

OFFICE OF STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

English Learner Program Evaluation Toolkit



INDIANA
DEPARTMENT of
EDUCATION

Using the English Learner Program Evaluation Toolkit

The Indiana Department of Education's (IDOE's) *English Learner Program Evaluation Toolkit* is designed to support local education agencies (LEAs) as they evaluate the effectiveness of local English learner (EL) programs. For a more comprehensive evaluation, IDOE recommends that programs be evaluated as a corporation, enabling analysis of student achievement and progress from preschool access to graduation and beyond. If a corporation-wide evaluation is not conducted, this toolkit is also appropriate for school-based program evaluations.

LEAs are encouraged to appoint one member of the evaluation team as the evaluation coordinator. The evaluation coordinator may delegate certain tasks, but will be responsible for meeting coordination, data collection, and oversight of the evaluation timeline. The evaluation coordinator is encouraged to review all provided training materials provided by IDOE and connect evaluation team members with resources according to their roles and needs.

The evaluation process will vary in length and scope according to local context, but IDOE recommends that LEAs plan to complete the first six steps of the evaluation over a period of *at least eight weeks* to allow adequate time to collect data, solicit stakeholder input, research evidence-based strategies, and develop a comprehensive plan of action. The final two steps of the evaluation will be conducted over the course of *the school year* on an ongoing basis. IDOE recommends that LEAs conduct a comprehensive program evaluation once every three years, with annual interim evaluations of success. A suggested timeline for program evaluation is provided below:

Evaluation Task	Estimated Time Needed
Step 1: Assembling the Evaluation Team	Two weeks
Step 2: Gathering Data	Three to four weeks
Step 3: Defining the Current State	Half- or full-day in-person meeting*
Step 4: Identifying Needs	Half- or full-day in-person meeting*
Step 5: Setting Goals	Half- or full-day in-person meeting*
Step 6: Developing a Plan of Action	Half- or full-day in-person meeting*
Step 7: Implementing the Plan of Action	Determined by evaluation team
Step 8: Evaluating Success	Six to nine months after implementation; and annually thereafter

*LEAs should allow for sufficient time for reflection, additional stakeholder review, and supplemental data analysis and research between Steps 3 and 6. For example, teams may conduct Steps 3 and 4 in a single, full-day meeting, then conduct Steps 5 and 6 in a second follow-up meeting a few weeks later. Sample agendas are included in Appendix A.

English Learner Programs: Why Evaluate?

In *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981), the Fifth Circuit Court ruled that simply providing an English language development program as required by *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) may not be sufficient to meet the unique needs of ELs. *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981) established a three-part test to evaluate the adequacy of EL programs. Under *Castañeda* [648 F.2d 989 (5th Cir., 1981)], LEAs must provide ELs with English language development programs that are:

- Based on sound educational theory.
- Provided with staff and resources in a manner “reasonably calculated” for program success.
- Evaluated regularly and revised where needed “to ensure language barriers are actually being overcome.”

The implementation of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in 2015 increased accountability for LEAs as they provide ELs with evidence-based English language development programs that ensure meaningful access to rigorous college- and career-ready academic standards. With a new separate federal accountability indicator measuring English language progress and EL student population performance as a determining factor in school improvement status for targeted and comprehensive support and improvement schools, EL achievement moved into the national spotlight.

As the number of ELs in classrooms across the nation continues to increase, schools must respond quickly to meet the unique linguistic, academic, and wellness needs of this ever-changing student population. With the *English Learner Program Evaluation Toolkit*, IDOE seeks to support LEAs as they conduct comprehensive, collaborative evaluations of their EL programs to identify areas of needed improvement and effectively enact revisions to strengthen EL achievement.

Step 1: Assembling the Evaluation Team

To effectively evaluate the EL program, key stakeholders must lead and contribute to the process. While each local context may vary, the following guidance addresses ideal team composition for corporation-wide and/or school-wide program evaluation. Take note of the team size and determine if having assigned roles will help move the work forward most effectively and meaningfully. An example corporation and school team organizer is included in Appendix A.

Corporation-Wide Evaluation Teams	School-Wide Evaluation Teams
<p>Team Members: These staff members should commit to fully engaging in the evaluation process as a collaborative and results-focused committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Corporation EL Director ● EL teachers/coaches ● Building-Level Principals (at least one elementary and one secondary) ● Elementary and Secondary Instructional Coaches ● Content Area teachers (for elementary, at least one primary and one upper elementary for secondary, at least two teachers from different content areas) ● Curriculum Director ● Title I Director and Key Title I staff ● Corporation Family Engagement Director (if applicable) 	<p>Team Members: These staff members should commit to fully engaging in the evaluation process as a collaborative and results-focused committee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Corporation EL Director ● Principal/Assistant Principal ● Instructional Coach ● All EL teachers ● Content Area teachers (for elementary, at least one primary and one upper elementary, for secondary, at least two teachers from different content areas) ● Title I teacher (if applicable) ● Family Engagement staff (if applicable)
<p>Contributing Staff: These staff members will contribute feedback and data for the evaluation process, and depending on local context, may or may not be members of the evaluation team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent ● Special Education Director ● Assessment/Data Director ● Finance Director 	<p>Contributing Staff: These staff members will need to contribute input and data for the evaluation process, and depending on local context, may or may not be members of the evaluation team.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● School Counselor ● Assessment/Data Coordinator ● Special Education Teacher ● EL Support Staff

Further Consideration: Consider how the team could engage community stakeholders in this work. For instance, when might it be appropriate to include parents or other community partners in the work? In some communities, it might be best to involve stakeholders from the very beginning. In other locations, it might be best to include stakeholders later in the process during goal setting or plan review.

