

Office of the
State Department
of Education

**Public
School Information**

**2014
Legislative
Report**

Limited English Proficient (LEP)

Contacts:

*Dr. Christina Nava, Coordinator
Limited English Proficient Program
208-332-6905
cnava@sde.idaho.gov*

*Nichole Hall, Coordinator
English Proficiency and College Assessment
208-332-6933
nhall@sde.idaho.gov*

Limited English Proficient (LEP) Program

BACKGROUND

The 1995 Legislature created the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) appropriation with the intent to support the programs for students with non-English or limited English proficiency. This action followed a legal suit brought against the Idaho State Board of Education by the Idaho Migrant Council. The 1983 Consent Decree Civil No 79-1068 sought equitable and appropriate education for limited English proficient (LEP) students. Idaho Statute 33-1617 followed in 2004 to ensure that statewide achievement objectives and goals were developed and district LEP Plans were implemented. Federal funding, under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 - Title III, supplements the state LEP appropriation. Due to these state and federal directives, specific criteria guide the LEP district programs across the state. The State Department of Education's LEP program oversees the district funding, programming, and monitoring and evaluation in line with this federal and state compliance. The State Department of Education's Assessment program oversees the Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA), which annually assesses LEP students' growth and proficiency in the English language.

OVERVIEW OF THE STATEWIDE PROGRAM

LEP Program

A student may be considered as LEP, if they have a home language other than English and test below the proficient level for English language acquisition, on a state-approved test. All students who qualify for the LEP program are counted for state and federal funding purposes. However, the U.S. Department of Education has clearly stated that no students can receive funds if they have exited the LEP program and are on the two-year federally mandated monitoring status. State LEP funding allows districts to provide core English Language Development (ELD) services inclusive of: highly qualified staffing, research-based curriculum, professional development and literacy activities for families of LEP students. Federal Title III funds enable districts to supplement ELD services with before and after school programs, summer school, professional development, curriculum and family literacy activities. In January 2013, Idaho adopted the World Class Instructional Design (WIDA) ELD standards that are aligned to the Common Core State Standards. The five distinct standards represent the social, instructional, and academic language needed for students to interact with peers, teachers, and content areas. The WIDA ELD standards contain a framework for instruction that represents the English language development standards through language functions, content and scaffolding.

Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA)

In July 2009, Idaho's assessment program, including the Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA), moved to the State Department of Education. The IELA has now been administered for eight years. Idaho is currently involved in a state-led consortium that will provide innovative and comprehensive assessment tools in order to help ELL students succeed in becoming college- and career-ready. With the adoption of new ELD standards, Idaho must align its English language proficiency assessment, the IELA, with the new standards. The ASSETS (Assessment Services Supporting ELs through Technology Systems) summative assessment will align to the WIDA standards and will be implemented across the State of Idaho in the 2015-2016 school year. The ASSETS structure will include an online screener/placement test, classroom benchmarks, formative assessment resources, and an annual summative assessment.

OVERVIEW OF DISTRICT LEP PROGRAMS

LEP Legislative Budget

The 2014 state LEP allocation of \$3,500,000 was distributed in October 2013 directly to districts with an approved State Limited English Proficient plan. *(See Appendix A for allocations by district.)* A total of 14,261 students were identified as LEP, averaging \$245.42 per student. Each district allocates the appropriate amount to the various schools or programs within the district. In order to receive funding, each district must have an LEP plan and budget on file and approved with the State LEP Program. Budget submissions indicate that districts use their state LEP allocation for salaries, professional development, and educational materials. More than 95 percent of the allocation is used for salaries. LEP students and programs are also funded from other sources, which include general funds and federal funds. Title I-A, and Title I-C Migrant, Title III-LEP and Title III Emergency Immigrant funds, which are all programs under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), can be used to serve LEP students. However, federal funds must be used to supplement state funded programs, not supplant them.

An additional \$500,000 was awarded in fiscal year 2012 in order to establish an LEP Enhancement Grant program that districts are eligible for through a competitive grant application process. This funding is not part of the direct LEP per student allocation, but is a part of the total LEP appropriation. More information on the LEP Enhancement Grant program can be found on the following page. Table A is an overview of the state LEP funding over the past 10 years.

