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ABSTRACT

The number of students enrolled in United States public schools speaking a language other than English in their homes doubled over the last decade. In Indiana more than 60% of all public school districts reported having at least one English Learner student enrolled. It is projected that Indiana EL enrollment will increase 21% by the year 2021 (National Center for Education, 2009). These statistics make EL students, those students whose native language is not English, the fastest growing demographic in the Indiana public school system. As such, there is a need to know, and adhere to, the numerous laws that govern EL education in America.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) allows for state-specific guidelines concerning EL education, but it monitors the states’ progress of the EL student federally. Schools that do not have EL students who show adequate progress are subject to a loss of funding or closure for failing to serve all of their enrolled student population. This has caused many Indiana schools to review their EL practices and procedures when considering instructional strategies. This study examined the history of EL education and what Indiana schools at the elementary level are doing enough to prepare EL students for success. It also attempts to find common factors that contribute to EL success, or the growing achievement gap, at the elementary level.
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Chapter I

Introduction of Study

English Learners in America

According to the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), the number of kindergarten through twelfth grade students (K-12) who spoke native languages, in their homes, other than English, increased from 4.7 million to 11.2 million from 1980-2009 in the United States. This has caused a concern for many Indiana educators about the service of English language learners in public schools as the schools have seen their English learning (EL) population rise nearly substantially in the last decade (IES, 2012).

In 2009, Indiana reported 1,046,661 students in k-12 public schools. Almost 10 percent of these students were reported to be EL students (IDOE, 2011). The largest numbers of those were of Latino/a or Hispanic descent and in need of second language acquisition assistance. This assistance, provided primarily by schools, plays an integral part in the lives of many EL students. For many, this support will determine student achievement socially and academically. "EL students, who are given adequate supports, have proven to assess at a comparable level with their English-speaking counterparts. The acquisition of language is the issue. We don’t doubt the intelligence of the students" (Rosen & Sasser, 1997, p. 16).

The greatest recorded number of immigrants ever to enter America, in one decade, did so in the 1990s totaling almost 16 million. Before they arrived, the United States had already begun to enact language assimilation legislation. Schools were mandated to give appropriate accommodations to EL students through civil rights acts. By the year 2000 one in five American
students, under the age of 18 was non-native English speaking. With an annual growth rate of 10 percent, they are currently the nation’s fastest growing demographic (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2011). As schools watch waves of EL students enter their doors, it is apparent that they must develop significant resources to meet the growing needs.

Statistics show that students who get a proficient education are more likely to get a better job and live a better quality of life. The single most important individual earning factor in the U.S is the years of education one attains (U.S Census, 2008). It is imperative that all students be given the best opportunity possible to receive a quality education. Quality is the key. Because many individual attempts to define a quality education have failed, the federal government created No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001. This law was created to ensure that each state was held accountable for the quality of its public schools. Federal funding has been given or curtailed according to a State’s ability to respond to the accountability measures. Special funding was given for EL students. No Child Left Behind (2001) states the following:

Federal funds made available under this subpart shall be used so as to supplement levels of Federal, State, and local public funds that, in the absence of such availability, would have been expended for programs for limited English proficient children and immigrant children and youth and in no case to supplant such Federal, State, and local public funds. (NCLB, 2001, p. 7)

These funds allow schools to hire more teacher’s aides and supplemental materials for EL learners. Immigrant students with limited English proficiency are also noted as part of a schools countable student population under the federal law. Schools may gain, or lose, funding according to how well students with limited language skills test on an English-based assessment. For this
reason, many schools have sought waivers for EL students who have been in the country for less than a calendar school year or may be classified as special needs.

In Indiana the standard is Title III: Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and the Immigrant Students legislation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The act, "aims to help ensure that children who are Limited English Proficient attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards as all children are expected to meet". (IDOE, 2011)

**Statement of the Problem**

Students whose primary language is not English are growing exponentially in Indiana classrooms. And while the growing numbers are impressive, the current levels of achievement are comparatively unimpressive. Compared to their Caucasian native English-speaking counterparts, EL students in Indiana are more than 30% less likely to graduate from high school. Elementary students in Indiana have a mean score that is 200-300 points lower than the general education students on Indiana’s standardized tests (IDOE, 2011). As the EL population rises, so must the attention given to EL student success. Specific attention must be given to the fact that EL students are scoring far below their Caucasian native English-speaking counterparts on common assessments.

National studies have shown that EL students, with proper support, are capable of assessing at comparable levels to their English-speaking counterparts. The majority of Indiana schools currently provide EL teachers and instructional aides for EL student support. Elementary schools in Indiana are responsible for providing adequate support, but many have failed to do so. In Indiana 10 schools were audited in 2008 for noncompliance related to their servicing of EL
students. All 10 were cited for infractions. In 2009, The Indiana Department of Education concluded that too many Indiana school administrators are either unaware of the rights of EL students or simply ignore them. This ignorance was tracked through the more than 32 EL parental complaints to the IDOE concerning EL service or alleged discrimination in 2009 (IDOE, 2011).

**Purpose of the Study**

The study purpose of the study was to take a historical look at the evolution of EL education law and juxtapose it to contemporary EL practices in Indiana elementary schools. Detrimental in this determination was the allocation of human and monetary resources. The study considered whether EL students in elementary schools received adequate (as determined by the State of Indiana) support from parents, teachers and staff. The study also analyzed whether schools review their staffing procedures, programming, and adherence to federal regulations for EL students. The study placed the spotlight on the achievement gap that continues to wide, while surveying administrators about their current EL practices and beliefs.
Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

1. What measures are school districts taking to ensure that students who are eligible and receive EL services are doing so appropriately (as determined by federal law)?
2. What efforts are made by school districts to professionally develop highly qualified EL staff (as determined by federal and state criteria)?
3. What qualifications do Indiana school districts require for EL teachers, assistants and substitute teachers?
4. Do elementary administrators believe that adequate human resources (teachers, support staff, aides, etc.) have been provided for EL students?
5. How are EL staff evaluated, and by whom?

Delimitations

The delimitations, items not in the researcher’s control, on this study were as follows:

1. The qualitative survey was sent to only 100 Indiana schools/districts
   (Convenience sample urged by IRB)
2. The elementary schools surveyed were limited to Indiana public schools
3. Most of the districts surveyed had students pre-classified as English Language learners.
4. The school districts in Indiana only limited by location and self-identification.

In trying to create a hypothesis concerning EL education in the entire state of Indiana, it is necessary to survey a majority of the schools/districts in the state. This was not feasible at this point. To make broader assumptions about EL elementary education, more than public schools would need to be surveyed. This study only surveyed schools around Central Indiana that self-identified as having EL populations.
Definitions

**EL:** (English Learner) An active learner of the English language who may benefit from various types of language support programs. This term is used mainly in the U.S to describe K-12 students (NCTE, 2010).

**ELP:** (English Language Proficient) This term is employed by the U.S. Department of Education to refer to EL students who show sufficient mastery of English to meet state standards and excel in an English-language classroom (NCTE, 2010)

**ESEA:** (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in 1965 as a part of the "War on Poverty." ESEA emphasizes equal access to education and establishes high standards and accountability. The law authorizes federally funded education programs that are administered by the states. In 2002, Congress amended ESEA and reauthorized it as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2001).

**ESL:** (English as a Second Language) Term formerly used to designate EL students; this term increasingly refers to a program of instruction designated to support EL students. It is still used to refer to multilingual students in higher education- English as a Second Language (NCTE, 2010).

**Immersion:** Term used to describe the placing of a second language learner in a setting where only the second language, not the native, is spoken (Dutro & Morgan, 2003).

**ISTEP:** The purpose of the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) program is to measure student achievement in the subject areas of English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science (Grades 4 and 6), and Social Studies (Grades 5 and 7). In particular, ISTEP+ reports student achievement levels according to the Indiana Academic Standards that
were adopted in November 2000 by the Indiana State Board of Education. An Applied Skills Assessment and a Multiple-Choice Assessment, which are required components of the ISTEP+ program, are used to measure these standards; this meets requirements of NCLB (IDOE, 2011).

**iREAD:** The purpose of the *Indiana Reading Evaluation and Determination (IREAD-3)* assessment is to measure foundational reading standards through grade three. Based on the Indiana Academic Standards, *IREAD-3* is a summative assessment that was developed in accordance with House Enrolled Act 1367 (also known as Public Law 109 in 2010), which "requires the evaluation of reading skills for students who are in grade three beginning in the Spring of 2012 to ensure that all students can read proficiently before moving on to grade four" (IDOE, 2012).

**LAS Links:** The purpose of the Language Aptitude Survey Link assessment is to determine a student's level of English proficiency. The placement test, administered upon the student's arrival in the United States, is used to determine which EL student services are appropriate for the student. The annual assessment, administered in January and February, is used to determine the student's current level of English proficiency. The annual assessment is also used for accountability purposes (see the "Results" section below for more information). *LAS Links* assesses students in grades K-12 on four domains: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. This assessment is administered in five grade bands: K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8 and 9-12 (IDOE, 2012).

**LEA:** (Local Educational Agencies) A Local Education Agency (LEA) can refer to a public school district or in rural areas a body that oversees multiple schools. The responsibilities of a LEA may include operating the public school system, distributing grant money to school projects, and contracting for educational services. The LEA system is important for communities to have an agency that responds to local educational
issues (IDOE, 2011).

**LEP:** Limited English Proficiency was a term employed by the U.S. Department of Education to refer to EL students who lack sufficient mastery of English to meet state standards and excel in an English-language classroom (NCTE, 2010).

**Pullout:** One, of two, models of ESL instruction. The pullout method is used with EL students who spend 75%, or more, of their day in general education classes and are pulled out for one on one support (Brinton, Snow & Weshe, 2003).

**Push-in:** One, of two, models of ESL instruction. The push-in method is used with EL students who spend their entire day in general education classes and are allotted EL teachers, or assistants, to work along-side them in 45-60 minutes increments for support (Brinton, Snow & Weshe, 2003).

**SEA:** (State Educational Agency) A state education agency (SEA), or state department of education, is a formal governmental label for the state-level government agencies within each U.S. state responsible for providing information, resources, and technical assistance on educational matters to schools and residents (IDOE, 2010).