Step 2(a): Gathering Data

Evaluation of the EL program should be rooted in the analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. To accurately assess the current and desired state of the program, data should include local and [state data](#) for both ELs and the general student population, as well as other overlapping populations (e.g., free and reduced lunch, special education). Comprehensive evaluation of the EL program will address each of the evaluation areas below. Data should be collected at both the school and corporation level for teams conducting either a school-wide or corporation-wide program evaluation where available. Data should additionally be gathered for analysis for at **least the past**

three years, as applicable. Appendix C contains a chart of common places to find the following data points, as well as individuals to contact who may have access to the information.

EL Student Population

- Total number of ELs by school and grade level.
- Descriptions of how ELs are identified and placed in classes.
- EL proficiency levels per grade level.
- Average number of years in EL program (i.e., years to attain proficiency).
- Languages spoken by ELs.

Equitable Representation:

- Number and percentage of ELs and overall student population enrolled at elementary, middle, and high school. Where possible, gather data by language/ethnicity, as well.
- Number and percentage of ELs and overall student population identified for special education.
- Number and percentage of ELs and overall student population retained at least one year.
- Number and percentage of ELs and overall student population identified for high ability programming.
- Number and percentage of ELs and overall student population enrolled in school/corporation pre-kindergarten (Pre-K) programs, where applicable.
- Number and percentage of ELs and overall student population enrolled in Advanced Placement (or equivalent) courses.
- Number and percentage of ELs and overall student population taking the ACT/SAT or other college entrance exam.
- Attendance data for ELs and overall student population.
- Behavior referrals, suspensions, and expulsions for ELs and overall student population.
- Educator demographics: language and ethnicity data for school and corporation faculty and staff.

Academic Achievement:

- Proficiency and growth data for all current ELs, former ELs, and the overall student population on ILEARN, IREAD-3, and WIDA ACCESS.
- Grade-level performance and growth data for all current ELs, former ELs, and the overall student population on local formative assessments.
- Four-year graduation rate for ELs, former ELs, and the overall student population.
- If available, EL rate of enrollment in postsecondary educational institutions compared to general student population.

Elementary/Secondary Programming:

- Master building schedule and EL services schedule.
- Curriculum map for all grades (general education curriculum and EL curriculum outline, where applicable).
- Master list of EL students and EL staff by building.

- Copy of school/corporation EL Plan (submitted to IDOE each fall, either as a separate submission or within the pre-application for federal funding).
- Feedback regarding program implementation, service delivery, or access to programs.

Professional Learning and Teacher Capacity:

- Master list of all staff who work with ELs (e.g., EL program staff and general education, special education, and other staff members with ELs in their classrooms).
- List of all staff in school/corporation with Indiana English as a New Language (ENL) license. Licensure information for all EL program teachers and staff.
- Teacher and staff evaluation records for all EL program staff.
- School and corporation professional development calendar/plan for previous three years, including sign-in sheets or other staff attendance data.
- EL staff professional development (PD) calendar/plan for previous three years.
- Schedules for staff development and collaboration time (e.g., professional learning communities).
- Comments from staff regarding professional learning (e.g., feedback surveys).

Family Engagement:

- Family/parent survey results where applicable (EL-specific or otherwise).
- Master schedule of all parent/family engagement activities, both formal and informal (e.g., meet-the-teacher night, parent-teacher conferences). This should include both EL-specific and general family engagement activities.
- Attendance documentation (e.g. sign-in sheets) from EL-specific and general family engagement activities.
- Translation and interpretation policy.

Resource Allocation:

- State and federal grant allocations and application budgets for previous three years (including Title I, Title II, Title III, Non-English Speaking Program (NESP), and other relevant funding streams).
- Report of actual expended amounts for years of Title III and NESP funding.
- Data regarding spending per student for ELs and general education students.

Step 2(b): Reviewing the Federal Program Evaluation Toolkit

The U.S. Department of Education provides additional resources including the [EL Program Evaluation Toolkit](#), [Evaluation Matters](#), and [Regional Educational Laboratory \(REL\) Program Evaluation Toolkit](#). Completion and/or use of these resources is not required, but may help steer data analysis, deepen questions, and target areas of improvement.

Step 3: Defining the Current State

After gathering quantitative and qualitative data for each evaluation area, the entire program evaluation team will conduct an in-depth analysis of the school- and corporation-level data to identify current gaps and clearly define the state of the program in each area. Depending on the size of the evaluation team and the amount of time available for this step of the evaluation, the team may either analyze each program area jointly or divide the different areas for analysis by smaller groups of evaluation team members. In either case, the entire team should have the opportunity to review and consent to the defined current states drafted in this phase of the evaluation.

The definition of the current state for each program area should be 3-5 sentences long and should cite specific data to define any observed achievement or opportunity gaps, as well as identified areas of strength. See Appendix A for an exemplar document for Step 3 and Appendix B for Driving Questions.