Although there was a decrease of approximately 1,182 LEP students from the 2012-2013 school year, new arrivals who qualify as LEP continually enroll in the Idaho public school system. The LEP subgroup is a fluid group with students constantly entering and exiting the program. The State Department of Education has consistently worked with districts to ensure that only those students who need an English language development program are placed or remain in an LEP program. Therefore, many students have exited the program and districts have established better procedures to ensure proper identification, which has resulted in a decrease in the population.

Table A: State LEP Funding 2002-2014

State LEP Funding			
Fiscal Year	Total Allocation	# of LEP Students	Per Pupil Amount
2002	\$4,475,000	18,168	\$246.31
2003	\$4,500,000	18,746	\$238.70
2004	\$4,500,000	19,649	\$227.75
2005	\$4,850,000	20,816	\$232.99
2006	\$5,060,000	20,936	\$241.69
2007	\$5,290,000	18,198	\$290.69
2008	\$6,040,000*	18,057	\$292.96
2009	\$6,040,000*	18,623	\$284.57
2010	\$6,040,000*	18,377	\$287.86
2011	\$4,000,000*	17,358	\$201.64
2012	\$4,000,000*	16,280	\$214.99
2013	\$4,000,000*	15,443	\$226.64
2014	\$4,000,000*	14,261	\$245.42

*This amount includes the LEP Enhancement Grant funding, as well as the per student appropriation.

LEP Enhancement Grant

The Idaho Legislature appropriated an additional \$500,000 in FY2012 Public Schools Budget to help maintain the LEP Enhancement Grant program that assists districts struggling to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) among the LEP student population. The grant funds are to help districts that have strong core English Language Development (ELD) programs enhance their services to LEP students.

The 2014-2015 school year will begin a new three-year cycle awarding period. A Request for Proposals (RFP) will be sent out to all districts with LEP students with specific guidelines for the application process. A committee of reviewers will be appointed to approve grant awards. The committee will consist of ELD experts from the university and district levels. Idaho Districts can choose to apply for one or all of the following grant options:

- Option I: Co-Teaching for English Language Acquisition
- Option II: EL Program Enhancements
- Option III: WIDA Teacher Leadership Training

In previous years, this funding has been especially valuable to local school districts. They have been able to provide extra resources that have directly impacted the education of Idaho's LEP students. Among other things, districts have used the funding for professional development in the area of language acquisition for all of teachers, curriculum materials, dual credit courses for LEP students, after-school programs, summer school programs, and math and reading interventions. Some districts, especially smaller ones, may not have been able to provide such services without this additional funding.

The Idaho State Department of Education uses \$50,000 for administration and evaluation of these grant funds. With the additional funding, the Department is able to do the following: provide technical assistance, plan and host Thinking Maps training and other professional development for awarded districts, send district personnel to the 2013 Idaho Title I Conference, and hire two external mentors/evaluators for the grant program. The external mentors/evaluators have each worked with the awarded districts over the past few years. Each mentor/evaluator has served a dual role in the districts—one of mentor and one of evaluator. As a mentor, they have worked with the districts to provide technical assistance on data collection and analysis, best practices for LEP students, choosing the most effective curriculum for LEP students, etc. As evaluators, they have evaluated -- both quantitatively and qualitatively -- the effects these additional grant funds are having on the enhancement of the LEP programs in awarded districts. The goal of the external mentors/evaluators is to build relationships and trust within and among awarded districts so resources and expertise can be shared. They have also provided the Department with an annual report detailing how the grant funds have been utilized and the progress districts are making as a result of receiving these extra funds.

Idaho LEP Student Demographics

The majority of LEP students in Idaho are of Hispanic or Latino origin and speak Spanish as their home language. With LEP student populations, there have consistently been more than 100 different languages reported to be spoken in Idaho school districts. These languages represent students from countries all over the world, although Spanish is still the most prevalent home language other than English. Table B represents percentages from the top ten languages that are spoken throughout the state, as reported in Spring 2013. These percentages are calculated from the total number of LEP students, rather than the entire student population.

