield	2,361	1	0	1	0	0	0
Malden	6,416	655	0	634	21	0	0
Mansfield	4,912	36	0	0	0	0	36
Marblehead	3,261	27	17	10	0	0	0
Marion	435	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marlborough	4,565	520	6	512	2	0	0
Marshfield	4,720	16	1	12	0	0	3
Mashpee	1,818	2	0	0	0	0	2
Mattapoissett	516	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maynard	1,325	27	0	27	0	0	0
Medfield	3,004	6	0	6	0	0	0
Medford	4,822	273	0	273	0	0	0
Medway	2,756	14	0	14	0	0	0
Melrose	3,659	61	27	34	0	0	0
Methuen	7,387	405	1	396	0	0	8
Middleborough	3,541	11	0	11	0	0	0
Middleton	880	7	0	7	0	0	0
Milford	4,191	220	0	218	0	0	2
Millbury	1,928	6	2	4	0	0	0
Millis	1,404	3	3	0	0	0	0
Milton	3,876	39	1	38	0	0	0
Monson	1,477	4	0	4	0	0	0
Nahant	246	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nantucket	1,279	69	13	54	0	0	2
Natick	4,721	39	0	39	0	0	0
Needham	5,115	49	0	49	0	0	0

District Name	Total Enrollment	LEP Students	No ELL Program	Sheltered	Two-Way Bilingual	Other	Parental Opt-Out
				English Immersion		Bilingual Education	
New Bedford	12,609	550	0	550	0	0	0
Newburyport	2,263	11	0	11	0	0	0
Newton	11,700	654	7	644	0	0	3
Norfolk	1,059	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Adams	1,592	29	1	28	0	0	0
Northampton	2,758	43	1	42	0	0	0
North Andover	4,604	54	0	54	0	0	0
North Attleborough	4,742	33	0	33	0	0	0
Northborough	1,896	67	0	67	0	0	0
Northbridge	2,526	7	0	7	0	0	0
North Brookfield	652	1	0	1	0	0	0
North Reading	2,792	11	0	11	0	0	0
Norton	2,883	2	0	2	0	0	0
Norwell	2,327	2	0	2	0	0	0
Norwood	3,439	143	0	142	0	0	1
Oak Bluffs	416	22	0	22	0	0	0
Orange	831	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orleans	197	5	1	3	0	1	0
Oxford	2,020	7	1	6	0	0	0
Palmer	1,840	11	7	4	0	0	0
Peabody	6,248	301	1	300	0	0	0
Pelham	117	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pembroke	3,451	0	0	0	0	0	0
Petersham	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pittsfield	6,120	221	0	221	0	0	0
Plainville	831	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plymouth	8,280	43	0	43	0	0	0
Plympton	228	0	0	0	0	0	0
Provincetown	172	10	3	2	0	0	5
Quincy	8,968	1,072	0	1,072	0	0	0
Randolph	2,966	174	3	164	0	0	7
Reading	4,428	14	0	14	0	0	0
Revere	6,033	618	3	615	0	0	0
Richmond	188	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rochester	604	1	1	0	0	0	0
Rockland	2,376	26	0	26	0	0	0
Rockport	1,003	2	0	2	0	0	0
Rowe	64	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salem	4,447	476	14	363	83	1	15
Sandwich	3,574	1	0	1	0	0	0
Saugus	2,927	46	13	33	0	0	0
Savoy	53	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scituate	3,241	26	0	26	0	0	0
Seekonk	2,162	17	0	17	0	0	0
Sharon	3,394	45	0	45	0	0	0
Sherborn	486	1	0	1	0	0	0
Shirley	581	4	0	4	0	0	0
Shrewsbury	5,904	168	0	168	0	0	0
Shutesbury	160	0	0	0	0	0	0

District Name	Total Enrollment	LEP Students	No ELL Program	Sheltered	Two-Way Bilingual	Other	Parental Opt-Out
				English Immersion		Bilingual Education	
Somerset	2,759	2	1	0	0	1	0
Somerville	4,877	821	6	625	123	67	0
Southampton	557	2	0	2	0	0	0
Southborough	1,596	44	0	44	0	0	0
Southbridge	2,120	150	2	147	0	0	1
South Hadley	2,188	10	10	0	0	0	0
Springfield	25,360	3,215	0	2,921	0	0	294
Stoneham	2,706	62	0	62	0	0	0
Stoughton	3,862	139	0	118	0	0	21
Sturbridge	917	2	0	2	0	0	0
Sudbury	3,224	23	0	23	0	0	0
Sunderland	214	13	0	13	0	0	0
Sutton	1,684	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swampscott	2,279	25	0	25	0	0	0
Swansea	2,081	12	0	12	0	0	0
Taunton	7,865	202	0	202	0	0	0
Tewksbury	4,411	10	0	10	0	0	0
Tisbury	306	26	0	26	0	0	0
Topsfield	677	3	3	0	0	0	0
Truro	141	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tyngsborough	2,083	3	0	3	0	0	0
Uxbridge	2,050	31	2	25	2	0	2
Wakefield	3,402	23	0	23	0	0	0
Wales	174	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walpole	3,923	74	0	74	0	0	0
Waltham	4,751	481	1	380	0	0	100
Ware	1,243	9	6	3	0	0	0
Wareham	3,203	15	0	15	0	0	0
Watertown	2,516	266	1	263	0	0	2
Wayland	2,766	12	0	9	0	0	3
Webster	1,935	61	0	61	0	0	0
Wellesley	4,896	73	2	55	0	0	16
Wellfleet	131	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westborough	3,553	235	1	234	0	0	0
West Boylston	1,055	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Bridgewater	1,289	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westfield	6,204	262	2	260	0	0	0
Westford	5,308	47	0	43	0	0	4
Westhampton	136	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weston	2,403	47	0	45	0	0	2
Westport	1,909	13	0	13	0	0	0
West Springfield	3,983	270	0	270	0	0	0
Westwood	3,066	32	3	29	0	0	0
Weymouth	6,861	88	0	84	0	0	4
Whately	133	0	0	0	0	0	0
Williamsburg	176	1	1	0	0	0	0
Williamstown	455	6	0	6	0	0	0
Wilmington	3,764	9	4	5	0	0	0
Winchendon	1,652	15	0	15	0	0	0