**Self-contained:** A self-contained classroom is one that has students who share similar academic requirements and needs. For example, all the “gifted students” in a school or district may be placed in the same classroom for instruction (About, 2011).
Summary

English language learners are rapidly changing the landscape of American public education. With the numbers of students rising each year, schools quickly have to equip themselves with the proper support for non-native speakers. Supporting students at the elementary level is vital in Indiana and around the country. According to the Office of Civil Rights, EL students are segregated in schools and not properly supported across the nation (2010). This recognition of inadequate support must be addressed and corrected. Indiana elementary schools must review their current EL practices and make adjustments that allow for the best education possible for non-native speaking students.

A review of literature has identified some of the more demanding federal mandates. Indiana laws have given specificity where federal laws are ambiguous. Trends have been noted and highlighted. Research findings have also identified strategic benefits that are short and long-range for EL students who are properly identified, placed and supported.
CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

Introduction and History

Over 31 million immigrants were reported to have come to America from 1971 to the year 2000. This is up from just 10 million reported before 1970 (NCES, 2011). Although the word “immigrant” is not synonymous with EL, the majority did not speak English as their native language (NCES, 2011). This influx included parents and children with the hope for a better life. By the year 2050, it is predicted that one of every five Americans will be an immigrant. This is compared to the one in eight reported in 2003. These immigrants face many challenges including linguistic and cultural hurdles. For the first time Indiana classrooms have seen a shift involving first time English learning (EL) school registration increasing by more than 300 percent from 1995-2005 (Payan & Nettle, 2007, p.197). This ranks Indiana as one of the top 10 states in EL student population growth during this time span.

In 1867 Indiana enacted a school compulsory law that mandated students attend school from the age of seven through the age of 16 (D’Angiulli, Siegel & Maggi 2004, p.205). This law was the result of many American parents believing that the best way for their children to make social, financial or personal progress was through educational advancement. It is for this reason that many parents today see the opportunity for children to become educated as the best chance for students to fulfill their potential. For many first generation immigrants, that came in the 1860’s and today, education is their lifeline to the American Dream (Gersten, Baker & Marks, 1998, p.4). Access to this dream can be detoured if provisions are not made for students who do
not enter school language proficient. This is a major reason that English as a Second Language (ESL) was conceived.

The ideas of creating a program to help non-native language speakers learn the English language in a uniform fashion started in England in the 15th century. Due to increased trading and colonization, England saw the benefit of teaching their trading partners to speak their language. This uniform program evolved with the spread of Britain’s 15th century empire. During this time, Britain sent teachers to educate their business associates and their colonized natives in the English language. With this, ESL and Bilingual education began (Crandall, 1994, p.29).

By the 19th century, the United States saw millions of immigrants reach its shores. Many of the immigrants settled in large cities and were in need of common language, even though many of them lived in enclaves that were mostly of the same nationality (Crandall, 1994, p.109). It became a must for immigrants to both retain their culture while assimilating to the new society in which they were living. This issue led to a law that only aimed to help cement the predominant language spoken in America in the early 1900s. By the time the Naturalization Act was passed in 1906, immigrants were mandated to have a working knowledge of the English language to become naturalized citizens of the United States. This recognition, by law, did not go unnoticed by the business sectors of the United States. Companies such as Ford Motor Company started in-house ESL programs to help immigrant workers gain English language skills (Toohey, 2000, p.13).

During World War I, immigrants, who spoke other languages were frowned upon. Many Americans feared that the “enemy” may be lurking, and many immigrants found themselves again having to assimilate through language acquisition (Payan & Nettle, 2007, p.225). The
numbers of immigrants grew and so did the need to speak English. As the United States entered the 1950s, lawmakers began to look at the most effective ways to help non-native speakers function. As schools saw a steady influx of foreign language speakers from the 1950s to the 1960s, schools began to modify ESL programs so that they allowed for optimum instructional success (Toohey, 2000, p.67). Today, EL experts continue to experiment with strategies, procedures and methods striving to find what is best for EL students. This search led to the provisions made for EL students in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This legislation sought to legally establish a means for accountability in public schools when dealing with students including EL students.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act "was one of the first pieces of federal legislation to address the needs and rights of speakers of other languages in public education" (August& Hakuta, 1997, p.18). This Act asserted that public schools were responsible for equal educational provisions for EL students. Specifically, the Act states,

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (Bell, 1990, p.17).

In essence, the law meant that schools that received federal funds could not legally ignore students who were not proficient in speaking English. All public schools must adhere to the statutes of Title VI and ensure that EL students are provided access to information, programs and services the school provides (Education Law.org, 2008). Today, schools receiving assistance from the federal government have flexibility in determining how to fulfill their obligations but are monitored by the Federal Office of Civil Rights (OCR).
Schools are not the only public entities that must adhere to the mandates of Title VI. Public archives, libraries and societies for history are also included as needing to adequately provide for EL individuals (IDOE, 2010). This means that the services they provide must also be accessible to EL students. This includes membership cards, instructions on card usage, information dissemination and the way that materials are displayed. Title VI assures that reasonable steps must be taken to enhance services for all EL students. The creation of reasonable steps include the number of resources available, the frequency that EL persons are allowed to access the materials, the nature of the material and the perceived importance given to the EL programs that the entity maintains.

The 1968 Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) followed Title IV. Also known as the “Bilingual Education Act,” the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1968 was vital in the establishment of bilingual education. This Act was one of the first to note “special educational needs of the large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability persons in the United States” (Richard-Amato, 1998, p.27). The law provided funding for schools for the development of EL programs. Funding for these programs would be used for staffing, the training of staff and the maintenance needs of EL programs. Today in Indiana there are more than 900 elementary schools whose EL programs are funded by Title VI dollars (IDOE, 2010).

The U.S. Supreme Court in its landmark decision Lau vs. Nichol (1974), announced that a schools failure to provide bilingual education (or EL) to student not speaking English as their first language was discrimination on the basis of natural origin. The case centered on the non-service that a young Chinese immigrant received from a public school. The Supreme Court made a decisive and swift decision. Although this decision did not require that schools create a specific program for EL students, it did give examples of acceptable resources for EL students (Coppola,
The Lau case outlined the need for state and local educational agencies to take appropriate educational steps in helping immigrant students achieve academically. By 1980, the Federal Department of Education sought to establish set requirements for schools that had language minority students. The DOE published a “Notice of Proposed Rulemaking” (NPRM) that gave structure to methods used by schools to adequately service non-English speaking groups (Coppola, 2003, p. 403). The NPRM was later found to be too burdensome and so many of its policies were withdrawn.

The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) has played a large role when it comes to EL regulations and enforcement of EL laws. After the failure of the federal Department of Education to create prescriptive methods for EL instruction, the OCR created procedures to help schools teach minority language students. These procedures were deemed less intrusive because they called for reviews of EL programming based on each school’s needs according to its EL population (Dutro, 2003, p.27). The OCR states “any educational approach that ensures the effective participation of language minority students in the districts educational program is accepted as a means of complying with the Title VI requirements” (Dutro & Morgan, 2003, p.34). This is the stance that the OCR continues to take as it reviews cases concerning English learning students in public schools. Many of the cases have resulted in orders from the OCR that schools must improve upon their services.

Today, there is a large achievement gap between native English speakers and EL students in American public schools. Although EL students are becoming increasingly more language proficient, they are still 30 to 40 percent behind their native language counterparts on state testing (IDOE, 2010). The achievement gap is also shown in other demographics, such as genders and races, causing further alarm. Data also show that the gap is consistent between
affluent students and urban students. These gaps were the catalyst for the reform in 2001. President George W. Bush initiated a law to “close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility and choice, so that no child is left behind” (NCLB, 2001).

NCLB Title III, Part A, is specifically aimed at making sure EL students gain language proficiency in English, attain high academic achievement in English and are able to meet the same standards that traditional English speakers are expected to uphold (NCLB, 2001). To help ensure this, NCLB allots more than 12 million dollars in funds to states so that they can service EL students by doing the following: develop high-quality language instruction education programs, assist EL students in schools who need to build their capacity to sustain language instruction programs, promote EL parental/community involvement, help with meeting accountability measure for increases in English proficiency and core academic content knowledge of EL students, making sure that EL students show improvement each year, and EL students reach adequate yearly progress (AYP) goals in section 1111(b)(2) of NCLB (NCLB, 2001). The accountability measure set forth through No Child Left Behind calls for progress that many school districts have been unable to maintain.

Indiana schools find their numbers of EL students increasingly caught unprepared and many schools are asking for waivers on assessment mandates such as the Indiana Equivalency Test for grades 6 and 8 (ISTEP) and the Indiana 3rd grade reading proficiency test (iREAD). In 2010, more than three-fourths of Indiana schools that had EL students requested assessment waivers for their EL students (Indianapolis Star & Newspaper, 2011, B7). These schools cited the unpreparedness of their EL students as the reason for the waiver. This increasing request for waivers has caused many to suspect that school are seeking waivers simply to avoid the adequate yearly progress (AYP) mandates of NCLB. In essences, schools are sidestepping their
responsibility to educate all EL students adequately. In fact, in 2011 President Barack Obama granted the entire state of Indiana a waiver from the penalties of NCLB, as the state announced its inability to meet NCLB federal mandates concerning adequate student progress. This led to a statewide review by the federal government concerning the condition of education in Indiana (Indianapolis Star & Newspaper, 2011, B7).

Legal Rights and Responsibilities

English learning students are protected by more than 8 major court rulings and the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation of 2001. NCLB identifies who LEP/EL students are, and it outlines the necessary services that the students receive. With a staggering 10.5 million children of immigrants in 2000, the law has set precedent for the estimated 18 million EL students expected by 2015 (Payan & Nettles, 2007, p.7). Title III, of the NCLB, outlines the rights and responsibilities of schools as they pertain to EL students. Title III requires the following:
- Requires that teachers be certified as English language proficient. School districts are to certify that all teachers in a language instruction education program for limited English proficient students are fluent in English and any other language used by the program, including written and oral communication skills.
- Requires that curricula be demonstrated to be effective. Language instruction curricula used to teach limited English proficient children are to be tied to scientifically based research and demonstrated to be effective.
- Provides discretion over instruction methods. Local entities have the flexibility to choose the method of instruction to teach limited-English proficient children.
- Targets funds to the classroom. Ninety-five percent of funds must be used for grants at the local level to teach limited English proficient children.
- Establishes annual achievement objectives for limited English proficient students. States must establish standards and benchmarks for raising the level of English proficiency, and meeting challenging state academic standards for limited English proficient students that are aligned with state standards.
- Sets English language proficiency as the objective. Annual achievement objectives for limited English proficient students must relate to gains in English proficiency, and meet challenging state academic standards that are aligned with Title I achievement standards.
- Requires reading and language arts assessments of children in English. Title I requirements to annually assess children, including limited English proficient students, in English for any student who has attended school in the United States (excluding Puerto Rico) for three or more consecutive years apply to grantees funded under Title III.
- Enforces accountability requirements. States must hold sub-grantees accountable for making adequate yearly progress as described in Title I and for meeting all annual achievement objectives.
- Notifies parents about program placement. Parents must be notified by the local education agency concerning why their child needs a specialized language instruction program. Parents have the right to choose among instructional programs if more than one type of program is offered and have the right to remove their child from a program for limited English proficient children (2001).