Table B: Top 10 Languages in Idaho

Native Language	% of Students
Spanish (SPA)	79.7%
Unknown	2.7%
Arabic (ARA)	1.8%
North American Indian (NAI)	1.3%
Somali (SOM)	1.1%
Nepali (NEP)	1.1%
Russian (RUS)	1.1%
Chinese (CHI)	0.9%
Swahili (SWA)	0.9%
Karen (KAR)	0.9%

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The State Department of Education has implemented a variety of methods to verify that districts are making every effort to develop and implement programs that will ensure access to an equitable education for all LEP students and meet both federal and state requirements. Many technical assistance visits and compliance reviews are coordinated with the following departments: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Special Education and Assessment. These visits focused on instruction and the best ways to effectively meet the linguistic, academic and cultural needs of LEP students, in addition to compliance with federal and state laws. This type of technical assistance has made a positive impact in the review process; strengthening relationships between the state and the districts.

In addition to the above, all districts with LEP students are required to provide the following:

- State Assessment System: Language Proficiency Testing (IELA), ISAT, IRI
- Internal On-Site Monitoring and Evaluation Visits
- Annual Desk Review of LEP Program
- End-of-Year LEP Data Collection Report
- LEP and Emergency Immigrant Student Count
- Educational Learning Plans (ELP) for Limited English Proficient Students if the students receive accommodations in the classroom
- Annual State LEP and Title III program plans in the Consolidated State and Federal Grant Application (CFSGA)
- District Improvement Plans are required for districts who do not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years.
- Corrective Action plan are required for districts who do not meet AMAOs for four consecutive years.

Models of Language Acquisition Instruction for K-12 Students

Under NCLB requirements for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), schools are encouraged to teach students content-based English as quickly as possible. Idaho districts have the flexibility to choose a research-based method of instruction and program model to serve their LEP students. Each district implements the instructional program in a manner appropriate for their student demographics.

Table C represents the number of students served with the most common language acquisition programs from 2009 to 2013. Below are descriptions of the main models of language instruction.

TABLE C: Students Served by Language Acquisition Program, 2009-2013

Type of Program	# of LEP students served in 09-10	# of LEP students served in 10-11	# of LEP students served in 11-12	# of LEP students served in 12-13
Sheltered English Instruction	8,728	5,719	6,604	8494
Pull-Out ENL	5,795	3,938	4,479	5755
Content-Based ENL	3,203	1,354	2,745	2688
Structured English Immersion	1,801	1,478	1,938	1923
Bilingual Education Programs	1,807	1,586	1,199	1021

Sheltered English Instruction: Districts across Idaho have adopted the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) methodology that has been scientifically researched and proven to be very effective. This instructional approach is used to make academic instruction in English understandable to English language learners and help them acquire proficiency in English while learning within the content area. Many districts have been trained in the SIOP methodology and are using simplified language, physical activities, visual aids, and the environment to teach vocabulary for concept development within all subjects. This program addresses both social and academic English essential for the current operating environment under NCLB.

The SIOP methodology is most effective for students who are at the intermediate or advanced in their English language development. Some beginning level students may still need additional specialized instruction to help them succeed.

In addition to SIOP, the state, beginning in the 2011-2012 school year, began working in partnership on a research study with Education Northwest, out of Portland, Oregon. Project GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design) is a professional development model for teachers, which focuses on strategies critical to giving LEP students access to the content areas. The research study will last three years with schools participating as either an experimental or control group. The experimental groups receive training in Project GLAD while the control group does not. After the three years, the state will examine the data from this study and determine the effectiveness of this model. (*See Appendix B for preliminary research findings.*)

Pull-out English as a New Language (ENL): Most of the districts continue to use a pull-out ENL model. This model is reflective of the traditional definition in which LEP students are pulled out of regular, mainstream classrooms for special instruction in English as a new language. Most instruction is provided for 30 minutes to two hours each day. For new arrivals, the pull-out model may be more intensive and ranges from two to three hours each day. Some districts provide ENL pull-out daily. However, as the LEP student progresses in language proficiency, the instructional time may be decreased to two to three times per week. The focus of the pull-out ENL in Idaho school districts is to give the LEP students an English language framework, inclusive of vocabulary, grammar, reading, writing and life/cultural skills, which will assist them in their regular classroom.