District Name	Total Enrollment	LEP Students	No ELL Program	Sheltered	Two-Way Bilingual	Other	Parental Opt-Out
				English Immersion		Bilingual Education	
Winchester	4,092	90	0	90	0	0	0
Winthrop	2,015	51	0	51	0	0	0
Woburn	4,732	176	1	175	0	0	0
Worcester	23,109	5,621	219	5,027	14	338	23
Wrentham	1,310	4	0	4	0	0	0
Northampton-Smith Voc. Agr.	460	3	1	2	0	0	0
Excel Academy CS	211	8	0	8	0	0	0
Academy Of Pacific Rim CS	474	4	0	4	0	0	0
Four Rivers CS	198	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berkshire Arts & Tech CS	245	3	0	3	0	0	0
Academy of Strategic Learning HMCS	49	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boston Preparatory CS	292	0	0	0	0	0	0
Christa McAuliffe Reg CS	210	5	0	4	0	0	1
Smith Leadership Academy CS	188	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benjamin Banneker CS	312	14	0	14	0	0	0
Barnstable HMCS	841	19	0	19	0	0	0
Boston Evening Acad HMCS	301	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marston Mill East HMCS	472	0	0	0	0	0	0
Edward Brooke CS	398	4	0	4	0	0	0
Kipp Academy Lynn CS	327	4	0	4	0	0	0
Advanced Math & Science CS	633	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cape Cod Lighthouse CS	216	0	0	0	0	0	0
Murdoch Middle Public CS	397	2	0	2	0	0	0
Community CS Cambridge	267	12	0	12	0	0	0
City On A Hill CS	274	2	2	0	0	0	0
Codman Academy CS	116	1	0	1	0	0	0
Conservatory Lab CS	135	13	0	13	0	0	0
Community Day CS	331	84	0	84	0	0	0
Sabis International CS	1,574	18	18	0	0	0	0
Neighborhood House CS	400	6	0	6	0	0	0
Abby Kelley Foster Reg CS	1,425	51	0	48	0	0	3
Foxboro Regional CS	1,083	18	1	17	0	0	0
Ben Franklin Classical CS	416	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boston Collegiate CS	464	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hilltown Cooperative CS	154	1	0	0	1	0	0
Robert M. Hughes Academy CS	186	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Careers Academy HMCS	214	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holyoke Community CS	703	74	0	74	0	0	0
Lawrence Family Development CS	579	223	0	0	223	0	0
Hill View Montessori CS	240	7	0	7	0	0	0
Lowell Community CS	915	230	0	230	0	0	0
Lowell Middlesex Academy CS	111	1	0	1	0	0	0
Marblehead Community CS	230	0	0	0	0	0	0
Martha's Vineyard CS	176	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ma Academy of Math & Science	89	0	0	0	0	0	0
Media & Tech CS	308	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mystic Valley Regional CS	1,311	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Leadership HMCS	441	7	0	7	0	0	0

District Name	Total Enrollment	LEP Students	No ELL Program	Sheltered	Two-Way Bilingual	Other	Parental Opt-Out
				English Immersion		Bilingual Education	
North Central Charter Ess	356	0	0	0	0	0	0
Silver Hill Horace Mann CS	552	38	1	37	0	0	0
Francis W .Parker CS	384	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pioneer Valley Perf Arts	410	1	0	1	0	0	0
Boston Renaissance CS	1,224	45	0	45	0	0	0
River Valley CS	289	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rising Tide CS	315	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roxbury Prep CS	230	5	0	5	0	0	0
Salem Academy CS	286	8	0	8	0	0	0
Seven Hills CS	680	81	0	81	0	0	0
Prospect Hill Academy CS	926	16	10	6	0	0	0
South Shore Cs	519	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sturgis CS	367	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uphams Corner CS	172	5	1	4	0	0	0
Atlantis CS	702	0	0	0	0	0	0
MLK Jr. School of Excellence	311	10	0	10	0	0	0
Phoenix Charter Academy	150	22	0	22	0	0	0
Pioneer Charter School of Science	177	3	3	0	0	0	0
Global Learning Charter	429	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pioneer Valley Chinese Immersion CS	88	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acton-Boxborough	2,958	20	0	19	0	0	1
Adams-Cheshire	1,585	4	1	3	0	0	0
Amherst-Pelham	1,731	60	0	60	0	0	0
Ashburnham-Westminster	2,426	5	0	5	0	0	0
Athol-Royalston	1,695	24	11	13	0	0	0
Berkshire Hills	1,376	26	5	21	0	0	0
Berlin-Boylston	466	1	0	1	0	0	0
Blackstone-Millville	2,145	11	0	10	0	0	1
Bridgewater-Raynham	5,863	22	8	0	0	0	14
Chesterfield-Goshen	180	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central Berkshire	2,039	1	0	1	0	0	0
Concord-Carlisle	1,268	1	0	1	0	0	0
Dennis-Yarmouth	3,461	138	0	138	0	0	0
Dighton-Rehoboth	3,316	2	0	2	0	0	0
Dover-Sherborn	1,110	4	0	4	0	0	0
Dudley-Charlton Reg	4,378	46	3	42	0	0	1
Nauset	1,519	14	2	12	0	0	0
Farmington River Reg	145	0	0	0	0	0	0
Freetown-Lakeville	1,949	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frontier	701	5	0	5	0	0	0
Gateway	1,220	10	0	10	0	0	0
Groton-Dunstable	2,814	7	0	7	0	0	0
Gill-Montague	1,082	26	22	4	0	0	0
Hamilton-Wenham	2,080	16	13	2	0	0	1
Hampden-Wilbraham	3,627	22	0	22	0	0	0
Hampshire	849	4	0	4	0	0	0
Hawlemont	119	0	0	0	0	0	0
King Philip	2,083	3	0	3	0	0	0