According to the 2003 United States Census a student whose primary language in their home was not English was near 6.8 percent in 2000. This number rose to 9.7 percent in 2001. These are mostly U.S. born second generation, immigrant students. The law also states that public schools must provide for the estimated 28% of immigrant population that may be illegally in the United States as of 2003.

The Fourteenth Amendment in the U.S Constitution has been interpreted that the states may not "deny educational services to any minor within the states’ jurisdiction." This prohibits a state or any public agency from denying access due to race, national origin, alien status, or gender (Wells, 1986, p.43). Consistently, the United States court system has upheld the belief that all children deserve an adequate education, no matter their status or current condition.

One of the earliest immigration laws to be passed in the United States was the Immigration Act of 1965. Through this act, national origin quotas were abolished. This act also allowed for a limit of 20,000 immigrants per year to be allowed from any country into the United States. The act gave priority to immigrants with family ties, along with those who had
employment obligations. This was on the heels of an important 1964 civil rights proclamation (Immigration Act of 1965).

The right to a restriction-free education is one that Americans cherish. This applies to immigrants who are English language learners. To ensure this right, the government has made it illegal to prohibit EL students from entering schools based on their citizenship status (Cummins, 1984, p.46). And, once allowed in the school, the school is responsible for making sure that the EL student receives an education equivalent to all other students in the school. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 clearly states the following:

(1) Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes national origin-minority group children from effective participation in the educational program offered by a school district, the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional program to these students.
(2) School districts must not assign national origin-minority group students to classes for the mentally retarded on the basis of criteria which essentially measure or evaluate English language skills; nor may school districts deny national origin-minority group children access to college preparatory courses on a basis directly related to the failure of the school system to inculcate English language skills.
(3) Any ability grouping or tracking system employed by the school system to deal with the special language skill needs of national origin-minority group children must be designed to meet such language skill needs as soon as possible and must not operate as an educational dead-end or permanent track.
(4) School districts have the responsibility to adequately notify national origin-minority group parents of school activities, which are called to the attention of other parents. Such notice, in order to be adequate, may have to be provided in a language other than English (Civil Rights Act, 1964).

Schools must make whatever provisions necessary to educate EL students with fidelity. The May 1970 memorandum to school districts entitled "Identification of Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of National Origin," and the Equal Educational Opportunities
Act of 1974 are both laws that echo the sentiments of Title VI. Both laws called for equal opportunities for all children, regardless of their race, color, creed or primary language. This equality is what The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) champions. The OCR, as a part of the United States Department of Education, remains vocal about the enforcement of the laws guaranteeing free and adequate educations for all students. The OCR audits for compliance around the country concerning policy documents on accountability (OCR, 2002).

Pursuant to the Lau decision, the United States Congress passed a federal law, the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA), which set a standard for determining whether schools were meeting their obligations concerning EL students. EEOA states that the denial of educational services on the basis of status is prohibited. It goes further to say that an agency is failing to uphold the law if it is not taking “appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs” as denial of equal opportunity (EEOA, 1974). This act requires EL students to receive needed assistance, and it was the first to specifically appropriate services. It does, however, stop short of demanding that any certain program be used. To date, courts have continued to determine what is deemed the appropriate action for schools.

*Castaneda vs. Pickard (1981)* cemented educational rights for immigrants of any status. This created the first program evaluations for schools that served English language learners. The case stated that schools must do the following: base their EL programs on sound educational theory or legitimate experimental strategies, implement the program with adequate resources and personnel to put the theory in practice, and evaluate the programs for the need to adjust them. Evaluations are done as a means of checking for adequate progress being made (August & Hakuta, 1981).
*Plyler vs. Doe* (1982) further established the rights of immigrant EL students:

“Undocumented children and young adults have the same right to attend public schools as United States citizens and must attend until they reach a mandated age” (Pugach & Seidl, 1998, p.52).

Specifically, violations occur when schools deny admission to students on the basis of undocumented status. Furthermore, *Plyler* states that schools may not engage in practices that stop student access to schools, demand students or parents to disclose documents pertaining to their immigration status, ask questions of students or parents concerning documentation status or demand that parents or students produce a social security number as a means for registration. This allows students to be enrolled without exposure of status (*Plyler vs. Doe*, 1982). Schools found in violation of the law could be fined and penalized.

Schools are careful to stay within the guidelines of federal mandates due to the need for federal funds. If a school district is found negligent or noncompliant with federal mandates, stoppage of funding is usually the federal penalty. When considering EL students, state and federal funds pay for most of the programming that public schools enact. Title I, of the Emergency Immigrant Education Act of 1984 places a minimum EL population stipulation on the recipients of its EL funding. Schools must have a minimum of 500 students to receive this money (Mohan, 1990, p.133). This act is in direct correlation to the many stipulations of NCLB that specifically addresses what EL students should be provided and how they must be served by public schools.

**EL Law and School Process**

In Indiana, as required by the NCLB Act, the school corporation must “assess all students whose first (native) language is other than English to determine whether a student is Fluent English Proficient (FEP, see level 5 below) or Limited-English Proficient (LEP, see levels 1-4
below). Each Spring, all LEP students must participate in the Language Aptitude Survey Links (Las Links) English proficiency assessment” (NCLB, 2001). New enrollees must be tested for LEP/EL using the LAS Links Placement Test. Successful EL students are seen as those who pass ISTEP or iREAD tests. To adequately support EL students, schools have 30 days from the arrival of a new EL student, or two weeks from the start of school for EL students who begin the school year at a school, to identify and serve EL students. In addition, Indiana schools must comply with the following:

Assessment shall, to the extent possible, include listening, speaking, reading, and writing abilities, as well as academic achievement. Language proficiency levels are described below:

Level 1: Students performing at this level of English language proficiency begin to demonstrate receptive or productive English skills. They are able to respond to some simple communication tasks.

Level 2: Students performing at this level of English language proficiency respond with increasing ease to more varied communication tasks.

Level 3: Students performing at this level of English language proficiency tailor the English language skills they have been taught to meet their immediate communication and learning needs. They are able to understand and be understood in many basic social situations (while exhibiting many errors of convention) and need support in academic language.

Level 4: Students performing at this level of English language proficiency combine the elements of the English language in complex, cognitively demanding situations and are able to use English as a means for learning in other academic areas, although some minor errors of conventions are still evident.

Level 5: Students performing at this level of English language proficiency communicate effectively with various audiences on a wide range of familiar and new topics to meet social and academic demands. Students speak, understand, read, write, and comprehend in English without difficulty and display academic achievement comparable to native English speaking peers. In order to attain the English proficiency level of their native English-speaking peers, further linguistic enhancement and refinement are necessary (NCLB, 2001).
Oral language skills cannot be the sole criterion for determining language proficiency. Academic achievement and writing and reading abilities in English must also be considered with the LAS Links English proficiency assessment.

Schools and corporations must create standards for placement of language minority students into appropriate groupings based on the following:

1. Students must be placed age appropriately.
2. If the student is fluent English proficient, placement will be in the regular instructional program.
3. If the student is limited-English proficient, placement will be made into an appropriate instructional program that provides English language development for a minimum of one (1) hour daily” (NCLB, 2001).

Schools are also responsible for reviewing previous educational records of EL students to determine the grade level attained in his/her home country. Moreover, the school corporation must have specific criteria established to guard appropriate placement and delivery of services to exceptional minority students. Schools cannot designate EL students to Special Education status without "pre-referral" action. The pre-referral process to Special Education should include an assessment in the native language and in English to provide evidence that difficulty exists in both languages. A referral should only be made after all other avenues have been explored and it has been determined that the child’s needs cannot be met by the regular education program. These criteria will be designed in accordance with Indiana Rule S-1 (IDOE, 2011).

State schools must provide for EL student in several areas, including “social, emotional adjustment to United States culture, drop-out prevention, introduction to technical vocational training, college preparatory coursework, information on substance abuse and teenage pregnancy. The limited-English proficient student should also be counseled, in his/her native language, when possible or necessary” (IDOE, 2011). The Indiana Department of Education
provides a definition for retention of language minority students (being based solely upon English language proficiency). It also defines what are appropriate classroom modifications, the school employing or training sufficient qualified personnel instructional aides, and mandates that aides must work under the direct supervision of a certified teacher. Aides should not have the sole responsibility of teaching, the ratio of the number of limited-English proficient students to qualified teachers, the requirement that exiting EL programs is the expectation (IDOE, 2011).

IDOE also requires that EL records be kept. This is required to assure adequate services have been rendered.

“The method of maintaining this information for each language minority student is the Individual Learning Plan (ILP). ILPs are developed for each student and updated annually, based on their overall/composite level of English proficiency on LAS Links. The ESL teacher in collaboration with the classroom teacher develops ILPs. Accommodations used on ISTEP+ must be those already in place for regular classroom instruction that are outlined on each ILP” (IDOE, 2011).

**EL Professional Development**

All regions of the United States have seen significant increases in the number of EL students they serve, but few have successfully academically transitioned. In the Midwest alone, there was a 3-5 percent increase in the number of enrolled EL students from 2002-2004 (National Center for Education Statistics, 2004). EL students have been a staple in America since its inception. As numbers continue to rise, teachers must prepare to meet modern day EL needs. “The teacher of EL students must be ready to address EL students who are usually associated with poverty, cultural assimilation needs and uncertainty concerning their futures” (Cummins, 1984, p.82). In Indiana, the standards for teaching EL students are becoming more defined than
in years past.

EL teachers in Indiana must have a bachelor's degree in TESOL, English and teacher's license. In Indiana it is not a state mandate that the teacher be bilingual or pass an EL special area test. In private K-12 schools, in Indiana, there is no requirement to which EL teachers are mandated to adhere. This means that private schools may or may not have staff that are highly qualified in helping students learn the English language (IDOE, 2012).