Evaluation Area	Current State
Equitable Representation	
Academic Achievement	
Elementary/Secondary Programming	
Professional Learning and Teacher Capacity	
Family Engagement	
Resource Allocation	

Step 4: Identifying Needs

After the evaluation team has analyzed data to define the current state for each of the evaluation areas, the team will identify the specific program needs in each area. As in Step 3, the team may either develop need statements for each area jointly or assign the different areas to smaller groups of evaluation team members. In either case, the entire team should have the opportunity to review and consent to the need statements drafted in this step of the evaluation process

Need statements should be rooted in data and clearly aligned to the gaps identified during Step 3 of the program evaluation. Need statements should typically be one to two sentences in length, although teams may identify two to three need statements for each evaluation area. See Appendix A for an exemplar document for Step 4 and Appendix B for Driving Questions.

Evaluation Area	Need Statement
Equitable Representation	
Academic Achievement	
Elementary/Secondary Programming	
Professional Learning and Teacher Capacity	
Family Engagement	
Resource Allocation	

After developing need statements for each evaluation area, the evaluation team is encouraged to share the drafted need statements with a broader group of stakeholders (corporation leadership, classroom teachers, EL program support staff, EL families, etc.) for review and revision before continuing to Step 5 of the program evaluation. The team should also identify any additional data needed after this step of the evaluation process.

Step 5: Setting Goals

After defining the needs of the EL program in each of the evaluation areas, the evaluation team will convene to set goals for program improvement. Although needs were identified in all program evaluation areas in Step 4, evaluation teams are encouraged to select one to three program evaluation areas for goal setting.

The evaluation team will revisit data and evaluation team input from Steps 2 through 4 to determine which evaluation areas will be prioritized for program improvement. The team will then develop specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely [\(SMART\) goals](#) to address the priority evaluation areas. At least one SMART goal should be developed for each priority evaluation area for a total of three to five SMART goals. The team should also define attainment of each SMART goal, including what data will be collected to measure progress toward attainment.

Priority Evaluation Area 1
SMART Goal 1:
How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 1?
SMART Goal 2 (Optional):
How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 2?
SMART Goal 3 (Optional):
How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 3?

Priority Evaluation Area 2	
SMART Goal 1:	
How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 1?	
SMART Goal 2 (Optional):	
How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 2?	
SMART Goal 3 (Optional):	
How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 3?	

Priority Evaluation Area 3	
SMART Goal 1:	
How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 1?	
SMART Goal 2 (Optional):	
How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 2?	
SMART Goal 3 (Optional):	
How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 3?	

Step 6: Developing a Plan of Action

After developing SMART Goals to address identified high priority areas of need, the evaluation team will select two to four evidence-based strategies to address each SMART goal. Strategies may include professional learning initiatives, language-based instructional programs, instructional strategies, or other program-wide practices to be implemented.

When developing the plan of action, the evaluation team should provide a brief rationale for each selected strategy outlining the evidence base for the selected practice. The evaluation team should also consider all needed resources, including funding, staff time, and supplemental external materials. The evaluation team should also determine who will be the lead responsible for carrying out or overseeing each strategy and when implementation of the strategy is projected to begin. Next, the evaluation team will define how achievement of the SMART goal will be evaluated.

SMART Goal 1:			Priority Evaluation Area:	
Strategy	Rationale	Resources Needed	Staff Responsible	Target Start Date
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				
How will the achievement of SMART Goal 1 be evaluated?				

SMART Goal 2:			Priority Evaluation Area:	
Strategy	Rationale	Resources Needed	Staff Responsible	Target Start Date
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				
How will the achievement of SMART Goal 2 be evaluated?				

SMART Goal 3:			Priority Evaluation Area:	
Strategy	Rationale	Resources Needed	Staff Responsible	Target Start Date
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				
How will the achievement of SMART Goal 3 be evaluated?				

SMART Goal 4 (Optional):			Priority Evaluation Area:	
Strategy	Rationale	Resources Needed	Staff Responsible	Target Start Date
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				
How will the achievement of SMART Goal 4 be evaluated?				

SMART Goal 5 (Optional):			Priority Evaluation Area:	
Strategy	Rationale	Resources Needed	Staff Responsible	Target Start Date
Strategy 1:				
Strategy 2:				
Strategy 3 (Optional):				
Strategy 4 (Optional):				
How will the achievement of SMART Goal 5 be evaluated?				

Step 7: Implementing the Plan of Action

After developing the plan of action, the evaluation team and evaluation coordinator are responsible for implementing the plan, along with any other designated staff members who will enact evidence-based strategies selected in Step 6. The following questions should be used to guide initial implementation, revisited at six weeks, and at each implementation meeting thereafter.

How will the evaluation results and plan of action be communicated with administrators, teachers, families, and other key stakeholder groups? When will this information be shared?

What additional steps must be taken to enact selected strategies (e.g., secure approval from school board, request amendment for budgeted grant funds, procure curricular materials)?

What additional training is needed to enact selected evidence-based strategies effectively? Who will provide this training? When will the training be provided?

What additional data need to be collected to track progress toward SMART goals and effectiveness of selected strategies? How will these data be collected? Who will be responsible for tracking this data?

When will the evaluation team meet next? Who will lead the next check-in meeting? Who will be expected to attend?

Note: IDOE recommends that the evaluation team meets after the first six weeks of implementation to address any concerns or barriers to full implementation and at least once every three months for the duration of the first school year of implementation.