District Name	Total Enrollment	LEP Students	No ELL Program	Sheltered	Two-Way Bilingual	Other	Parental Opt-Out
				English Immersion		Bilingual Education	
Lincoln-Sudbury	1,638	4	0	4	0	0	0
Manchester Essex Regional	1,382	3	0	3	0	0	0
Marthas Vineyard	709	21	1	20	0	0	0
Masconomet	2,147	3	3	0	0	0	0
Mendon-Upton	2,888	8	0	8	0	0	0
Mount Greylock	651	1	0	1	0	0	0
Mohawk Trail	1,157	6	0	6	0	0	0
Narragansett	1,643	1	0	1	0	0	0
Nashoba	3,358	21	1	20	0	0	0
New Salem-Wendell	149	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northboro-Southboro	1,411	7	1	6	0	0	0
North Middlesex	4,267	7	1	5	0	0	1
Old Rochester	1,141	1	1	0	0	0	0
Pentucket	3,280	1	0	1	0	0	0
Pioneer Valley	1,151	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quabbin	3,126	4	0	2	0	0	2
Ralph C. Mahar	765	7	0	7	0	0	0
Silver Lake	1,883	3	3	0	0	0	0
Southern Berkshire	886	4	0	4	0	0	0
Southwick-Tolland	1,829	20	1	19	0	0	0
Spencer-E. Brookfield	2,097	6	0	6	0	0	0
Tantasqua	1,799	1	1	0	0	0	0
Triton	3,179	18	0	18	0	0	0
Up-Island Regional	338	7	0	7	0	0	0
Wachusett	7,339	40	1	39	0	0	0
Quaboag Regional	1,433	1	0	1	0	0	0
Whitman-Hanson	4,465	13	0	13	0	0	0
Assabet Valley	933	15	0	15	0	0	0
Blackstone Valley Reg	1,103	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blue Hills Voc	844	6	0	6	0	0	0
Bristol-Plymouth Voc Tech	1,195	6	0	6	0	0	0
Cape Cod Region Voc Tech	703	7	0	7	0	0	0
Franklin County	517	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greater Fall River	1,354	10	10	0	0	0	0
Greater Lawrence RVT	1,170	38	0	15	19	4	0
Greater New Bedford	2,064	25	0	25	0	0	0
Greater Lowell Voc Tec	1,922	30	0	30	0	0	0
So Middlesex Voc Tech Reg	633	47	0	47	0	0	0
Minuteman Voc Tech	625	1	0	1	0	0	0
Montachusett Voc Tech Reg	1,341	28	0	28	0	0	0
Northern Berkshire Voc	500	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nashoba Valley Tech	642	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northeast Metro Voc	1,245	64	0	64	0	0	0
North Shore Reg Voc	447	4	0	4	0	0	0
Old Colony Reg Voc Tech	572	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pathfinder Voc Tech	622	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shawsheen Valley Voc Tech	1,268	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southeastern Reg Voc Tech	1,251	8	0	8	0	0	0
South Shore Reg Voc Tech	584	0	0	0	0	0	0

District Name	Total Enrollment	LEP Students	No ELL Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way Bilingual	Other Bilingual Education	Parental Opt-Out
Southern Worcester Cty VT	1,097	4	0	0	0	4	0
Tri County	916	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Cape Cod Voc Tech	648	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whittier Voc	1,178	5	0	5	0	0	0
Bristol County Agr	429	0	0	0	0	0	0
Essex Agr Tech	442	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norfolk County Agr	454	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Totals	958,910	57,002	1,702	46,244	1,193	1,636	6,227