By 2020, Caucasians will no longer be the major demographic in the United States (U.S Census, 2008). It is imperative that schools review the qualifications that EL teachers possess as well as how schools develop the teachers. Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was amended in 1974 to focus on professional development for teacher. Title I and Title II of NCLB both address the need for professional development, as it pertains to elementary and secondary schools.

Developing professionally is a vital element of instructional development. Title II of NCLB provides the Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program. In particular, it focuses on improving teaching and learning through consistent and intensive high-quality activities in science, English and math. (NCLB, 2002). No Child Left Behind not only requires that teachers be involved in development it provides grants for the professional development:

To receive a sub grant under Title II, an LEA must conduct an assessment of its professional development needs. This assessment must be carried out with the involvement of teachers, including teachers in schools receiving assistance under Title I, Part A. It must result in a plan that describes how professional development activities will contribute to the LEA's overall efforts for school reform and educational improvement,
addressing, in particular, how those activities will meet the needs of teachers in Title I schools (2002).

Part A of Title I establishes specific requirements for teacher professional development. To meet federal guidelines, State Education Agency (SEA) and Local Education Agency (LEA) must make sure that implementation is completed with fidelity.

Each LEA that receives Title I, Part A funds must provide high-quality professional development that will improve the teaching of academic subjects, consistent with the State's content standards, to enable children to meet the State's student performance standards. An LEA may satisfy this requirement through district wide professional development activities or activities implemented by each Title I school. Regardless, professional development activities must be designed by principals, teachers, and other staff in Title I schools. Parents may also be involved in designing professional development activities. Schools must do the following:

- Support instructional practices that are geared to challenging State content standards and create a school environment conducive to high achievement in the academic subjects.
- Support LEA Title I plans and school wide program plans.
- Draw on resources available under other programs such as Title III of Goals 2000, Title II of ESEA, and from other sources.
- Include strategies for developing curricula and teaching methods that integrate academic and vocational instruction (including applied learning and team teaching) if an LEA determines such strategies are appropriate.
- Include strategies for identifying and eliminating gender and racial bias in instructional materials, methods, and practices. (NCLB, 2001)

An LEA must describe in its Title I plan the strategies of the LEA and its Title I schools to provide professional development. In designing professional development programs, it must be noted:
• All school staff in school wide program schools may participate.
• All school staff in targeted assistance schools may participate, if such participation will result in better addressing the needs of participating students.
• Knowledge of effective teaching strategies that is gained through Title I professional development activities may be shared with teaching staff that do not work with Title I participants.
• Parents may participate in professional development activities if a school or LEA determines that parental participation is appropriate. An LEA must ensure that sufficient resources are devoted to carry out professional development activities effectively in each Title I school. An LEA may reserve these resources off-the-top of the LEA’s Title I allocation, each Title I school may use Title I funds it receives to provide professional development, or the LEA may use a combination of these approaches. (NCLB, 2001)

If a school’s teachers are identified as needing improvement, that school must do so or risk penalties. It must provide effective professional development activities as part of its school improvement plan. This includes:

• Devote to professional development, over two consecutive years, an amount equivalent to at least 10 percent of the Title I, Part A funds received by the school during one fiscal year; or
• Otherwise demonstrate that the school is effectively carrying out professional development activities. (EEOA, 1974)

**Instructional Support**

According to federal guidelines, if an LEA or Title I school uses Title I funds to employ instructional aides, the aides must do the following:

• Possess the knowledge and skills sufficient to assist participating children in meeting the State's performance standards.
• Have a secondary school diploma, its recognized equivalent, or earn either within two years of employment. An aide does not need to meet this requirement if the aide possesses proficiency in a language other than English that is needed to enhance the participation of limited-English-proficient children in Title I programs.
• Be under the direct supervision of a teacher who has primary responsibility for providing instructional services to participating children (NCLB, 2001).

An LEA must include instructional aides in professional development activities, if feasible. In addition, an LEA or Title I school may use Title I funds to create career ladder programs for Title I instructional aides to obtain the education necessary to become licensed and certified teachers.

Although most professional development activities will be carried out at the LEA and school level, each SEA has a significant role in providing technical assistance to enable LEAs and schools to carry out those activities. An SEA must review each LEA's plan to determine if the LEA's professional development activities:

• Are tied to challenging State student content and student performance standards.
• Reflect current research on teaching and learning.
• Are designed to have a positive impact on teachers' performance in the classroom.
• Contribute to continuous improvement in the classroom or throughout the school.
• Include methods to teach children with special needs.
• Are developed with the extensive participation of teachers.
• Include gender-equitable education methods, techniques, and practices.
• Implement a system of school support teams, including provision of necessary professional development for those teams.
• Work with other agencies, including educational service agencies or other local consortia, and institutions to provide technical assistance to LEAs and schools, including technical assistance in providing professional development and school support and improvement. (NCLB, 2001)

If educational service agencies exist, the SEA must consider providing professional development and technical assistance through such agencies. If educational service agencies do not exist, the SEA must consider providing professional development and technical assistance through other cooperative agreements such as through a consortium of LEAs. (NCLB, 2002)

In 2010, the National Center on Migration reported that there were more than 5.3 million
EL students enrolled in public school in 2008. EL students represented about 11 percent of the total preschool through 12th grade school populations (ELL Information Center Facts Sheet Series, 2012). In Indiana the total enrollment of EL students tripled from the total in 2000 to 2008. Consequently, many schools started to adjust their professional focus. A study completed by Indiana University showed that during the years of 2000-2008, universities added more than 52 new EL professional development programs for teachers and educational staff. These seminars, workshops and lectures are currently rated from best reviewed to worst on the Indiana University website (Indiana University School of Education, 2011).

The highest rated teacher development programs stress similar subject matter, and they yield the highest student assessment results. These programs demand that teachers first master their subject matter. Although this sounds like a given, studies have shown that 67% of public school teachers do not show "mastery" when it comes to knowing their subject matter (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2000, p.46). This number is 47% when it comes to teachers who have EL licenses. Data show that teachers who continuously engage in professional development opportunities, help their students achieve at a higher rate (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p.194). This is why the top rated programs begin with sound theory, content knowledge and develop strategies for teaching EL students.

EL teachers must be reminded that the information a first-year college student learns is usually outdated by their junior year (Toohey, p. 52, 2000). This means that professional development must be ongoing. Participants are given upcoming dates for seminars, lectures and collaborative functions. This allows teachers to better prepare themselves for the students and competency as a professional.

A major component in the assessing of teacher competency deals with professional
Professional development for teachers is more than typical training. It is an opportunity for the learning of skills, or methodology and it is included in its definition of:

helping teachers not only learn new skills but also develop new insights into pedagogy and their own practice, and explore new or advanced understandings of content and resources. [This] definition of professional development includes support for teachers as they encounter the challenges that come with putting into practice their evolving understandings about the use of technology to support inquiry-based learning.... Current technologies offer resources to meet these challenges and provide teachers with a cluster of supports that help them continue to grow in their professional skills, understandings, and interests. (Graves, Fitzgerald, p.73, 2003)

Indiana, like most states, advocates for teachers’ professional development and includes it in its latest RISE evaluation for teachers and principals.

The Indiana RISE evaluation claims the capacity to provide both new teacher and veteran teachers with the individual professional development deemed necessary for them to excel in the classroom and continue to improve throughout their careers. Indiana code 20-28-11.5 mandates that school corporations link each staff members’ performance evaluation results with professional development opportunities and license renewal credits. While many districts already suggest, recommend, or offer differentiated sessions or courses to help teachers grow professionally, this link to evaluation results has never before been required (IDOE, 2011). In Indiana, professional development for teachers may include: university coursework, conference attendance, peer modeling, peer coaching, creating Professional Learning Communities or initiating "rounds" (per observations). The standard, however, is not the same for other school
staff that play a part in EL education.

Paraprofessionals, staff members who are not certified teachers but may provide instructional support, must have at least a high school diploma. “.... Paraprofessionals hired after January 8, 2002, and working in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds must have completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; or obtained an associate’s (or higher) degree; or met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing, reading, writing, and mathematics” (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (NCLB, 2001). This allows the individual state to create a standard for paraprofessional staff development, which to this point has been left to the school district's discretion.

When it comes to professional development for EL educators, there are many options. To date, there are more than 70 nationally recognized companies offering EL professional development on everything from seminars on groundbreaking methods to video streaming on the importance of linguistics in English language (Brinton, Snow & Wesche, 2003, p. 73). In the fall of 2007, the Indiana University School of Education collaborated with the United States Department of Education to hold a professional development for the state’s largest school district, Indianapolis Public Schools. The 1.5 million dollar grant given by the United States Department of Education was used to fund a project that prepared new teachers and current classroom teachers/paraprofessionals. The aim was to revise some of the old college campus theory on instruction for EL students.
The professional development focused on best practices for EL educators and the hurdles that stifle student achievement. Nearly 80 teachers and staff were given the opportunity to clarify popular misconceptions while reviewing the new standards for EL education. The activities centered on teachers engaging students versus lecturing them. The professional development centered around five standards for effective pedagogy. As it admonished teachers for not checking their instructional clocks and lecturing too long, the professional development called for collaboration, emphasis on language and literacy, making learning relevant, rigor and the importance of conversation (Indiana University School of Education, 2011).

In Indiana, the "formal State or local academic assessment," is determined by the school district or administrative office. And, though all teachers and staff are indirectly affected by the failure of EL students to make progress, the staff members have no direct evaluative penalty. This can be directly correlated to the lack of urgency that schools feel to provide professional development for support staff (Faltis, 2005, p. 52).

In 2004, Indiana EL students scored 35% lower than did their native speaking counterparts on state standardized tests. Whereas the average general education score on the ISTEP was 72% passing, EL students were passing at less than 39%. For many, this is a reflection of both the school and its priorities (IDOE, 2011). "Anytime you see an achievement gap that is greater than ten percent, it is a direct reflection on the country, the community, and the schools. All three of these stakeholders must be aware of the issue, and they must have decided not to take the appropriate steps to remedy the issue" (Sparks, Ganschow, 1999, p. 91). Dr. Jonathan Ortiz says that teachers must make it their professional development goal to learn what strategy will help
each and every student they encounter. Professional development goals should mirror the needs of the "clients" being served, in a professional institution, not just the professional needs of the employees of that institution. Conversely, the goal of every administrator should be to develop teachers whose goals are to facilitate growth in students (Ortiz, 1992, p.118).