Step 8: Evaluating Success

Evaluation is an ongoing process and is most impactful when it occurs regularly and proactively. IDOE recommends that LEAs conduct a comprehensive evaluation of their EL programs once every three years. Step 7 concludes the comprehensive program evaluation process, but Step 8 maximizes impact by continually assessing progress and adapting the plan of action to program needs. The evaluation team should meet once after the first six weeks of implementation to address any barriers to full implementation and at least once every three months during the first school year of implementation.

After the initial implementation period, the evaluation team should meet at least once annually to formally analyze data and assess progress toward SMART goals as an interim program evaluation. The interim evaluation template provided below is intended to guide evaluation teams as they seek to continuously improve their EL programs. When revising the plan of action, evaluation teams are encouraged to preserve the fidelity of the comprehensive evaluation findings and ensure that any changes align to the priority focus areas and work toward the SMART goals defined during the comprehensive program evaluation.

Interim Evaluation Date:	
Evaluation Team Members Present:	
<p>SMART Goal 1:</p> <p>What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 1? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.</p> <p>Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 1 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 1?</p>	

<p>SMART Goal 2:</p> <p>What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 2? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.</p> <p>Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 2 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 2?</p>	

SMART Goal 3:

What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 3? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.

Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 3 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 3?

SMART Goal 4 (Optional):

What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 4? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.

Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 4 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 4?

SMART Goal 5 (Optional):

What progress has been made toward attainment of SMART Goal 5? Cite specific quantitative and qualitative data demonstrating progress.

Review evidence-based strategies selected to address SMART Goal 5 in Step 6 of the comprehensive evaluation. Are all strategies being implemented with fidelity? Do any strategies need to be revised? Do additional strategies need to be implemented to meet SMART Goal 5?

What additional resources are needed to enact all selected strategies with fidelity and ensure all SMART Goals are met?

What additional data need to be collected to track progress more effectively?

When will the evaluation team meet next? Who will lead the next check-in meeting? Who will be expected to attend?

Appendix A - Exemplar Documents

Sample Agenda - In-Person Meeting for Steps 3 and 4

Time	Task
8:00 - 8:05 a.m.	Welcome and Intros
8:05 - 8:20 a.m.	Agenda and Intro to EL Program Evaluation Process
8:20 - 8:30 a.m.	Review of Steps 1-2; Introduce Step 3
8:30 - 8:35 a.m.	Split into review teams and assign areas
8:35 - 8:55 a.m.	Review Data Protocol and Practice Phase 1: Predict
8:55 - 9:20 a.m.	Phase 2: Go Visual
9:20 - 9:50 a.m.	Phase 3: Observe
9:50 - 10:00 a.m.	Break
10:00 - 10:20 a.m.	Discuss with one other evaluation area group and provide feedback
10:20 - 10:40 a.m.	Groups Draft Current State Statements
10:40 - 11:15 a.m.	Groups Present Data and Current State Statements
11:15 - 11:30 a.m.	Return to groups and revise Current State Statements
11:30 a.m. - 12:45 p.m.	Lunch
12:45 - 1:00 p.m.	Finalize Step 3: Current States (Review with Large Group)
1:00 - 1:30 p.m.	Begin Step 4: Identifying Needs Phase 4: Infer/Question
1:30 - 2:00 p.m.	Draft Need Statements
2:00 - 2:15 p.m.	Needs Gallery Walk
2:15 - 2:30 p.m.	Revise Need Statements
2:30 - 2:45 p.m.	Review and finalize Need Statements
2:45 - 3:00 p.m.	Next Steps (Preview Step 5), Conclusion Survey, Dismiss

Sample Agenda - In-Person Meeting for Steps 5, 6, and 7

Time	Task
8:00 - 8:05 a.m.	Welcome and Intro
8:05 - 8:10 a.m.	Overview of EL Program Evaluation Process
8:10 - 8:30 a.m.	Review of Steps 1-4
8:30 - 8:45 a.m.	Review of Teacher Input
8:45 - 9:00 a.m.	Any needed changes to Steps 3 and 4?
9:00 - 9:10 a.m.	Select and finalize priority evaluation areas.
9:10 - 9:15 a.m.	Introduce goal setting: SMART goal teaching.
9:15 - 10:05 a.m.	Draft SMART Goals
10:05 - 10:15 a.m.	BREAK
10:15 - 10:50 a.m.	Gallery Walk Review of SMART Goals
10:50 - 11:00 a.m.	Return to groups and revise goals
11:00 - 11:15 a.m.	Review and finalize Step 5
11:15 - 11:30 a.m.	Intro Step 6: Plan of Action and Supporting Resources
11:30 a.m. - 12:45 p.m.	Lunch
12:45 - 1:30 p.m.	Develop Plan of Action
1:30 - 2:00 p.m.	Review and give feedback on Plan of Action
2:00 - 2:15 p.m.	Finalize Plan of Action
2:15- 2:45 p.m.	Whole Group: Step 7 Planning
2:45 - 3:00 p.m.	Next Steps, Feedback Survey, Dismiss

EL Program Evaluation Corporation Team Organizer

Title	Name	Attendance
Corporation EL Director		
Building-Level Principal		
EL Teachers/Coaches		
Elementary Instructional Coach		
Secondary Instructional Coach		
Content Area Teacher		
Content Area Teacher		
Content Area Teacher		
Curriculum Director		
Title I Director		
Corporation Family Engagement Director		
Superintendent*		
Special Education Director*		
Assessment/Data Director*		
Finance Director*		