Attachment 8

English Language Learners in Massachusetts: First Language: October 2008

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Abington	3	16	0	2	0	14	35
Acton	5	6	1	0	0	55	67
Acushnet	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Agawam	10	0	0	3	0	114	127
Amesbury	4	13	0	0	0	12	29
Amherst	65	5	20	2	0	93	185
Andover	7	1	0	0	0	29	37
Arlington	26	11	0	1	8	178	224
Ashland	9	27	0	0	0	15	51
Attleboro	156	7	44	4	3	42	256
Auburn	9	6	0	13	4	20	52
Avon	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Ayer	24	12	0	0	0	3	39
Barnstable	53	103	0	0	4	21	181
Bedford	11	3	0	2	1	21	38
Belchertown	9	1	5	0	0	24	39
Bellingham	7	5	0	3	0	10	25
Belmont	4	5	0	0	0	104	113
Berkley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berlin	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Beverly	4	11	1	3	0	27	46
Billerica	16	7	2	2	3	49	79
Boston	6,061	234	11	653	898	2,722	10,579
Bourne	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boxborough	0	1	0	0	0	5	6
Boxford	0	1	0	0	0	3	4
Boylston	1	0	0	0	0	8	9
Braintree	10	5	0	10	1	75	101
Brewster	5	0	0	0	0	1	6
Brimfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brockton	433	134	5	36	448	1,480	2,536
Brookfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brookline	44	11	0	7	3	474	539
Burlington	2	7	0	1	1	55	66
Cambridge	78	30	0	2	80	222	412
Canton	5	5	0	6	3	25	44
Carlisle	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Carver	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Chatham	7	2	0	0	0	3	12
Chelmsford	13	5	6	5	0	57	86
Chelsea	786	25	3	8	8	121	951
Chicopee	191	5	2	2	0	119	319
Clarksburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Clinton	106	24	0	0	12	15	157
Cohasset	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Concord	9	1	0	2	1	15	28
Conway	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Danvers	4	2	1	0	1	14	22
Dartmouth	3	33	0	3	0	22	61
Dedham	38	4	0	7	12	37	98
Deerfield	5	0	0	1	0	1	7
Douglas	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
Dover	0	0	0	0	2	4	6
Dracut	9	8	10	0	0	22	49
Duxbury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Bridgewater	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Eastham	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Easthampton	13	0	14	2	0	18	47
East Longmeadow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Easton	7	4	0	1	6	14	32
Edgartown	2	23	0	0	0	0	25
Erving	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Everett	269	107	0	17	80	36	509
Fairhaven	1	2	0	0	0	1	4
Fall River	365	213	62	6	1	58	705
Falmouth	0	9	0	2	0	21	32
Fitchburg	462	2	5	9	1	88	567
Florida	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foxborough	6	4	0	1	2	15	28
Framingham	528	509	1	2	15	115	1,170
Franklin	10	5	0	4	1	21	41
Freetown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gardner	73	2	0	3	2	11	91
Georgetown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gloucester	36	20	0	3	0	13	72
Gosnold	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grafton	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Granby	2	0	0	0	0	11	13
Granville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greenfield	17	0	0	0	0	35	52
Hadley	5	0	0	0	0	5	10
Halifax	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hancock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hanover	1	0	0	0	0	7	8
Harvard	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Harwich	9	5	0	0	7	24	45
Hatfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haverhill	351	8	0	5	6	27	397
Hingham	4	0	0	0	0	9	13
Holbrook	4	4	0	3	3	8	22

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Holland	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Holliston	11	14	0	0	0	11	36
Holyoke	1,442	0	0	0	0	18	1,460
Hopedale	1	0	0	0	0	2	3
Hopkinton	3	2	0	0	0	22	27
Hudson	45	65	0	1	0	19	130
Hull	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Ipswich	4	3	0	0	0	5	12
Kingston	0	2	0	0	0	2	4
Lakeville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lanesborough	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lawrence	2,693	3	35	30	0	30	2,791
Lee	8	5	0	0	0	4	17
Leicester	3	0	0	6	0	5	14
Lenox	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Leominster	436	66	0	6	5	85	598
Leverett	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lexington	12	3	1	0	2	279	297
Lincoln	8	1	0	0	0	18	27
Littleton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Longmeadow	5	0	0	1	0	31	37
Lowell	1,593	332	1,725	116	14	447	4,227
Ludlow	6	8	0	0	0	19	33
Lunenburg	2	2	0	0	0	3	7
Lynn	2,599	35	280	68	65	372	3,419
Lynnfield	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Malden	110	93	1	39	97	315	655
Mansfield	9	2	0	1	0	24	36
Marblehead	5	3	0	0	0	19	27
Marion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marlborough	273	209	0	3	1	34	520
Marshfield	3	7	0	0	0	6	16
Mashpee	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Mattapoisett	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maynard	11	8	0	0	3	5	27
Medfield	0	3	0	0	0	3	6
Medford	25	81	0	13	89	65	273
Medway	7	0	0	0	2	5	14
Melrose	2	7	0	4	2	46	61
Methuen	332	1	4	15	5	48	405
Middleborough	1	0	0	1	0	9	11
Middleton	3	1	0	0	0	3	7
Milford	79	106	0	5	0	30	220
Millbury	0	0	0	3	0	3	6
Millis	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Milton	3	3	0	5	16	12	39
Monson	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Nahant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nantucket	58	7	0	0	0	4	69
Natick	5	2	0	4	0	28	39
Needham	8	2	0	0	1	38	49
New Bedford	376	83	0	1	30	60	550
Newburyport	1	5	0	0	0	5	11
Newton	94	27	1	8	10	514	654
Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Adams	24	0	2	0	0	3	29
Northampton	32	1	3	0	0	7	43
North Andover	21	1	0	2	0	30	54
North Attleborough	11	0	0	1	0	21	33
Northborough	13	15	0	0	1	38	67
Northbridge	3	1	0	0	0	3	7
North Brookfield	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
North Reading	2	0	0	0	0	9	11
Norton	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Norwell	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Norwood	31	33	0	1	4	74	143
Oak Bluffs	1	21	0	0	0	0	22
Orange	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orleans	0	2	0	0	0	3	5
Oxford	1	0	0	1	0	5	7
Palmer	0	2	0	0	0	9	11
Peabody	139	83	1	11	0	67	301
Pelham	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pembroke	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Petersham	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pittsfield	166	2	0	6	0	47	221
Plainville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plymouth	11	21	1	2	1	7	43
Plympton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Provincetown	9	0	0	0	0	1	10
Quincy	39	30	1	146	2	854	1,072
Randolph	27	5	0	54	61	27	174
Reading	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Revere	414	33	12	21	8	130	618
Richmond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rochester	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Rockland	1	24	0	0	0	1	26
Rockport	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Rowe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salem	401	16	1	6	2	50	476
Sandwich	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Saugus	17	9	3	6	5	6	46
Savoy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scituate	0	5	0	0	4	17	26