**Evaluation of EL Teachers**

Last September 350,000 teachers went on strike for more than seven school days in Chicago. The main issue of the strike dealt with an administrator's right to select teachers. The strike focused on the right of the administration to make student assessment scores more than 30% of a teacher’s evaluation (Huffington Post, 2012). Proficient teacher evaluations will always be juxtaposed to the achievement of students and a teacher's ability to prove effectiveness. This should be no different for the EL teachers of Indiana.

Assessment has always been linked to the gathering of data, while evaluation is a process for interpreting and analyzing data at a given point with the aim of improvement (Peregoy, Boyle, 2001, p.82). If taken literally, these definitions could easily dissolve any conflict that arises in teacher evaluations. Evaluating an EL teacher should be structured as a process for professional development. “Most teachers know that their evaluations can be used against them when it comes time to make staffing decisions. This is why many do not perform as well as they could. They are too nervous. They know that an administrator's "interpretation” can get them terminated," stated EL Specialist Ana Arroyo (Arroyo, personal communication, 2012).

There is no consensus on what teacher evaluations should entail. Consequently there is no set observation tool, evaluation rubric, or nationally used teacher measurement practice. The state of Indiana uses the RISE evaluation, based on federal guidelines (Indiana Department of
Education website). The federal government demands that test scores become the benchmark for school success. With this, there is little hope that there will ever be consensus with teachers. The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, along with WestEd (a national educational corporation), decided to be a voice of many educators who are being evaluated. Their national report states that a teacher’s effectiveness should be the measurement, but the definition of effectiveness should be more inclusive. “Teachers are not solely responsible for student learning. Teacher evaluations should recognize all of the cultural, familial and historical issues that students bring to the classroom” (The National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2008, p. 9). The study goes on to state that evaluations should always be of an inclusive nature. This means that teachers, parents, administrators, and educational central offices should decide what makes a teacher effective. And, in the case of EL teachers, this is more important because of the many challenges with which they deal.

When evaluating an EL teacher, one must take measurement of the teacher’s contribution to outcomes as well as the outcome itself. EL teachers impact student learning and growth through the processes that they employ (National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2008, p. 10). The operative word is “process.” EL students must go through a process in order to grasp the language. Because this is true, EL teachers should be evaluated on the process implementation, their mastery of linguistic content and the student progress results (Arroyo, personal communication, 2012). Currently, no such recognition of the process exists for EL teachers.

All Indiana educators are facing more in-depth professional evaluation guidelines. School districts must adopt the RISE evaluation model or create a model that is comparable for approval. In an effort to allow stakeholders the chance to understand the major components of
the Indiana RISE evaluation, the IDOE released information on its website, created opportunities for training and held open forums (IDOE, 2011). In response to many people wondering how the evaluation works, the IDOE responded that the evaluation is "designed in collaboration with educators across Indiana, RISE look's at a teacher's professional practice as well as the evidence of student learning" (IDOE, 2011). Former Indiana Superintendent Dr. Tony Bennett stated that the new evaluation takes a fair, comprehensive and accurate look at the performance in Indiana classrooms.

All teachers, including those teaching EL students, will be evaluated on their professional practice and assessed student outcomes. The RISE evaluation professes to evaluate teachers on their knowledge and skills, planning, instruction, leadership and their "core professionalism" (IDOE, 2011). In addition, the evaluation will require classroom observations, lesson plan review and additional review based on the "Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Rubric." The evaluation defines student learning and requires dual evaluators in hopes of eliminating bias. Teachers will be deemed highly effective, effective, in need of improvement or ineffective. Retention of teachers will be directly related to the evaluation of all teachers.

EL teachers are not connected with what the state calls its "growth model," although they are evaluated on the progress of their students. The ability to successfully navigate the growth model for schools will result in a school rating from A to F. This rating system has been the catalyst for debate also (Star, 2011, p. B5). The state evaluation system, NCLB mandates, have teachers more than a little concerned about the future for teachers of public education.

The new Indiana evaluation mandates a call for accountability from all those involved with student education, from the teachers to school superintendents. For EL teachers, as with all Indiana teachers, their evaluations are tied directly to the progress that the EL students make on
language assessment tests. According to NCLB Section 4, an evaluation plan must include the following:

1. Annual performance evaluations for all certified employees.
2. Objective measures for student achievement and growth, including methods for areas and subjects not measured by statewide assessments.
3. Rigorous measures of teacher effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators.
4. Annual designation of each certified employee in 1 of 4 ratings categories: Highly Effective, Effective, Improvement Necessary, In-effective.
5. An explanation of the evaluator’s recommendations for improvement, including the time frame in which improvement is expected.
6. A teacher, who negatively affects student achievement and growth, cannot receive a rating of “Highly Effective” or “Effective” (2001).

An EL teacher who has taught 20 years, and now holds the title of EL Specialist, stated, "No matter how they frame it, teachers are still subjected to human bias" (Arroyo, personal communication, 2012). This sentiment is echoed in Stephen Cary's *Working with second language learners: Answers to teachers' top ten questions*, book (2000). The book outlines how evaluator bias is inevitable when conducting a teacher evaluation because the evaluator has decided what is "good" (2000, p.146). Cary says the language may change and the methods may change but the bias is real. Teachers who are perceived to be good teachers will receive effective ratings while other teachers will be evaluated as “in need of improvement” based on the administrator's outlook. With this in mind, it is imperative that the administrator be as well versed in EL instruction as the EL teacher him/herself. Without a working knowledge of all that encompasses the world of EL, it is impossible to accurately evaluate the effectiveness of an EL instructor (p.235).
School Outreach to Parents of EL Students

All students need support from their parents and parents need support from the schools. “School corporations shall provide evidence that communication between the school and the home, whether about language minority student progress or school activities, is conducted, to the extent possible, in the native/preferred language of the home” (NCLB, 2001). It is vitally important to look at who the EL students are so that service can be appropriate. Nationwide, Hispanic students are 75% of the EL population and Asian students comprise 13%. In the Midwest, characteristics of EL students are starting to mirror the statistics of the most highly populate EL state of California:

1. Almost 25% K-12 students are English learners
2. 75 to 85 percent speak Spanish as their primary language
3. 60 to 75 percent are economically disadvantaged
4. Up to 70% receive special education services
5. At least 6% have attended American schools less than 12 months
6. 8 to 10 % are re-designated as “Fluent English Proficient" each year
7. Of all ELL students, 40-61 percent is in elementary school (grades K-5), 20 % are in middle school (grades 6-8), and 19 % are in high school (grades 9-12) (U.S. Census, Bureau, 2008).

Lau vs. Nichols (1973) made it necessary for schools to provide services for EL students, including parent information. Parents must be informed, in writing, of the services provided to their students. This information must be in the native language of the parent and student. This outreach allows parents to make the best decision concerning their students' education
Fredrickson, Frith, 1998, p.87). NCLB addresses the need for parental involvement in EL education. It states:

In addition to an LEA parent involvement policy, each Part A participating school must jointly develop with, and distribute to, parents of participating children a written parental involvement policy, agreed upon by these parents, that describes the means for carrying out school-level policy, sharing responsibility for high student performance, building the capacity of school staff and parents for involvement, and increasing accessibility for participation of parents with limited English proficiency or with disabilities. Such policy must be updated periodically to meet the changing needs of parents and the school. (2001)

It is important to understand that the involvement of families in their children's education is not limited solely to attendance at Parent Teacher Organizations (PTO) meetings or volunteering at school. What parents do at home with their children is even more important to the total educational effort. Schools need to let parents know that they value both their contributions at school and their participation at home.

School Policy Involvement

A school's written policy should describe specifically enough for parents and school system personnel to readily understand how each participating school will do the following:

1. Convene an annual meeting to inform parents of their school's participation in Part A, to explain Part A's requirements, and their right to be involved. In preparation for this meeting, efforts should be made to determine the most convenient time for parents of participating children to attend and to determine the most reliable method for ensuring that parents receive notice.

2. Offer a flexible number of meetings, such as in the morning or evening, and provide, if necessary, with Part A funds transportation, child care, or home visits as these services relate to parental involvement.

Involve parents, in an organized, ongoing, and timely way, in the planning, review, and improvement of Part A programs, including the school parental involvement policy and the joint development of the school wide program plan, if any. If a school has in place a process for involving parents in the joint planning
and design of its general education programs, the school may use that process as long as there is adequate representation of parents of participating children, and it conforms to, and is effective in implementing, the parental involvement requirements of Part A.

3. **Provide parents of participating children**
   
   (a) timely information about Part A programs;
   
   (b) school performance profiles required under section 1116(a)(3), where the LEA must assess annually the progress of each participating school;
   
   (c) their child's individual student assessment results, including an interpretation of such results;
   
   (d) a description and explanation of the curriculum in use at the school, the forms of assessment used to measure student progress, and the proficiency levels students are expected to meet;
   
   (e) opportunities for regular meetings to formulate suggestions, share experiences with other parents, and participate as appropriate in decisions relating to the education of their children if parents express an interest in doing this; and
   
   (f) timely responses to the suggestions made by parents that have been offered in meetings such as those described in (e) above.

If the school wide program plan is not satisfactory to parents, the school will submit any parent comments on the plan when the school makes the plan available to the LEA.” (NCLB, 2002)

In addition to determining the most convenient time for parents to attend meetings and the most reliable method for ensuring that parents receive notice of them, school staff may want to consider holding some meetings in locations other than schools. This could negate potential transportation issues.

Schools must create parent compacts. This corresponds to a major theme and new emphasis of the ESEA to link schools, parents, and communities in order to meet the educational needs of the children with whom they are involved. It builds on the belief that school-community links are critical to creating environments where all children can reach high standards. These links are encouraged by the school-parent compact designed to increase the sharing of responsibility between families and schools for the high performance of students. As a
component of the school-level parental involvement policy, all Part A schools are required to develop *jointly* with the parents of participating children a school-parent compact. If the school-level policy includes a school-parent compact already, the existing compact may be used to meet this requirement as long as it meets the Part A compact provisions explained in subsequent paragraphs, and includes Part A parents (NCLB, 2001).