***Contributing Staff:** These staff members will contribute feedback and data for the evaluation process, and, depending on local context, may or may not be members of the evaluation team

EL Program Evaluation School Team Organizer

Title	Name	Attendance
Corporation EL Director		
Principal		
Assistant Principal		
Instructional Coach		
EL Teacher		
EL Teacher		
EL Teacher		
Content Area Teacher		
Content Area Teacher		
Title I Teacher		
Family Engagement Staff		
School Counselor*		
Assessment/Data Coordinator*		
Special Education Teacher*		
EL Support Staff*		
EL Support Staff*		

***Contributing Staff:** These staff members will contribute feedback and data for the evaluation process, and, depending on local context, may or may not be members of the evaluation team

Exemplar - Step 3: Defining the Current State

Considerations:

- Current state statements for each area are three to five sentences long (maximum).
- Current state statements objectively record current realities, citing data when possible.

Equitable Representation

In ABC Schools, 24% of EL students are identified for special education, compared to 14.78% at the state level. Compared to state-level EL school attendance (95.6%), ABC Schools' EL attendance rate is higher (97.1%). Only 62% of ABC Schools students are white, while over 95% of certified staff are white. 61 languages are spoken by ABC Schools ELs, with 72% speaking Spanish.

Academic Achievement

Despite seeing growth in state testing from academic years 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 (IREAD-3 +8%), grade 10 ISTEP+ (+4%), and grades 3-8 ISTEP+ E/LA (+2.5%) there is still a significant gap between EL and non-EL populations on all major state assessments.

Elementary and Secondary Programming

All EL students receive a wide range of services/supports across all grades, and programming and placement varies by building. Services include both push-in and pull-out supports. At the elementary level, students are pulled out for EL services during student intervention periods.

Professional Learning and Teacher Capacity

While EL teachers in the corporation attend four to five training events a year, less than 10% of other teachers reported receiving any training in EL strategies or interpreting WIDA scores for their students when surveyed.

Family Engagement

We've increased our focus on engagement yet do not know results due to lack of data tracking in this area. EL teachers and instructional support staff typically provide interpretation and translation support during the school day.

Resource Allocation

Communication between corporation and building level administrators during grant planning rarely occurs, and funds are largely uncoordinated across programs.

Exemplar - Step 4: Identifying Needs

Considerations:

- Need statements are rooted in data and clearly aligned to any gaps identified in Step 3: Defining the Current State.
- Need statements are one to two sentences long.
- Data teams may include one to three need statements for each evaluation area.

Equitable Representation

We need to more accurately identify EL students who have disabilities in order to reduce disproportionality in special education identification for ELs.

Academic Achievement

We need to identify multiple ways to measure student growth (student wellness, academic achievement, language development), including ways that do not require English proficiency to assess.

We need to increase individual EL student growth in ELA and math proficiency scores, particularly on grades 6-8 ILEARN assessments.

Elementary and Secondary Programming

We need to ensure that students at all proficiency and grade levels (elementary, middle, high) receive direct EL services, and that additional support is available to EL students who exhibit a need for more intensive programming. We need to better define and communicate our EL programming structure.

We need to track data (WIDA ACCESS, corporation formative assessments, ILEARN, etc.) at each level (elementary, middle, high) for a more detailed analysis of student achievement across different schools within our corporation.

Professional Learning and Teacher Capacity

We need a shared understanding of the role of the EL teachers, classroom teachers, instructional support staff, counselors, social workers, and administrators in providing EL services and carrying out the EL program.

We need to collect quantitative and qualitative data on professional development and teacher capacity to better monitor our progress and identify needs.

Family Engagement

We need to identify and respond to barriers families might be facing to access their school and community (research community resources and coordinate efforts).

We need a systematic method to collect data and evidence of family engagement (including clear ownership of data collection).

Resource Allocation

We need to coordinate efforts with grant funding to benefit all students.

We need to identify financial needs and increase communication between schools and corporation level.

Exemplar - Step 5: Setting Goals

After reviewing teacher feedback on Steps 3 and 4, the evaluation team will develop [SMART goals](#) to address the priority evaluation areas. At least one SMART goal should be developed for each priority evaluation area for a total of three to five SMART goals. The team should also define attainment of each SMART goal, including what data will be collected to measure progress toward attainment.

Priority Evaluation Area 1: Elementary/Secondary Programming

SMART Goal 1:

Every EL at ABC Schools will receive services aligned to their individual language needs and provided or directly overseen by a certified EL teacher.

How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 1?

We will create and track a master list of EL students and service schedules in the corporation, and will review annually to ensure equity of services across all schools.

SMART Goal 2:

Every certified staff member will demonstrate knowledge of the EL program at ABC Schools and will be able to communicate how and why students receive services (and how to advocate for students who need more or different support, as needed).

How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 2?

- Quarterly checks for understanding
- Teacher interviews and surveys

Priority Evaluation Area 2: Professional Learning and Teacher Capacity**SMART Goal 1:**

Each school will build capacity and develop understandings of second language acquisition for all certified teachers based on evidence of student and staff needs.

How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 1?

- Professional Learning Community (PLC) Notes
- EL team will lead and share building-level progress during corporation EL collaboration meetings
- EL teacher will develop a building-level cohort made up of classroom teachers, instructional support staff, and administrators who will work within the structure of a PLC
- Staff surveys

Priority Evaluation Area 3: Equitable Representation**SMART Goal 1:**

The rate of special education identification of ELs at ABC Schools will be within 3% of the state rate by 2022.