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Seekonk	4	1	0	0	0	12	17
Sharon	1	0	0	6	5	33	45
Sherborn	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Shirley	2	1	0	0	0	1	4
Shrewsbury	15	38	1	9	0	105	168
Shutesbury	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Somerville	402	188	0	6	81	144	821
Southampton	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Southborough	3	4	0	0	0	37	44
Southbridge	137	0	0	0	0	13	150
South Hadley	6	0	1	0	0	3	10
Springfield	2,943	1	2	79	3	187	3,215
Stoneham	20	6	0	4	1	31	62
Stoughton	21	59	0	5	11	43	139
Sturbridge	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Sudbury	6	3	2	1	1	10	23
Sunderland	3	0	0	0	0	10	13
Sutton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swampscott	5	0	0	0	1	19	25
Swansea	2	2	0	4	0	4	12
Taunton	90	64	0	3	8	37	202
Tewksbury	0	0	2	3	0	5	10
Tisbury	0	23	0	0	0	3	26
Topsfield	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Truro	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tyngsborough	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
Uxbridge	12	3	0	0	0	16	31
Wakefield	8	4	0	1	0	10	23
Wales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walpole	9	10	0	0	13	42	74
Waltham	326	23	0	2	29	101	481
Ware	5	0	0	0	0	4	9
Wareham	4	2	0	1	0	8	15
Watertown	52	33	0	1	3	177	266
Wayland	4	0	0	0	0	8	12
Webster	34	9	0	0	0	18	61
Wellesley	19	0	0	1	0	53	73
Wellfleet	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westborough	36	41	0	0	1	157	235
West Boylston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Bridgewater	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westfield	42	0	0	0	0	220	262
Westford	4	0	1	3	1	38	47
Westhampton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weston	6	0	0	1	2	38	47
Westport	3	9	0	1	0	0	13

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
West Springfield	34	3	0	2	0	231	270
Westwood	3	2	0	0	0	27	32
Weymouth	11	41	0	3	3	30	88
Whately	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Williamsburg	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Williamstown	1	3	0	0	0	2	6
Wilmington	0	3	0	1	0	5	9
Winchendon	8	3	0	0	0	4	15
Winchester	8	8	0	2	2	70	90
Winthrop	14	7	0	0	1	29	51
Woburn	25	45	0	7	5	94	176
Worcester	3,338	270	37	619	38	1,319	5,621
Wrentham	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Northampton-Smith Voc. Agr.	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Excel Academy CS	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Academy Of Pacific Rim CS	1	1	0	0	1	1	4
Four Rivers CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berkshire Arts & Tech CS	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Academy of Strategic Learning HMCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boston Preparatory CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Christa McAuliffe Reg CS	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Smith Leadership Academy CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benjamin Banneker CS	2	0	0	0	12	0	14
Barnstable HMCS	4	12	0	0	0	3	19
Boston Evening Acad HMCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marston Mill East HMCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Edward Brooke CS	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Kipp Academy Lynn CS	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Advanced Math & Science CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cape Cod Lighthouse CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Murdoch Middle Public CS	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Community CS Cambridge	6	0	0	0	5	1	12
City On A Hill CS	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Codman Academy CS	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Conservatory Lab CS	9	1	0	0	0	3	13
Community Day CS	82	0	0	0	2	0	84
Sabis International CS	11	1	1	3	0	2	18
Neighborhood House CS	4	0	0	1	0	1	6
Abby Kelley Foster Reg CS	16	5	1	3	3	23	51
Foxboro Regional CS	1	0	0	0	2	15	18
Ben Franklin Classical CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boston Collegiate CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hilltown Cooperative CS	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Robert M. Hughes Academy CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Careers Academy HMCS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holyoke Community CS	74	0	0	0	0	0	74
Lawrence Family Development CS	222	0	0	0	0	1	223