Content-based ENL: Several districts are using a content-based ENL approach in order to better meet the requirements of NCLB. This approach to teaching English as a New Language makes use of instructional materials, learning tasks, and classroom techniques from academic content areas as the vehicle for developing language, content, cognitive and study skills. Cognitive academic language development in English occurs through content-area instruction.

Structured English Immersion: The goal of this program is acquisition of English language skills so that the LEP student can succeed in an English-only mainstream classroom. All instruction in an immersion strategy program is in English. Teachers have specialized training in meeting the needs of LEP students, possessing a bilingual education or ENL teaching credential and/or training, and strong receptive skills in the students' primary language.

Bilingual Educations Programs: Bilingual education programs focus on developing English language at the same time the native language is taught. The various programs include Transitional Bilingual Education, Dual Language, Two-Way Immersion, and Heritage Language. All differ slightly in methodology but maintain two languages while providing instruction. Bilingual Education programs are highly intensive and require certified bilingual staff. Most districts in Idaho cannot financially attract bilingual certified teachers, or they have too many languages represented in the schools to provide a bilingual program.

Many districts and researchers have indicated that the differences in program success depend more on individual teacher and paraprofessional performance, rather than specific programming. This underscores the importance of professional development and training regarding English language learning programs. All staff, within a school that serves LEP students, should have training on how to address the needs of this special population.

Staffing for LEP Programs

Bilingual/ENL education in Idaho is considered a content area for certification. However, not all Bilingual/ENL certified teachers in the state serve LEP students. Some Bilingual/ENL certified teachers are not teaching in a specific Bilingual/ENL classroom, as they have been assigned specific content classes. In addition, as LEP students move toward increasing accountability to demonstrate proficiency in content areas, more LEP students are being served by certified content teachers. Some of these content teachers have gone through training in serving LEP students, but some have not.

Many districts and charter schools continue to struggle to hire teachers that have their English as a New Language (ENL) certification, due to funding limitations and location. Most districts are rural and are not able to pay their teachers at the same level as larger districts. As a result, many districts and charters are only able to hire paraprofessionals to provide the language instruction to LEP students. In 2012-2013, districts reported that 420 paraprofessionals worked with the LEP students.

LEP Student Achievement

With the accountability structure of NCLB focusing both on the Idaho Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) and the Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA), more and more districts are realizing that specialized services and district training are essential in helping LEP students meet the content standards. The state is encouraged about the progress districts are making to acknowledge the importance of services for LEP students, through providing focused professional development and implementing the English Language Development (ELD) standards, and core curriculum for the English language learners.

Progress on the IELA

The 2012-2013 school year was the eighth year of the Idaho English Language Assessment (IELA). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, or NCLB, requires that each state define “progress” and “proficiency” and set targets for each based on the state language proficiency assessment, which is the IELA in Idaho. States are required to hold districts accountable to the state determined targets, which are called Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs).

Idaho as a whole met the two AMAO targets for growth and proficiency, as did every district. However, the third accountability piece in the AMAO structure is Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as measured on the ISAT. Although, Idaho has transitioned away from AYP and to a new Five-Star Rating System for all schools under NCLB, the LEP Program is measured at the district level. Therefore, the state continues to use AYP to measure districts for their LEP Programs. Many districts did not meet the AYP targets for LEP students. Therefore, these districts did not meet the full accountability for the IELA Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives. Districts that do not meet the AMAO targets for two consecutive years are required to develop a District Improvement Plan. Districts that miss the AMAO targets for four years in a row are required to implement a Corrective Action Plan for LEP students. Currently, the state LEP program is working with 15 districts that are in District Improvement, and an additional 13 districts in continued Corrective Action (Year 6), to understand the area(s) they can improve to increase LEP student achievement. With the shift to the new Smarter Balanced Assessment, AYP will not be calculated for districts for school year 2013-2014.

Many variables must be factored in to understand why a district, or the state as a whole, did or did not meet targets. Some students come into the system with no literacy skills or at an older age so it would take longer for those particular students to show growth. First-year LEP students, due to federal flexibility, are not assessed on the ISAT Reading or Language Usage, however, the ISAT Math and Science tests still must be given. Mobile students are also not included in proficiency calculations in the ISAT.