How will we know we have attained SMART Goal 1?

Review of disproportionality data

Special education teacher, EL teacher, and school psychologist data analysis and review

Review of clarified procedures for identification of ELs with disabilities at the corporation level

Exemplar - Step 6: Developing a Plan of Action

After developing SMART Goals to address identified high priority areas of need, the evaluation team will select two to four evidence-based strategies to address each SMART goal. Strategies may include professional learning initiatives, language-based instructional programs, instructional strategies, or other program-wide practices to be implemented.

When developing the plan of action, the evaluation team should provide a brief rationale for each selected strategy outlining the evidence base for the selected practice. The evaluation team should also consider all needed resources, including funding, staff time, and supplemental external materials. The evaluation team should also determine who will be the lead responsible for carrying out or overseeing each strategy and when implementation of the strategy is projected to begin and be completed. Next, the evaluation team will define how achievement of the SMART goal will be evaluated.

SMART Goal 1: Every EL at ABC Schools will receive services aligned to their individual language needs and provided or directly overseen by a certified EL teacher.			Priority Evaluation Area: Elementary/Secondary Programming		
Strategy	Rationale	Resources Needed	Staff Responsible	Target Start Date	Target Completion Date
Strategy 1: Develop a framework for EL instructional programming with a sample recommended service schedule for elementary, middle, and high school students at all levels of English language proficiency.	This is necessary to move ABC Schools into compliance with our federal civil rights requirements for EL programming. Differentiated services and supports will rely on regular analysis of English language proficiency and academic proficiency growth	-Program and service model definitions -EL teacher -Schedules -Master list of EL students by grade level, proficiency	EL Teachers Building-Level and Corporation-Level Administrators	October 2019	January 2020

	and national research on EL program models.	level, and building			
Strategy 2: Develop clearly-defined process for EL representation, identification, and support within the ABC Schools multi-tiered system of support (MTSS).	The evidence base for MTSS for all students is extensive, and our work will rely on EL and MTSS expertise in the development of our framework.	- WIDA RTI for ELs resource - ABC Schools MTSS & EL Framework	EL Collaborative Team, admins, counselors, and teachers	January 2019	March 2020
Strategy 3: Provide a pathway for EL teachers at ABC Schools who do not yet hold their Indiana ENL license to begin coursework in an approved educator preparation program.	This is necessary to move ABC Schools into compliance with IDOE EL teacher of record requirements and our federal civil rights requirements for teacher qualifications.	- Funding for teacher coursework (Title I, Title II, Title III, NESP, Local) -University partnership	EL collaborative team, admins, counselors, and teachers	October 2019	May 2022
<p>How will the achievement of SMART Goal 1 be evaluated?</p> <p>We will create and track a master list of EL students and service schedules in the corporation, and will review annually with the EL team and building-level administrators to ensure equity of services across all schools. We will use annual and interim assessment data (especially WIDA ACCESS growth data) to assess program effectiveness and make revisions to the program as needed. By the school year 2022-2023, all EL teachers will meet IDOE EL teacher of record requirements.</p>					

<p>SMART Goal 2: Every certified staff member will demonstrate knowledge of the EL program at ABC Schools and will be able to communicate how and why</p>	<p>Priority Evaluation Area: Elementary/Secondary Programming</p>
--	--

students receive services (and how to advocate for students who need more or different support, as needed).					
Strategy	Rationale	Resources Needed	Staff Responsible	Target Start Date	Target Completion Date
<p>Strategy 1: Clearly define EL programming and structure at ABC Schools, including roles and responsibilities of EL teachers, classroom teachers, and other stakeholders at all grade levels and in all contexts (including special education, related arts, etc.).</p>	<p>This step is an important foundational safeguard to ensure that all educators at ABC Schools understand federal requirements for ELs and their role in meeting them. Additionally, this ensures equity across buildings within our corporation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -IDOE EL Guidebook -Framework from Goal #1 -Strategy #1 -ABC Schools Special Education Framework 	<p>EL team and building-level administrators</p>	<p>January 2020</p>	<p>March 2020</p>
<p>Strategy 2: Communicate and provide training to certified staff through various modes and resources (video explanation, in-person meeting options, website, email, highlighted in program newsletter, etc.).</p>	<p>Various modes of communication will ensure comprehension and retention of information for all learning styles represented.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -EL Guidebook -Communication tools (e.g. learning management system) 	<p>EL Director, Curriculum Director, administrator, and EL Collab</p>	<p>March 2020</p>	<p>Throughout 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 school years.</p>
<p>How will the achievement of SMART Goal 2 be evaluated? Quarterly checks for understanding conducted at building-level. Teacher interviews and surveys administered annually (twice annually during first year of implementation).</p>					