Since Part A serves as the catalyst to strengthen and improve the entire instructional program in school wide program schools, school-parent compacts must be developed with all parents of the students enrolled. In targeted assistance schools, school-parent compacts must be developed jointly with the parents of participating Part A students. Although compacts are a good idea for all families and schools, in targeted assistance schools, they are required only for participating Part A families. (An LEA and school should make it clear to families that obtaining parental signature for such learning compacts is strongly encouraged, yet voluntary).

Parents of EL students, like the students themselves, are the products of varying sets of circumstances. It is important that they understand their parental rights under NCLB as they pertain to their students. According to NCLB, Section 3302 (a) [Parental notification], parents should be aware of the following:

“Each eligible entity...shall, not later than 30 days after the beginning of the school year, inform a parent...of a limited English proficient child identified for participation in...such program of

(1) the reasons for the identification of their child...and...need of placement in a language...program;

(2) the child’s level of English proficiency, how such level was assessed, and the status of the child’s academic achievement;

(3) the method of instruction used in the program...;

(4) how the program...will meet the educational...needs of the child;

(5) how such program will specifically help their child learn English, and meet age appropriate academic achievement standards for grade promotion and graduation;
(6) the specific exit requirements…, the expected rate of transition…and the expected rate of graduation from secondary school…;
(7) in the case of a child with a disability, how such program meets the objectives of the individualized education program of the child; and (8) information pertaining to parental rights that includes written guidance—(A) detailing—(i) the right that parents have to have their child immediately removed…upon their request; and (ii) the options that parents have to decline to enroll their child…” (2002).

Parents must be given notification before a child is inducted into any EL program. In Indiana, this mandate is satisfied by sending a standard parent notification form. Part of the Indiana RISE teacher evaluation stipulates that teachers must make parental contact frequently. Parents must have the opportunity to receive school information in at least the native language of the parent and English. (NCLB, 2002) In every major school district in Indiana's Marion County, there should be a "means of parent orientation, noted visual assistance and parent liaison to aid English learning parents" (Star, 2011)

EL Specialist, Ana Arroyo, has found parents of EL students in need to be educated themselves. Many parents need to continue their formal education and all need to be more educated on EL law. Schools that offer adult classes to parents have seen a 30-45% increase in parent participation over schools who do not offer such (Guo, 2006, p.73). English learner parent outreach is more than creating opportunities for parents to support their students. Parent outreach is allowing the parents the chance to experience what it means to become language proficient as they become academically engaged.

Studies on EL Instructional Strategies and Programs

Differentiation is a strategy from which all students benefit; EL students are no different. NCLB states:
The school corporation shall provide equal educational opportunity to language minority students with the appropriate level of English language development to allow for meaningful participation of language minority students in the district’s educational program. Such instruction shall take place during the regular school day. A minimum of one (1) hour daily is appropriate for LEP students at English proficiency levels 1-4” (2001).

According to this statute, one or more of the following approaches to instruction may be used:

1. **Transitional Bilingual Education:** (TBE) is an instructional program in which subjects are taught through two languages--English and the native language of the English language learners -- and English is taught as a second language. English language skills, grade promotion and graduation requirements are emphasized. The primary purpose of these programs is to facilitate the LEP student's transition to an all-English instructional environment while receiving academic subject instruction in the native language to the extent necessary. As proficiency in English increases, specialized EL support decreases. Transitional bilingual education programs vary in the amount of native language instruction provided and the duration of the program (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1994). TBE programs may be *early-exit* or *late-exit*, depending on the amount of time a child may spend in the program (Grey, p.118, 1991).

2. **ESL:** English as a second language (ESL) is an educational approach in which English language learners are instructed how to use of the English language. Their instruction is based on a special curriculum that typically involves little or no use of the native language, focuses on language as opposed to content and is usually taught during specific school periods. For the rest of the school day, students may be placed in mainstream classrooms, an immersion program, or a bilingual education program. Every bilingual education program has an ESL component (U.S Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences [IES], 2008).

3. **Pull-out ESL:** A program in which LEP students are taken out of the regular, mainstream classrooms for special instruction in English as a second language (Hill, Flynn, 2006).

4. **Content-based ESL:** This approach to teaching English as a second 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. English is used as the medium of instruction (Crandall, 1994).
5. **English Speaker of Other Languages**: English language development (**ELD**) means instruction designed specifically for English language learners to develop their listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English. This type of instruction is also known as “English as a second language”, “teaching English to speakers of other languages” (**TESOL**), or “English for speakers of other languages” (**ESOL**). **ELD**, **ESL**, **TESOL** or **ESOL** standards are a version of **These standards** that have been crafted to address the specific developmental stages of students learning English (Grey, p. 216, 1991).

6. **Sheltered English**: An instructional approach used to make academic instruction in English understandable to **EL** students to help them acquire proficiency in English while at the same time achieving in content areas. **Sheltered English** instruction differs from **ESL** in that English is not taught as a language with a focus on learning the language. Rather, content knowledge and skills are the goals. In the sheltered classroom, teachers use simplified language, physical activities, visual aids, and the environment to teach vocabulary for concept development in mathematics, science, social studies and other subjects (National Council for Teacher Education, 2010).

7. **Structured Immersion**: In this program, language minority students receive all of their subject matter instruction in their second language. The teacher uses a simplified form of the second language. Students may use their native language in class; however, the teacher uses only the second language (Renandya, p.322, 2010). The goal is to help minority language students acquire proficiency in English while at the same time achieving in content areas.

8. **English as a New Language (ENL)**: This is a course for high school students which may count as four of the eight English/language arts credits needed for high school graduation. Under Certification Type Rules 46/47, teachers with any license may teach the course although the K-12 **ESL** endorsement is strongly recommended. Under Certification Type Rules 2002, teachers must have the content area certification (**ENL**) and the high school setting licensure to teach the course (Grey, p.115, 1991).

Empirical studies show that dual language programs, a bilingual model that varies in intensity and length, is gaining prominence in U.S. schools. (Genesse, 2009, p.28) Other programs like transitional bilingual programming are also gaining support as they recognize the need to taper native-language support as English skills increase. No matter the strategy, it is necessary for **EL** students to be given the opportunity to acquire vocabulary, have scaffold-type lessons and receive continued support from qualified teachers.
Summary

The review of literature has uncovered several studies that have shown long-term benefits to EL students who are enrolled in EL programs versus being governed by EL policy. The literature has offered insight into the perils that await schools, students, and communities who are not aware of EL laws. Some studies have offered alternative definitions, methods and characteristics to successful EL strategies and achievements. Studies have also identified some common characteristics to EL programs that have proven to advance EL students academically.

There are other studies that have shown the need for further research, as the EL issue continues to grow. Literature reviews show that many of the studies completed are outdated or need to be updated as a result of changing laws and student populations. Research studies have highlighted the positive effects of school districts reviewing their policies concerning EL students and individualizing the instruction given. This means setting standards not only for EL teachers, but professionally developing all teachers with whom EL students have contact.

To date, Indiana has no set procedure for instructing EL students, but the IDOE does have requirements for the majority of staff that work with EL students. Just as with all teachers in Indiana, quality EL teachers are an issue when addressing quality EL programs. Consequently, the literature reviewed calls for an in-depth look at the way EL staff is chosen and evaluated. As the EL population continues to balloon in Indiana, research shows that the need for EL focused learning will do nothing but increase. Awareness is the first step in providing a quality education.

CHAPTER III

Methodology
Restatement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine which strategies Indiana elementary schools were using to close the achievement gap involving English Learning (EL) students. Key in this determination is the allocation of human and monetary resources, federal/state law and EL awareness. With a hypothesis that states declares although there are federal provisions concerning the support of EL students, many Indiana school districts still do little more than comply with the law (and some do less), the observations of Indiana elementary administrators were surveyed.

The demographics of schools in the United States are changing drastically. Consequently, English language learners should be the focus of a major public education overhaul. The research questions that were pursued in this study were as follows:

1. What measures are school districts taking to ensure that students who are eligible and receive EL services are doing so appropriately, as determined by federal law?

2. What efforts are made by school districts to professionally develop highly qualified EL staff (as determined by federal and state criteria)?

3. What qualifications do Indiana school districts require for EL teachers, assistants and substitute teachers?

4. Do elementary administrators believe that adequate human resources (teachers, support staff, aides, etc.) have been provided for EL students?

5. How are EL staff evaluated, and by whom?

Description of the Sample
The researcher identified a sample of 100 individual elementary school administrators, from various school corporations around Indiana. One hundred of the identified administrators came from 91 identified schools because some schools had two administrators. This included all Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) registered elementary schools in Marion County and those within 200 miles of the county. The corporation sizes ranged from 1-1,000 students (small), 1,001-5,000 students, (midsize) to 5,001-35,000 students (large). The researcher surveyed the administrators of these elementary schools. The sample of 91 elementary schools, which yielded the 100 administrators, was identified through the IDOE website (IDOE, 2011). By researching the website data was retrieved concerning all Indiana elementary schools and their districts including school names, grade levels, total enrollment, and enrollment by grade level, name of administrators, demographics and contact information. Also included on the site were previous assessment scores, student attendance, geographical data and other accountability data.

To first determine the population for the study, Indiana elementary schools were grouped by reported size. Schools were categorized as follows: 1-100 students (small), 101-300 students, (midsize) to 301-500 students (large). For logistics, the sample of 91 schools was selected from the population of all Indiana elementary schools by eliminating the districts that had no reported English language-learning students and/or were more than 25 miles from Marion County. This, and the need for sample-size control, led to the identification of the target school districts for the sample as those described as having EL populations.

The Instrument
A research survey was deemed the most effective means to study EL education in Indiana because it was the most efficient way to find out what Indiana administrators were doing concerning EL support. There were two similar EL surveys found, both completed in North Dakota, but no such EL survey existed for research on Indiana students. Within the opening of the survey administrators were told about the usage of the information they would voluntarily give, informed of the date the data would be available and told about the length of the ensuing queries. Demographics were compiled, surveys were anonymous, state data was referenced, both Likert scale and open-ended questions were asked, as the questions were developed based on federal/state law. The laws include the following:

Section 3122 (a)(3)(A)
1. At a minimum, annual increases in the number of percentage of children making progress in learning English
2. At a minimum, annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency by the end of each school year, as determined by a valid and reliable assessment of English proficiency consistent with section 1111(b)(7);

This means that schools need to show that EL students are learning English more proficiently each year, an increasing percentage of the EL students are becoming fluent each year, and that they are making adequate yearly progress (AYP) each year (Fenner, p. 232, 2006).