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Hill View Montessori CS	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
Lowell Community CS	106	13	91	2	2	16	230
Lowell Middlesex Academy CS	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Marblehead Community CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Martha's Vineyard CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA Academy of Math & Science	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Media & Tech CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mystic Valley Regional CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Leadership HMCS	4	0	0	0	0	3	7
North Central Charter Ess	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Silver Hill Horace Mann CS	32	1	0	1	1	3	38
Francis W. Parker CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pioneer Valley Perf Arts	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Boston Renaissance CS	37	0	0	1	3	4	45
River Valley CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rising Tide CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roxbury Prep CS	3	0	0	0	0	2	5
Salem Academy CS	6	0	0	0	0	2	8
Seven Hills CS	69	0	0	0	1	11	81
Prospect Hill Academy CS	6	3	0	0	5	2	16
South Shore Cs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sturgis CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uphams Corner CS	2	1	0	0	0	2	5
Atlantis CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MLK Jr. School of Excellence	9	0	0	0	1	0	10
Phoenix Charter Academy	20	0	0	0	1	1	22
Pioneer Charter School of Science	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
Global Learning Charter	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pioneer Valley Chinese Immersion CS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acton-Boxborough	1	7	0	0	1	11	20
Adams-Cheshire	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Amherst-Pelham	19	2	3	1	0	35	60
Ashburnham-Westminster	3	0	0	0	0	2	5
Athol-Royalston	18	0	0	0	0	6	24
Berkshire Hills	19	0	0	0	0	7	26
Berlin-Boylston	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Blackstone-Millville	4	1	0	0	0	6	11
Bridgewater-Raynham	8	4	0	1	0	9	22
Chesterfield-Goshen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central Berkshire	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Concord-Carlisle	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Dennis-Yarmouth	33	60	0	3	13	29	138
Dighton-Rehoboth	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Dover-Sherborn	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Dudley-Charlton Reg	15	1	0	0	0	30	46
Nauset	5	2	0	0	0	7	14
Farmington River Reg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Freetown-Lakeville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Frontier	1	1	0	1	0	2	5
Gateway	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Groton-Dunstable	4	1	0	0	0	2	7
Gill-Montague	14	0	0	0	0	12	26
Hamilton-Wenham	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Hampden-Wilbraham	2	0	0	0	0	20	22
Hampshire	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Hawlemont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
King Philip	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Lincoln-Sudbury	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Manchester Essex Regional	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Marthas Vineyard	0	21	0	0	0	0	21
Masconomet	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Mendon-Upton	1	2	0	0	0	5	8
Mount Greylock	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Mohawk Trail	0	0	0	1	0	5	6
Narragansett	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Nashoba	11	3	0	0	1	6	21
New Salem-Wendell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northboro-Southboro	0	1	0	0	0	6	7
North Middlesex	4	0	0	0	0	3	7
Old Rochester	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Pentucket	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Pioneer Valley	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quabbin	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Ralph C. Mahar	1	0	1	0	0	5	7
Silver Lake	0	1	0	1	0	1	3
Southern Berkshire	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Southwick-Tolland	1	0	0	0	0	19	20
Spencer-E. Brookfield	5	0	0	0	0	1	6
Tantasqua	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Triton	2	1	0	6	0	9	18
Up-Island Regional	2	2	0	0	0	3	7
Wachusett	9	4	0	4	0	23	40
Quaboag Regional	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Whitman-Hanson	6	7	0	0	0	0	13
Assabet Valley	8	6	0	0	0	1	15
Blackstone Valley Reg	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blue Hills Voc	1	3	0	0	2	0	6
Bristol-Plymouth Voc Tech	1	5	0	0	0	0	6
Cape Cod Region Voc Tech	2	3	0	0	0	2	7
Franklin County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greater Fall River	5	3	2	0	0	0	10
Greater Lawrence Reg Voc Tech	37	0	0	0	0	1	38
Greater New Bedford	19	6	0	0	0	0	25
Greater Lowell Voc Tec	13	6	7	0	0	4	30

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
So Middlesex Voc Tech Reg	24	18	0	0	0	5	47
Minuteman Voc Tech	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Montachusett Voc Tech Reg	19	1	0	1	0	7	28
Northern Berkshire Voc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nashoba Valley Tech	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northeast Metro Voc	62	1	0	0	0	1	64
North Shore Reg Voc	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Old Colony Reg Voc Tech	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pathfinder Voc Tech	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shawsheen Valley Voc Tech	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southeastern Reg Voc Tech	0	2	0	0	1	5	8
South Shore Reg Voc Tech	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Worcester Cty Voc Tech	3	0	0	0	0	1	4
Tri County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Cape Cod Voc Tech	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whittier Voc	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Bristol County Agr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Essex Agr Tech	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norfolk County Agr	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Totals	30,885	4,323	2,417	2,218	2,317	14,842	57,002

VII. Appendix B

Chapter 182 of the Acts of 2008

7027-1004 For English language acquisition professional development to improve the academic performance of English language learners and effectively implement sheltered English immersion as outlined in chapter 386 of the acts of 2002; provided, that the department shall only approve professional development courses and offerings with proven, replicable results in improving teacher performance, and which shall have demonstrated the use of best practices, as determined by the department, including data comparing pre-training and post-training knowledge; provided further, that the department shall, not later than February 16, 2009 , provide a report on the number of educators who have received such training since passage of chapter 386 of the acts of 2002, the estimated number who need such additional training, and a review and analysis of the most effective types of professional development and the most common gaps in the knowledge base of educators implementing English immersion and teaching English language acquisition, along with legislative or regulatory recommendations of the department; provided further, that said report shall be provided to the secretary of administration and finance, the senate president, the speaker of the house, the chairs of the house and senate ways and means committees and the house and senate chairs of the joint committee on education; and provided further, that no funds shall be expended for personnel costs \$470,987

M.G.L. Chapter 69 section 1I

CHAPTER 69. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Chapter 69: Section 1I. Performances of public school districts and individual public schools; evaluation system; assessment instruments; reports

Section 1I. The board shall adopt a system for evaluating on an annual basis the performance of both public school districts and individual public schools. With respect to individual schools, the system shall include instruments designed to assess the extent to which schools and districts succeed in improving or fail to improve student performance, as defined by student acquisition of the skills, competencies and knowledge called for by the academic standards and embodied in the curriculum frameworks established by the board pursuant to sections one D and one E in the areas of mathematics, science and technology, history and social science, English, foreign languages and the arts, as well as by other gauges of student learning judged by the board to be relevant and meaningful to students, parents, teachers, administrators, and taxpayers.