AYP is calculated based on the following: (1) valid test scores and (2) statistical reliability according to Title I, 1111(b)(2)(C)(ii). The data below reflects the overall state calculations from students tested in grades 3-8, and 10, as compared to spring 2006-2013. Although significant improvements throughout the state have been seen with district LEP programs, the LEP subgroup still falls significantly behind in the statewide AYP percentages and did not meet the 2013 AYP targets as a whole.

TABLE C: ISAT Results for LEP Students

ISAT Results for LEP Students								
	2006 AYP	2007 AYP	2008 AYP	2009 AYP	2010 AYP	2011 AYP	2012 AYP	2013 AYP
Reading	51.81%	49.58%	55.66%	73.72%	69.2%	74.6%	76.3%	56.0%
Mathematics	56.14%	51.58%	55.77%	69.14%	65.3%	69.1%	68.0%	47.3%

STATE FISCAL YEAR 2015 REQUEST

For FY2015, Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Luna has requested ongoing funding of \$4,000,000 for LEP programs. Of this amount, \$3,500,000 will be directly allocated to school districts on a per-student basis. The remaining \$500,000 will be used to continue funding the LEP Enhancement Grants, which are in the last year of a 3-year cycle, to local school districts that are struggling to meet AYP in Math and Reading with their LEP subgroup.

Out of the \$500,000, the State Department of Education will continue to use \$50,000 to administer the grants. This \$50,000 will cover the technical assistance provided to awarded districts, the external mentors/evaluators, to plan and host professional development for Co-Teaching awarded districts each fall and spring, and to plan and host District Data and Collaboration Days in the spring of each year.

APPENDIX A: LEP Allocations by District

STATE LEP 2013-2014 ALLOCATIONS			
DISTRICT NAME	DISTRICT#	LEP STUDENT COUNT	LEP ALLOCATION
ABERDEEN	58	116	28,469
AMERICAN FALLS	381	360	88,353
BLACKFOOT	55	646	158,544
BLAINE	61	574	140,874
BLISS	234	34	8,344
BOISE	1	1737	426,303
BONNEVILLE	93	301	73,873
BOUNDARY	101	18	4,418
BRUNEAU-GRANDVIEW	365	49	12,026
BUHL	412	150	36,814
CALDWELL	132	990	242,970
CASSIA CO.	151	586	143,819
CASTLEFORD	417	27	6,626
CLARK CO.	161	25	6,136
COEUR D'ALENE	271	33	8,099
DIETRICH	314	23	5,645
EMMETT	221	66	16,198
FILER	413	38	9,326
FREMONT CO.	215	181	44,422
FRUITLAND	373	105	25,770
GLENNS FERRY	192	90	22,088
GOODING	231	128	31,414
GRACE	148	11	2,700
HAGERMAN	233	30	7,363
HANSEN	415	23	5,645
HOMEDALE	370	122	29,942
IDAHO FALLS	91	520	127,621
JEFFERSON CO.	251	168	41,231
JEROME	261	685	168,116
KIMBERLY	414	32	7,854
KUNA	3	112	27,488
MADISON	321	167	40,986
MARSING	363	116	28,469
MCCALL-DONELLY	421	20	4,908
MELBA	136	77	18,898
MERIDIAN	2	1310	321,506
MIDDLETON	134	83	20,370
MINIDOKA	331	299	73,382
MOSCOW	281	39	9,572
MOUNTAIN HOME	193	131	32,151
MURTAUGH	418	52	12,762
NAMPA	131	895	219,655
NEW PLYMOUTH	372	16	3,927
NOTUS	135	68	16,689
ONEIDA CO.	351	13	3,191
PARMA	137	95	23,315
PAYETTE	371	234	57,429
POCATELLO	25	76	18,652
PRESTON	201	50	12,271