The design of the survey questions was done in such a manner as to assess the effectiveness of the English language learning programs at Indiana elementary schools. The questions focused on knowledge of EL law, teacher professional development, teacher
qualifications, EL program implementation, and adequate human resources for EL success. Respondents were allowed an additional opportunity to express their views concerning their EL programs in depth.

To demonstrate that the survey instrument measures that which it is intended to measure, a panel of noteworthy educators was assembled. This panel included the following:

- Dr. Joseph McKinney, Department of Educational Studies - Ball State University
- Dr. Del Jarman, Department of Educational Studies - Ball State University
- Ana Arroyo, EL Specialist School #15 (Thomas D. Gregg; IPS)
- Alicia Harris, Principal Winding Elementary School (Lawrence Township)

These members of the panel were selected for content review of the validity of the instrument because of their expertise with research, elementary EL issues, and/or doctoral studies. Each panel member was given a draft of the instrument for review. Each of the questions were analyzed for inconsistencies, ambiguity or the need for any changes. This qualitative instrument was reviewed and the instrument creator made final decisions.

Charles and Mertler noted that "a valid test is always reliable but a reliable test is not necessarily valid" (2002, p.159). Thus, it was important to make sure that the instrument measured what it was created to measure, no matter its reliability. For this reason, there was statistical consultation provided by Kianre Eouanzoui, Ph.D., of the Ball State University Office of Research and Academic Effectiveness. After this consultation it was determined that it was necessary to prove the reliability of the survey because the survey did elicit some opinions and attitudes from those who responded. It was likely that responses to the survey would be different
from one respondent to another. Most of the questions were to be based solely on data, but there were three (3) particular questions that asked for opinions. These questions could impact the internal consistency and a test for reliability would be needed. For this reason, the reliability was tested through a test pilot group of elementary educators before the survey was sent to principals.

A group of five elementary principals were chosen to test the reliability of the survey instrument. More than 80% of the respondents found the survey to be “comprehensive and easily understood.” Each administrator was given the instrument and asked to respond according to the written directions. Each administrator complied. The feedback from the administrators was consistent, and each gave lengthy feedback in the open-ended portion. The administrators stated that they were able to express themselves clearly concerning their EL programs and the direction the programs were taking. From this, survey questions were revised according to respondent feedback concerning clarity.

**Research Design**

Survey research was completed in this study to collect information pertinent to success of EL elementary students in Indiana. Just like all other states, Indiana must adhere to the federal mandate to service all EL students with fidelity or risk losing federal funding (NCLB, 2002). The selection of survey research for this study was gathered from all elementary schools registered with the Indiana Department of Education’s website to determine how many of them possessed EL programs, what the programs entailed, who ran the programs and what were the results of the programs. The research design was crafted to be "broader in scope and less personal in nature" (Charles & Mertler, p. 155 2002). This means that the survey was designed to allow the respondents to let the district data speak as their responses, versus their opinions, on the state of EL education in the district. The survey was invaluable in the collection of responses and
correlating trends.

The research project (435418-1) EL Students in Indiana at the Elementary Level was submitted for approval to the Ball State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) in February 2013. The IRB application was approved as Exempt Review in March 2013 (see appendices).

**Procedures**

Survey Monkey, an online survey website, was used to deliver the survey to more than 90 elementary schools in Indiana. The survey included a cover letter and a link to the survey, which was derived using an email database of the population sample of Indiana elementary administrators. Within 10 days of the original mailings, follow up e-mails were sent to would-be respondents. In all, 100 original e-mails were sent to elementary administrators listed on the Indiana Department of Education site. Five days later, the non-respondents received a second mailing. A final e-mail was sent to the remaining non-respondents, five days after the second mailing. To block duplicate surveys from being sent, Survey Monkey received the responses and eliminated the respondents from future mailings.

Thanks to private login information, the data received were securely stored in Survey Monkey. The data were also tracked through the survey, resources and the responses to the question disaggregated. Survey Monkey gave an update each time a respondent submitted. Following submissions, graphs and tables were created.

**Data Collection**

Collected data were the result of the Survey Monkey online distribution system, which used the list serve of e-mails of the 91 schools with 38 respondents. Follow-up surveys were sent twice through e-mail up to ten (10) days after the previous mailing to any non-respondents. The
surveys were e-mailed to the conductor of the study, or through traditional mail. The professional position of the respondent or their designee was designated on the first page of the survey.

The data were organized and collected by categories related to the questions of research and the demographic size of the school. This means that the data were first organized according to the following questions:

1. What measures are school districts taking to ensure that students who are eligible and receive EL services are doing so appropriately, as determined by federal law?
2. What efforts are made by school districts to professionally develop highly qualified EL staff (as determined by federal and state criteria)?
3. What qualifications do Indiana school districts require for EL teachers, assistants and substitute teachers?
4. Do elementary administrators believe that adequate human resources (teachers, support staff, aides, etc.) have been provided for EL students?
5. How are EL staff evaluated and by whom?

Data Analysis

Data was compiled to determine whether EL students are being supported in elementary schools in Indiana and how. Further analyses of the data were done to identify whether or not EL student success can be linked to the adequacy of the EL teacher and support staff. This would allow schools an opportunity to review their own practices and make adjustments as necessary.

Descriptive analysis was used in relation to the survey results partially for satisfaction of the study. The study yielded adequate percentages to show a correlation with EL assessment achievement and the amount of support the school provided. The percentages were able to show the common resources deficiencies that led to the lack of EL progress. The number of survey
respondents was not enough to state that all schools with low assessing EL students have the same characteristics. Further research would be necessary to fully accomplish all of the purposes of this study.
Summary

This survey was specifically designed to assess the practices and perceptions of public elementary schools in Indiana in regards to EL students. The qualitative survey was sent to 91 elementary schools (100 Indiana licensed administrators) in and around Indiana. The results of the survey were collected in confidence and the results were used to create this dissertation.

A panel of experts tested the validity of the survey and the content validity of the instrument was upheld. The reliability of the survey was tested by a group of five elementary principals who piloted the survey but were not counted in the official results. Tables and graphs were created from the data that were collected through the Survey Monkey online data service.
Chapter IV

Results and Discussion

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine which strategies Indiana elementary schools were using to support English Learning (EL) students. Key in this determination was the allocation of human and monetary resources for EL students. In noting these findings, the achievement gaps were mentioned. The purpose was also to address federal and state mandates concerning educating EL students as well as those who educate them. The research focused on the knowledge of the EL laws, adequate programming and proper instructional support. The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

1. What measures are school districts taking to ensure that students who are eligible and receive EL services are doing so appropriately, as determined by federal law?
2. What efforts are made by school districts to provide professional development for the EL staff (as determined by federal and state criteria)?
3. What qualifications do Indiana school districts require for EL teachers, assistants and substitute teachers?
4. Do elementary administrators believe that adequate human resources (teachers, support staff, aides, etc.) have been provided for EL students?
5. How are EL staff evaluated and by whom?

The data collection was accomplished through the distribution of an online survey, Survey Monkey, emailed on March 9, 2013 using an email database of elementary administrators from seven Indiana counties. Two follow-up mailings of the survey were also sent by email. The
The first follow-up survey was March 14, 2013 and the second follow-up was sent March 23, 2013. The original mailing of the survey was sent to 91 elementary schools, surveying 100 Indiana elementary principals. The first follow-up was sent to 77 principals (who had not responded to the initial e-mail), and the second follow-up mailing was sent to 64 (who had not responded to either of the first two emails). When Survey Monkey received the survey responses, the respondents’ emails were blocked from receiving any further surveys. A total of 38 responses were received out of the 100 mailed for a response rate of 38%. Of the 100 intended respondents, 62% were categorized as “unsent/opted out/ bounced” or as “un-responding”.

The 38 survey responses included 31 building principals and seven assistant principals. The assistant principals who completed the surveys were shown, by the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) website, to be active administrators in elementary buildings. This gave them access to EL statistics in their respective buildings. Of the data collected, 100% of the responses came from a primary source, which was defined as an active elementary Indiana licensed school administrator.

Respondents were surveyed on 45 questions to answer the five overarching research questions. To appropriately group the 45 questions, they were first broken down into categories and then applied to the five research questions (See Appendix E). The analysis of the survey data will be based on the responses. The following tables reflect many of the responses to each of the survey questions. The survey began with demographical questions (See Appendix D Tables) and led to questions created to satisfy the research questions. The survey results and tables will be presented according to research questions.
What measures are school districts taking to ensure that students who are eligible and receive EL services are doing so appropriately, as determined by federal law?

No one can do more than they know to do. This is why it was important to survey the administrators on their comfort level with EL law and what it mandates. Less than 8% of the respondents stated that they were very familiar with EL laws (See Appendix D).

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As an elementary administrator, what is your EL law familiarity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than somewhat/less than very (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Somewhat (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

When asked what EL offerings of support were available at their schools, the respondents answers were in line with their response of their knowledge of EL law. Most were providing traditional EL strategies of EL pullout and EL push-in methods. Over 40% of the respondents placed EL students in a separate room altogether. Less than 24% dared to try immersion
techniques. Federal law, per NCLB, mandates that EL students be allowed “fair and adequate supports in or out of the classroom” (See Appendix D).

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concerning push-in/ pullout EL services, what does your school offer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Push-in only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullout only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Push-in and Pullout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have self-contained EL classrooms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many schools shy away from immersion because it has limited formative assessment opportunities, as the learning is fluid. This fluidity is what makes immersion the best way to
learn. Immersion limits the control of instructors and places learning at the feet of the student (Kagan, S. 1995 p.28) (See Appendix D).

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your school offer “immersion” classes for EL students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per NCLB, all respondents claimed a process to ensure EL labeling (See Appendix D).

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does your school have an EL process/procedure specifically for new EL students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What efforts are made by school districts to provide professional development for the EL staff (as determined by federal and state criteria)?

Professional development is a must in any evolving profession. Employees must be provided, and take advantage of, the chance to grow as professionals in the areas in which they work. Almost 11% of the respondents stated that their district has never offered EL professional development. The priorities of a corporation can be seen by the professional development it allows. Less than 3% of the respondents stated that they felt EL professional development was not at all a priority in their district (See Appendix D).

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are EL PD opportunities for teachers a priority in your corporation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much So (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Somewhat (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38
More than 40% of respondents stated that they were employed by a school/district that offered EL professional development at least once a year (See Appendix D).