The system shall be designed both to measure outcomes and results regarding student performance, and to improve the effectiveness of curriculum and instruction. In its design and application, the system shall strike a balance among considerations of accuracy, fairness, expense and administration. The system shall employ a variety of assessment instruments on either a comprehensive or statistically valid sampling basis. Such instruments shall be criterion referenced, assessing whether students are meeting the academic standards described in this chapter. As much as is practicable, especially in the case of students whose performance is difficult to assess using conventional methods, such instruments shall include consideration of work samples, projects and portfolios, and shall facilitate authentic and direct gauges of student performance. Such instruments shall provide the means to compare student performance among the various school systems and communities in the commonwealth, and between students in other states and in other nations, especially those nations which compete with the commonwealth for employment and economic opportunities. The board shall take all appropriate action to bring about and continue the commonwealth's participation in the assessment activities of the National Assessment of Educational Progress and in the development of standards and assessments by the New Standards Program.

In addition, comprehensive diagnostic assessment of individual students shall be conducted at least in the fourth, eighth and tenth grades. Said diagnostic assessments shall identify academic achievement levels of all students in order to inform teachers, parents, administrators and the students themselves, as to individual academic performance. The board shall develop procedures for updating, improving or refining the assessment system.

The assessment instruments shall be designed to avoid gender, cultural, ethnic or racial stereotypes and shall recognize sensitivity to different learning styles and impediments to learning. The system shall take into account on a nondiscriminatory basis the cultural and language diversity of students in the commonwealth and the particular circumstances of students with special needs. Said system shall comply with federal requirements for accommodating children with special needs. All potential English proficient students from language groups in

which English language learners programs established under chapter 71A are offered under chapter seventy-one A shall also be allowed opportunities for assessment of their performance in the language which best allows them to demonstrate educational achievement and mastery of academic standards and curriculum frameworks established under sections 1D and 1E. For the purposes of this section, a “potential English proficient student” shall be defined as a student who is not able to perform ordinary class work in English; provided, however, that no student shall be allowed to be tested in a language other than English for longer than three consecutive years.

The commissioner is authorized and directed to gather information, including the information specified herein and such other information as the board shall require, for the purposes of evaluating individual public schools, school districts, and the efficacy and equity of state and federal mandated programs. All information filed pursuant to this section shall be filed in the manner and form prescribed by the department.

Each school district shall maintain individual records on every student and employee. Each student record shall contain a unique and confidential identification number, basic demographic information, program and course information, and such other information as the department shall determine necessary. Said records shall conform to parameters established by the department.

For the purposes of improving the performance of school districts and individual public schools and the efficacy and equity of state and federal programs and for the purposes of reducing the amount of paperwork to relieve the administrative burden on local districts, each district shall file with the commissioner once in each 3 year period a comprehensive, 3 year district improvement plan. The plan shall be developed and submitted in a manner and form prescribed by the department of education.

The plan shall, to the extent feasible, be designed to fulfill all planning requirements of state and federal education laws, and shall include, but not be limited to: (a) an analysis of student and subgroup achievement gaps in core subjects; (b) identification of specific improvement objectives; (c) a description of the strategic initiatives the district will undertake to achieve its improvement objectives; and (d) performance benchmarks and processes for evaluating the effect of district improvement initiatives. Also the plan shall describe the professional development activities that will support each district improvement initiative and the teacher induction and mentoring activities that will be undertaken to support successful implementation of the district’s improvement efforts.

On an annual basis, not later than September 1 of each year, each district shall prepare and have available for state review an annual action plan. The district annual action plan shall enumerate the specific activities, persons responsible, and timelines for action to be taken as part of the strategic initiatives set forth in the district’s 3 year improvement plan, and shall identify the staff and financial resources allocated to support these initiatives.

Annually, the principal of each school, in consultation with the school council established pursuant to this section, shall adopt student performance goals for the schools consistent with the school performance goals established by the department of education pursuant to state and federal law and regulations and, consistent with any educational policies established for the district shall assess the needs of the school in light of those goals and formulate a school plan to

advance such goals and improve student performance. The school's plan to support improved student performance shall include, but not be limited to, the same components required for district improvement plans and shall conform to department and district specifications to ensure that such school improvement plans meet state and federal law requirements. Each school improvement plan shall be submitted to the superintendent for review and approval not later than July 1, of the year in which the plan is to be implemented according to a plan development and review schedule established by the district superintendent. Upon request of the school committee, copies of the plans shall be made available to the committee for review in order to ensure consistency with the 3-year district improvement plan and the district annual action plan; provided, however, that the superintendent shall have the final approval authority of all school improvement plans.

The 3-year comprehensive district plan, annual district action plan and annual school improvement plan shall replace any district and school plans previously required under the education reform including, but not limited to, the school improvement plans required by section 59C of chapter 71, the provisional educator program plan required by section 38G of chapter 71, the professional development plan required by section 38Q of chapter 71, the curriculum accommodation plan required by section 38Q½ of chapter 71, the MCAS success plan, if any, required under this section and any other report or plan called for by the General Laws or regulation, which, in the professional opinion of the commissioner, would be most effectively presented as part of the coordinated district or school plan for improving student achievement. The department shall identify any additional reports or plans called for by any general law or regulation which can be incorporated into this single filing in order to reduce paperwork and eliminate duplication.