STATE LEP 2013-2014 ALLOCATIONS

DISTRICT NAME	DISTRICT#	LEP STUDENT COUNT	LEP ALLOCATION
RIRIE	252	14	3,436
SHELLEY	60	68	16,689
SHOSHONE	312	130	31,905
SNAKE RIVER	52	166	40,740
SUGAR-SALEM	322	41	10,062
TETON	401	185	45,404
TWIN FALLS	411	385	94,488
VALLEY	262	102	25,033
VALLIVUE	139	690	169,343
WEISER	431	216	53,012
WENDELL	232	224	54,975
WEST JEFFERSON	253	83	20,370
WILDER	133	71	17,425
ANOTHER CHOICE VIRTUAL	476	29	7,117
HERITAGE COMMUNITY CHARTER	481	54	13,258
TOTAL LEP STUDENTS FOR ALL DISTRICTS - Districts with less than 10 students were omitted from the table, but included in the overall total.		14,261	3,500,000
PER STUDENT FUNDING		\$245.42	
TOTAL STATE FUNDING		\$3,500,000.00	

APPENDIX B: Project GLAD preliminary findings

An Efficacy Study of Project GLAD[®]: Preliminary Findings



Prepared for the Idaho State Department of Education

November 15, 2013

English language learners (ELLs) face the double challenge of learning all the academic content as other students, while also learning the language of instruction. With the rapid growth in the size of the ELL student population in the U.S., schools and districts are looking for ways to make this challenge less daunting.

Many schools and districts turn to *sheltered instruction* to support ELLs in the mainstream classroom. The primary goal of sheltered instruction is to make the learning of academic content easier, for example by using visual and other non-verbal supports to make the content more understandable to ELLs. A secondary goal is to help build English proficiency, for example by building in frequent opportunities to practice new vocabulary and sentence structures.

There are several different models of sheltered instruction. The most widely used model is the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (or SIOP, pronounced “sigh-op”). Project GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Design) is also used in many western states. A recent review of the literature found, however, there is little research evidence that these models have an impact on student learning.¹

Our **preliminary findings in the first rigorous evaluation of Project GLAD**, conducted in 30 schools and more than 90 classrooms across Idaho, show that

- ELLs whose teachers were trained in Project GLAD demonstrated improvements in reading comprehension equivalent to about five months of learning. They also saw gains in vocabulary and in some aspects of writing, although not in science.
- Non-ELLs who attended Project GLAD classrooms performed the same as those who did not.

These preliminary results suggest that using Project GLAD in the classroom may bring about positive improvements in ELLs’ reading comprehension, vocabulary, and some aspects of their writing, while not detracting from the learning of their native English-speaking classmates.



¹ Goldenberg, C. (2013). Unlocking the research on English learners: What we know—and don’t yet know—about effective instruction. *American Educator*. 37(2):4-11, 38.

About Project GLAD

Project GLAD is a K–12 instructional model consisting of 35 well-defined strategies that, according to its developers, can be used with any curriculum. It includes strategies to boost student interest and engagement, provide students with new content in a variety of ways, give students the opportunity to use new vocabulary and language structures in small groups, and scaffold increasingly sophisticated reading and writing behaviors. It is widely used in California and the Pacific Northwest, most commonly in mainstream classrooms that include both ELLs and native English-speaking students. Project GLAD developers claim that the approach is beneficial to all students but particularly to ELLs.

Overview of the Study

In 2010, the Institute of Education Science awarded Education Northwest a four-year grant from the Institute of Educational Sciences to study the efficacy² of Project GLAD. In the planning year we recruited 30 schools and established study measures. In spring 2011, we randomly assigned half the schools to the treatment group and half to the control group. Over the next two school years (2011-2012 and 2012-2013), treatment teachers received Project GLAD training and coaching, paid for by the grant, and the research team collected information about implementation at treatment schools and outcomes at both treatment and control schools. This year (2013 – 2014), teachers in control schools have been receiving training while the research team analyzes data already collected.

Study Design

We used a study design called a *cluster randomized trial*, which means that groups of teachers or students (“clustered” into their schools) are randomly assigned to receive or not receive the Project GLAD “treatment.” Random assignment is considered a critical element of a rigorous study because it means variation in factors that might influence outcomes (teacher quality, teacher interest, prior student achievement and other characteristics the research team might not even think of) is randomly spread across the two groups.

Grade 5 teachers in the 42 treatment classrooms received standard Project GLAD training: a two-day workshop and five days of demonstration with six days of coaching support over two years. Grade 5 teachers in the 50 control classrooms proceeded with business as usual.