SMART Goal 3: Each school will build capacity and develop understandings of second language acquisition for all certified teachers based on evidence of student and staff needs.			Priority Evaluation Area: Professional Learning and Teacher Capacity		
Strategy	Rationale	Resources Needed	Staff Responsible	Target Start Date	Target Completion Date
Strategy 1: EL collaborative teacher will establish a building-level EL cohort made up of classroom teachers, instructional support staff, and administrators who will work within the structure of a PLC.	Collaboration builds collective efficacy across the building; guiding responsive decision-making & flexibility & building staff capacity.	-Dedicated PLC time for EL cohort -Yearlong PLC meeting schedule and staff in-service schedule	Building-level administrators Instructional coaches EL teachers EL cohort members	January 2020	Ongoing
Strategy 2: The EL building-level cohort will collect and analyze evidence of student learning, including academic, social emotional, family, and culture, to develop a plan for EL collaboration meetings and training for all staff.	Collaboration builds collective efficacy across the building and supports students holistically.	-Survey or assessment to determine student and staff needs	Building-level EL cohort members	January 2020	Ongoing, but with initial collection and analysis completed by May 2020.
How will the achievement of SMART Goal 3 be evaluated? Professional Learning Community (PLC) notes. EL team will lead and share building-level progress during corporation EL collaboration meetings. Building-level cohorts made up of classroom teachers, instructional support staff, and administrators will share progress annually and convene with other building-level EL cohorts across the corporation.					

Exemplar - Step 7: Implementing the Plan of Action

After developing the plan of action, the evaluation team and evaluation coordinator are responsible for implementing the plan, along with any other designated staff members who will enact evidence-based strategies selected in Step 6. The following questions should be used to guide initial implementation and revisited at each implementation meeting thereafter.

How will the evaluation results and plan of action be communicated with administrators, teachers, families, and other key stakeholder groups? When will this information be shared?

Share with the corporation administration at the next cabinet meeting.

Share with the forum after cabinet approval.

Share at board meetings (June or July) and make any new staffing or fiscal requests needed.

Share this with all staff, specifically those tied to the work we've done already.

Share with families at annual EL family night. Develop one to three pages of easily understood and translated resources to explain the work completed and to be done.

What additional steps must be taken in order to enact selected strategies (e.g. secure approval from school board, request amendment for budgeted grant funds, procure curricular materials)?

School board must approve a contract proposed with a technical assistance partner for special education training pieces. Building-administrator approval is needed for all strategies requiring staff time in and out of the workday.

What additional training is needed in order to enact selected evidence-based strategies effectively? Who will provide this training? When will the training be provided?

EL teachers not yet certified need to enroll in coursework to begin an approved educator preparation program. The corporation leadership team will explore opportunities for a university partnership to offer this option beginning next semester. Various goals and strategies in our action plan address specific training needs and planning to move us forward in implementation.

What additional data need to be collected to track progress toward SMART goals and effectiveness of selected strategies? How will these data be collected? Who will be responsible for tracking this data?

The EL director will work with our assessment coordinator to develop and review a staff survey to be used for the tracking of several of our goals. Building-level administrators will be responsible for administering the survey and tracking completion. Additionally, student surveys will be conducted at the building-level for middle and high school students.

When will the evaluation team meet next? Who will lead the next check-in meeting? Who will be expected to attend?

***Note:** IDOE recommends that the evaluation team meets after the first six weeks of implementation to address any concerns or barriers to full implementation and at least once every three months for the duration of the first school year of implementation.*

Mid-September 2019--full evaluation team will attend, EL Director will lead.

December 2020--full evaluation team will attend, EL Director will lead.

March 2020--full evaluation team will attend, EL Director will lead.

Appendix B - Driving Questions & Goal Review

Driving Questions

Consider these questions throughout the program evaluation process:

1. How effective are the following processes?
 - a. Identification/screening
 - b. Student assessment, including annual WIDA ACCESS assessments
 - c. Provision of qualified staff and resources
 - d. Provision of EL programs and services to *all* EL students
 - e. Monitoring practices for current and former EL students
2. Do classroom teachers have the resources, skills, and knowledge to address the needs of EL students in their classroom?
3. Does the corporation/school provide adequate PD and follow-up training in order to prepare EL program teachers and administrators to implement the EL program effectively?
4. Are administrators who evaluate EL program staff adequately trained to meaningfully evaluate whether EL teachers are appropriately employing their training in the classroom?
5. Does the school use mainly paraprofessionals to serve EL students or teachers who are qualified to deliver EL services?
6. Are EL students acquiring English language skills in all four language domains (e.g., listening, speaking, reading, and writing) at a pace that is consistent with EL program goals or expectations and with EL students at comparable ages and initial ELP levels?
7. Is the language progress of intermediate and advanced ELs or ELs with disabilities stagnating? If so, what supports are these ELs receiving in addition to continued ELD instruction targeted to their language needs?
8. Are EL students progressing in English language skills so they will be able to successfully manage regular coursework?
9. Do former EL students who no longer receive English language development services continue to demonstrate English language skills that enable them to successfully manage regular coursework?
10. Are EL students learning grade-level core content in addition to English language development?
11. Depending upon the corporation/school's EL program model(s) and goals, are EL students making sufficient academic progress in the core content areas so that they are either at

academic grade level or will be able to “catch up” academically within a reasonable period of time?