Each school district in which more than 20 per cent of the students score below level two on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System exam, in this paragraph called MCAS, shall submit an MCAS success plan to the department. The plan shall describe the school district's strategies for helping each student to master the skills, competencies and knowledge required for the competency determination described in subparagraph (i) of the fourth paragraph of section 1D. The department shall determine the elements that shall be required to be included in such plan. These elements may include, but are not limited to, the following: (a) a plan to assess each student's strengths, weaknesses and needs; (b) a plan to use summer school, after school and other additional support to provide each child with the assistance needed; and (c) a plan for involving the parents of students as described in said subparagraph (i) of said fourth paragraph of said section 1D. The department shall examine each district's plan and determine if it has a reasonable prospect of significantly reducing the school district's failure rates. The department shall coordinate oversight of the MCAS success plans with existing audit and oversight functions and with the MCAS grant program.

Each school district shall file a report with the department every year by a date and in a format determined by the board. Said report shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- (a) an outline of the curriculum and graduation requirements of the district;
- (b) pupil/teacher ratios and class size policy and practice;
- (c) teacher and administrator evaluation procedures;

- (d) statistics, policies, and procedures relative to truancy and dropouts;
- (e) statistics, policies, and procedures relative to expulsions and in-school and out-of-school suspensions;
- (f) percent of school-age children attending public schools;
- (g) racial composition of teaching and administrative staff;
- (h) enrollment and average daily attendance;
- (i) the annual budgets and expenditures for both the district and the individual schools in the district.

Each school district shall file a description of the following instructional procedures and programs with the department every year:

- (a) art and music programs;
- (b) technology education;
- (c) programs for gifted and talented students;
- (d) adult education programs;
- (e) library and media facilities;
- (f) condition of instructional materials including textbooks, workbooks, audio-visual materials, and laboratory materials;
- (g) types and condition of computers and computer software;
- (h) basic skills remediation programs;
- (i) drug, tobacco and alcohol abuse programs;
- (j) multi-cultural education training for students and teachers; and
- (k) global education.

Each school district and charter school shall file an annual report for the current school year regarding implementation of chapter 71B with the department every November 1 first in a format determined by the board. The report shall include, but not be limited to, the following:—

- (a) the number of children receiving services pursuant to said chapter 71B within each disability category as set forth in section 1 of said chapter 71B;

(b) the number of children, by grade level, within each such disability category and the costs of services provided by each such category for such children receiving their education in a publicly operated day school program;

(c) the number of children, by grade level, within each such disability category and the costs of services provided by each such category for such children receiving their education in a private day setting;

(d) the number of children, by grade level, within each such disability category and the costs of services provided by each such category for such children receiving their education in a private residential setting;

(e) the number of children who remain in the regular education program full time; the number of children who are removed from the regular classroom for up to 25 per cent of the day; the number of children who are removed from the regular classroom between 25 and 60 per cent of the day;

(f) the number of children who are placed in substantially separate classrooms on a regular education school site;

(g) the number of children, ages three and four, who are educated in integrated and separate classrooms; and the assignment by sex, national origin, economic status, race and religion, of children by age level to special education classes and the distribution of children residing in the district by sex, national origin, economic status, race and religion of children by age level; and

(h) the number of children, by grade level, receiving special education services who have limited English proficiency.

Each school district and charter school shall furnish in a timely manner such additional information as the department shall request.

Each school district shall furnish to the department in a timely manner such additional information as the department shall request.

Each school district required to provide an English language learners program under chapter 71A shall file the following information with the department annually:

(a) the type of English language learners programs provided;

(b) with regard to limited English proficient students (i) the number enrolled in each type of English language learners program; (ii) the number enrolled in English as a second language who are not enrolled in another English language learners program; (iii) the results of basic skills, curriculum assessment, achievement and language proficiency testing, whether administered in English or in the native language; (iv) the absentee, suspension, expulsion, dropout and promotion rates; and (v) the number of years each limited English proficient student has been enrolled in an English language learners program;

- (c) the number of students each year who have enrolled in institutions of higher education and were formerly enrolled in an English language learners program;
- (d) the academic progress in regular education of students who have completed an English language learners program;
- (e) for each limited English proficient student receiving special education, the number of years in the school district prior to special education evaluation and the movement in special education programs by program placement;
- (f) the number of limited English proficient students enrolled in programs of occupational or vocational education;
- (g) the name, national origin, native language, certificates held, language proficiency, grade levels and subjects taught by each teacher of an English language learners program, bilingual aides or paraprofessionals, bilingual guidance or adjustment counselors and bilingual school psychologists;
- (h) the per pupil expenditures for each full time equivalent student enrolled in an English language learners program;
- (i) the sources and amounts of all funds expended on students enrolled in English language learners programs, broken down by local, state and federal sources, and whether any such funds expended supplanted, rather than supplemented, the local school district obligation; the participation of parents through parent advisory councils; and
- (j) whether there were any complaints filed with any federal or state court or administrative agency, since the program's inception, concerning the compliance with federal or state minimum legal requirements; the disposition of such complaint and the monitoring and evaluation of any such agreement or court order relative to such complaint.

Said information shall be filed in the form of the total for the school district as well as categorized by school, grade and language.

The commissioner annually shall analyze and publish data reported by school districts under this section regarding English language learners programs and limited English proficient students. Publication shall include, but need not be limited to, availability on the department's worldwide web site. The commissioner shall submit annually a report to the joint committee on education, arts and humanities on such data on a statewide and school district basis, including, but not limited to, by language group and type of English language learners program.