Schools. The 30 schools in the study were spread across Idaho, with almost half (47%) in rural settings. The other half were within towns (23%), cities (17%), or suburban locations (13%). School enrollment varied from 277 to 717, with a mean of 475 students. All but one of the schools served current or former ELLs, although the percentage varied from 3 to 50 percent.

² An “efficacy” study examines whether a program works under the best possible conditions. For our study, this meant that Project GLAD was implemented in schools that wanted to try it, by teachers who received the full training and other supports from Tier IV trainers—the most highly qualified trainers.

Students. Data were collected from all fifth-grade students, not only ELLs. Of the 2,253 students in the sample, 13 percent were current ELLs or former ELLs who had been reclassified within the previous two years. Most ELLs in the study were Spanish speakers. Ten percent of students in the study were eligible for special education and 65 percent were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.

Teachers. Most teachers were white, female, and had been teaching for more than a decade. Teachers had received no prior training with Project GLAD, although many (68%) had at least some exposure to SIOP. Only 24 percent had received any other form of prior training to support ELLs. The prior training of teachers was similar for the treatment and control groups.

Data collection. We collected data over two years from the same teachers and from two different cohorts of grade 5 students. To learn how teachers were using Project GLAD, we administered surveys to teachers and observed their teaching. To investigate the impact on students, we administered standardized assessments in reading, asked students to write essays on a scientific topic, and gave students an end-of-unit test on rocks and minerals—one of the topics students learn about in grade 5. We also obtained students' scores from the state science assessment.

Findings

Did Project GLAD have a positive impact on ELLs? And how did it affect students who were not ELLs? To answer these questions, we examined assessment results in three areas: reading, writing, and science. Here we summarize the findings from the first year of implementation.

For ELLs. When we focused on students who were current or former ELLs, we found marginally significant positive results in their reading comprehension, vocabulary, and in some aspects of their writing (their ideas and organization). We did not find statistically significant differences between the treatment and control groups in their science achievement. *Marginally significant* means there was less than a 10 percent chance that these results were obtained due to random variation.³

While statistical significance is important, it is also crucial to consider the practical importance of the impact—how much difference does this really make in student learning? *Effect size* is a measure of how much better students in the treatment group performed, compared to students in the control group. The effect size of Project GLAD on reading comprehension was 0.24. We know from other studies that this is equivalent to about 60 percent of the growth in reading that students typically make over the course of fifth grade, or about five months of growth.

³ Many research studies use a 5 percent cut-point to determine statistical significance, but when the group size is small, as the ELL group was, it is not uncommon to look at a higher cut-point and consider results that are marginally significant.

The effect sizes for vocabulary, ideas in writing, and organization of writing were 0.21, 0.32 and 0.27, respectively. Unlike for reading comprehension, we do not have data from other studies that would allow us to compare the vocabulary effect size to typical growth. The same is true of writing, although we do know that a rigorous study of the impact of a writing intervention for grade 5—using the same outcome measure as our current study—produced effects that were smaller (0.07 for ideas and 0.12 for organization) for the overall student population than the effect we found here for ELLs.⁴

For non-ELLs. When we looked only at students who were not ELLs, we found that students in the treatment group scored higher on tests of reading comprehension, vocabulary, science and writing, but the differences between the treatment and control group were not statistically significant.

Next Steps

We still have much to learn about the implementation and impact of Project GLAD. The analysis of Year 2 outcome data will tell us whether the marginally significant impacts we observed in Year 1 continue. We also know from our analyses of data on implementation that some teachers implemented Project GLAD more thoroughly than others. We will be examining whether the impact was higher in classrooms with higher levels of implementation. These results will be available in 2014.

To learn more:

projectgladstudy.educationnorthwest.org for information about the study

www.ocde.us/ProjectGLAD for information about Project GLAD

Contact the Principal Investigator:
theresa.deussen@educationnorthwest.org

The research reported here was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant R305A100583 to Education Northwest. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education.

⁴ Coe, M. Hanita, M., Nishioka, V., and Smiley, R. (2011). An investigation of the impact of the 6+1 Trait Writing model on grade 5 student writing achievement (NCEE 2012–4010). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.