12. Are middle and high school EL students receiving meaningful access to courses needed to graduate on time?
13. Once EL students have exited EL programs and services, are they able to participate meaningfully in the standard curriculum comparable to their peers who have never been classified as ELs?
14. How do the percentages of current ELs, former ELs, and never-ELs compare in special education, advanced courses, and extracurricular activities? Does such access differ by EL program or language background? If there is disproportionate participation, what are the barriers to participation? Are the barriers based on language needs or EL status?
15. Is each identified area of concern evaluated to determine why it arose and how it is interfering with program objectives?
16. Were adequate resources allocated to the area of concern?
17. Has a description of the changes been developed? (What procedural and program modifications will be undertaken? Who is expected to be responsible for what? When will the changes be implemented?)
18. Has a description of the rationale and objective(s) been developed? (What are the changes expected to accomplish? How will success be measured?)
19. Have all stakeholders (i.e., responsible and interested parties) been notified of any program changes?
20. Has necessary training been identified? Have appropriate steps been put in place so that responsible persons understand expectations and are prepared to implement the changes as planned?

SMART Goal Overview

SMART Stands for:

Specific: The goal must be clear and well defined. Vague or generalized goals are unhelpful because they don't provide sufficient direction.

Measurable: Include precise amounts, dates, and so on in the goal so as to measure the degree of success.

Attainable: Is it possible to achieve the goal? The goal should be neither too easy nor too hard. Set a realistic yet challenging goal.

Relevant: Goals should be relevant to the identified needs. By keeping goals aligned with this, you'll develop the focus you need to see program improvement.

Time-Bound: Goals must have a deadline. When working on a deadline, the sense of urgency increases and achievement is more quickly attained.

Appendix C - Data Gathering

This chart has been compiled to assist with the collection of data for Step 2. Locations and contacts are not a comprehensive list as corporations or schools may utilize additional data warehouses.

Data Point	How/Where to Collect	Contact
Number of ELs by school and grade level	Data Exchange InView Local student information system (SIS)	Student Services EL Director
Identification and Placement Processes	Corporation/school Handbook Corporation website Local documentation	EL Director Principal HR
EL Proficiency Levels per grade level	Data Exchange (LM Report) Local SIS Local Teacher Files	EL Director
Average number of years in EL Program	Tracked Locally	EL Director
Number and percent of ELs and overall student population at elementary, middle, high school	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Student Services Enrollment Specialist EL Director/Teacher
Number and percent of ELs and overall student population identified for special education	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Student Services Enrollment Specialist EL Director/Teacher SpEd Director/Teacher
Number and percent of ELs and overall student population retained at least one year	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Student Services Enrollment Specialist EL Director/Teacher MTSS Team Lead
Number and percent of ELs and overall student population identified for high-ability programming	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Student Services Enrollment Specialist EL Director/Teacher High Ability Director
Number and percent of ELs and overall student population enrolled in school/corporation Pre-K programs	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Student Services Enrollment Specialist EL Director/Teacher

		Early Childhood Director
Number and percent of ELs and overall student population enrolled in Advanced Placement courses	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Student Services EL Director/Teacher School Counselor
Number and percent of ELs and overall student population taking the ACT/SAT or other college entrance exam	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Student Services Enrollment Specialist School Counselor
Attendance data for ELs and overall student population	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Attendance Counselor (or equivalent)
Behavior referrals, suspensions, and expulsions for ELs and overall student population	Local SIS	MTSS Team Behavior Administrator
Educator demographics for school/corporation	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Data Specialist HR
Proficiency and growth data for ELs, former ELs, and overall student population on ILEARN, IREAD-3, WIDA ACCESS	Data Exchange InView Local SIS WIDA AMS	Data Specialist Student Services EL Director
Grade-level performance and growth data for ELs, former ELs, and overall student population on local formative assessments	Local SIS	Data Specialist EL Teachers Classroom Teachers
Four-year graduation rate for ELs, former ELs, and the overall student population	Data Exchange InView Local SIS	Data Specialist High School Counselor High School Administrator
EL rate of enrollment in postsecondary education compared to general student population	Local Data Source	High School Counselor High School Administrator
Master building schedule and EL services schedule	Local Data Source	Principal EL Teacher(s)
Curriculum maps	Local Data Source	Curriculum Director
Master list of EL students and EL staff by building	Local Data Source	Student Services EL Director

Copy of school/corporation EL Plan	Pre-Application	Grant Specialist
Feedback regarding program implementation, service delivery, and/or access to programs	Parent Survey Staff Survey Student Survey	Curriculum Director EL Director Family Engagement Dir.
Master list of all staff who work with ELs	Locally Tracked	EL Director
List of all staff in corporation with Indiana EL license	IN License Lookup Locally Tracked	HR EL Director
Teacher/staff evaluation records for all EL program staff	Local Data Source	Principals (or others responsible for evaluation)
School/Corporation PD calendar/plan for previous three years	Local Data Source	Curriculum Director Administrators
EL staff PD calendar/plan for previous three years	Local Data Source	EL Director Administrators
Schedules for staff development/collaboration time	Local Data Source	Administrators
Comments from staff regarding professional learning	Local Surveys Local Town Hall Minutes Anecdotal Observations	Administrators Curriculum Director Other
Family/parent survey results	Local Surveys	Family Engagement Dir.
Master schedule of all family engagement activities	Local Data Source	Family Engagement Dir.
Family event attendance documentation	Local Data Source	Family Engagement Dir.
Translation and interpretation policy	Corporation Handbook Corporation Website	EL Director Principal
State and federal grant allocations and application budgets for previous three years	IDOE Website Local Data Source	Corporation Treasurer Grant Specialist EL Director
Title III and NESP expenditure reports for previous three years	Local Data Source	Corporation Treasurer EL Director
Data regarding per-pupil spending for ELs and general education students	Local Data Source, Inview	Corporation Treasurer