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often does your school/district offer EL Professional Development (PD)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (yearly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (I don’t know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ultimately, the employee/administrators are responsible for attending relevant professional development. Knowing what is best for their clientele should be of high priority for individual administrators. Almost 40% of the respondents admitted to having engaged in no EL professional development in 2012. Other respondents said that they had attended at least one EL professional development, with 5% stating that they had attended four or more (See Appendix D).
Table 4.8

Survey of Indiana Elementary School Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>2012-13 EL PD Attended</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four or More</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1)</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (0)</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered the question</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What qualifications do Indiana school districts require for EL teachers, assistants and substitute teachers?

NCLB mandates that teachers be “highly qualified” but leaves many of the details of this qualification to the individual states. The state of Indiana outlines what makes a teacher highly qualified and effective but allows school districts to create their own guidelines for ensuring teachers meet the requirements specific to their students needs. This means that those involved in the acquisition of human resources must be versed in EL law when making qualification decisions. Only 10.5% of the respondents were aware that NCLB mandates that paraprofessionals and substitutes be specifically qualified to work with EL students (See Appendix D).
With 100% of the respondents stating that they were involved in the hiring process of EL staff/faculty, it is important to note their knowledge of the requirements for proficiency. All of the respondents stated that their districts had minimum educational requirements for EL instructional assistant. Less than 20% required college (See Appendix D)

Table 4.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware that there are mandated Indiana laws that specifically govern EL paraprofessionals and substitute teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the minimum educational requirement for EL Instructional Assistants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (explain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A human resources issue that has long been debated is whether an EL teacher can be as effective as possible without being bilingual. Less than 20% of the respondents stated that EL teachers needed to speak more than one language to be an EL teacher in their district (See Appendix D).

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your school/district are EL teachers required to be bilingual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do elementary administrators believe that adequate human resources (teachers, support staff, aides, etc.) have been provided for EL students?

The disproportionate ratio of students to qualified teachers working with them has long been a problem in public education. The declining numbers of teachers entering the profession has been an issue in recent year. So much so that national certification programs have been offered by the government to aid in the issue. The need to adequately staff EL classes, and acquiring qualified staff/faculty is an issue of high priority. More than 43% of the respondents felt that EL students were receiving less than adequate support (See Appendix D).
Table 4.12

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Rate the adequacy of the teacher/assistant support that EL students receive in your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Adequate EL Support Staff</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than somewhat</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behind socio-economic status, school teaching staff is generally heralded as the most important factor in student success. “Very important” was the response from more than 70% of the administrators concerning the importance of EL staff (See Appendix D).

Table 4.13

How important is the EL school staff to EL success?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Importance of EL Staff to EL Success</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very (5)</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important (4)</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat (3)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than somewhat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Question</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the state of Indiana continues to adhere to the federal laws, it is vital that administrators gain clarity of the purpose of the legal statutes to receive federal funds. Of the 38 respondents, less than 37% (14 of 38) reported that the states’ funding is adequate (See Appendix D).

Table 4.14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you believe that the State of Indiana is providing adequate funding for the education of EL students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How are EL staff evaluated, and by whom?

Retention through development is essential for educators. This means that teachers must be given a clear goal, a vehicle to reach that goal and feedback along the way. No one can get better, unless they are given the tools to measure their progress. Formative evaluations for teachers are a requirement of NCLB. Each state must ensure that teachers are given explicit targets to reach professionally. In Indiana, the RISE teacher’s evaluation is the measuring-stick with which districts can create a measurement. Districts must either use RISE or create a comparable evaluation for their teachers. With all the respondents stating that they evaluate EL teachers, two major questions needed to be answered. The first entailed the tool used for evaluation (See Appendix D).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1 Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How do you evaluate EL teachers?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISE evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/School Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answered Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluating an EL teacher has more intricacies than evaluating general education teachers because of the language difference and the need to infuse culture heavily into the curriculum. These create a special set of issues for an evaluator that may not be well versed in EL strategies or EL milestones. This may be why more than three-fourths of the respondents commented that they consider themselves qualified to evaluate EL teacher’s performance (See Appendix D). The fact that there are a large number (almost 25%) of principals who feel unqualified is noteworthy. This is a major issue as teacher evaluation has been a hot-button topic in the state of Indiana in recent years.
Table 4.16

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Feel Qualified for EL Evaluation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel qualified</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel qualified to evaluate EL teachers</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38
Conclusion

The analysis of the data generated by the survey of elementary administrators demonstrated that much of the success of EL students in Indiana elementary schools can be traced to the EL programming, administrator comfort level with EL law and the EL personnel set in place. For the schools that have a program that supports EL students, (from intake through testing) have administrators with a greater knowledge of EL strategies/law, and have consistent EL personnel, the results show higher success rates for the students (per D.O.E reports). This will further be examined, in detail, in the final chapter.
Chapter V
Summary and Conclusions

Summary of the Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the adequacy of EL elementary education in Indiana. The study sought to review EL history and address contemporary issues that may be leading to the current achievement gap. The study also sought to find out whether Indiana elementary school districts adhered to ESL/EL provisions mandated by federal, state or local government, committed to EL programming and supported qualified EL instructors and instruction. The research questions that were addressed in the study were as follows:

1. What measures are school districts taking to ensure that students who are eligible and receive EL services are doing so appropriately, as determined by federal law?
2. What efforts are made by school districts to professionally develop highly qualified EL staff (as determined by federal and state criteria)?
3. What qualifications do Indiana school districts require for EL teachers, assistants and substitute teachers?
4. Do elementary administrators believe that adequate human resources (teachers, support staff, aides, etc.) have been provided for EL students?
5. How are EL staff evaluated, and by whom?

The data collection was accomplished through the distribution of an online survey through Survey Monkey, emailed on March 9, 2013 using and email database of random elementary administrators found on the Indiana Department of Education website. The original mailing was sent to 100 elementary school administrators of Indiana elementary schools and a total of 38 responses were received for a response rate of 38%. This response rate was more than one-third of the surveyed population, which is large enough for the results to be considered adequate and the data was sufficient enough to show some potential trends. Although a research
study with a small sample could be considered insignificant, there can be some practical, significance and powerful implications (Charles & Mertler, 2002, p. 198).

The 38 survey responses received yielded the following: the building principal, to whom the survey was addressed, completed 31 of the surveys and seven by assistant principals. The assistant principals that completed the surveys were shown by the DOE website to be active administrators in elementary buildings and thus given access to EL statistics in their respective buildings. Of the data collected, 100% of the responses came from a primary source.

The survey was constructed to assess the knowledge and best practice of federal state and district regulations concerning EL education at the elementary level. Additional survey questions focused on the perception of the state of EL programming at the school, the perception assistance that is received from the State, and adequacy of the EL staff and their evaluation. The scope of questions was intended to enhance the generalizability and potential ability to replicate the research. The analysis of the survey data was based on the respondents’ responses to questions that specifically related to the five (5) research questions. In other words the relevant survey questions were grouped into clusters for each of the research questions.

Discussion and Conclusions

Demographics

This study was intended to focus on various school districts in Indiana in hopes of determining the extent to which ESL programming is being successful according to Indiana student achievement statistics. The introduction to the survey specified that ESL programming is subject to numerous federal and state mandates that must be followed in order to comply with the laws. The responses to the questions on the survey reflect, in part, each principal’s knowledge of the laws pertaining to ESL education and programming.
Of the 38 survey responses received, 68.4% were from school districts with enrollments of 15,001-25,000 students (Indianapolis Public Schools and Fort Wayne Community Schools) and 23.6% were from school districts with 10,001 to 15,000 students. Thus, a majority (26 school district out of 38) of the responses received were from some of the largest school districts in the state of Indiana. As a result, the data collected were highly reflective of the commitment of some of Indiana’s largest schools districts to EL programming. However, 2 urban, and 10 self-identified rural school districts also participated in the study.

A review of past and current literature regarding ESL education at the elementary level, demonstrates that the research has focused on large urban areas and/or school districts. A large amount of the research targeted a population of children of Hispanic descent, and low socioeconomic standings. Dutros’ (2003) research efforts focused on ESL students of lower socioeconomic background in California, while Guo (2006) focused on ESL programming in Canada that served ESL students. Few studies, if any, have examined ESL/EL programs and their implementation. The results of the research study detailed in the fourth chapter and analyzed in this chapter yielded the following:

**Research question #1:** What measures are school districts taking to ensure that students who are eligible and receive EL services are doing so appropriately, as determined by federal law?

Federal and Indiana State laws mandate that students who are English Learners receive services to support both language and academic growth. The number of EL students in Indiana elementary schools has tripled since 2005 (Indiana Department of Education, 2011). The No Child left Behind (NCLB) law requires Indiana to create academic content that challenges all students. Title III of the same Act provides that EL students must also meet the standards that are the result of rigorous instruction. Because EL students are not exempt from meeting the high standards of NCLB, it is vital that schools create opportunities for EL students to flourish. NCLB
mandates that EL students must develop language proficiency while meeting the same challenges that other language proficient students are required to meet (NCLB, 2001).

The starting place to find an answer to research question #1 is to look at the legal/policy knowledge base of the respondents. In order to be in compliance with NCLB, and its regulations, principals need to know the law. A school’s EL program is “driven” by federal law. How familiar are principals with the legal rights and responsibilities that schools owe to EL students? Only 7.8% of the principals answered that they were “very” familiar (5 on the Likert scale), while 71% maintained they were “more than somewhat/less than very”. Of those surveyed, 18.4% said they were “somewhat” familiar with EL laws and regulations.

This is a disturbing finding because NCLB is aimed at closing academic performance gaps and setting performance goals for all students including subgroups. One such subgroup is the EL student. Principals must understand how NCLB forces schools to effectively serve students that were previously overlooked. If principals do not know or understand EL law it is logical to deduce they will not be able to apply the law appropriately. This means that the achievement gap will not be properly addressed.

Likewise, it is striking that principals are not substantially involved in their own professional development given their relative lack of knowledge about EL regulations. A meager 42.6% of the principals said they had attended one EL professional development seminar/workshop in the past two years. Sadly, 14 of the principals said they had attended zero EL professional development offerings in the past 2 years. The lack of priority given to professional development may be indicative of the insufficient urgency placed on closing the achievement gap between EL students and their cohorts.

On a more positive note, all principals reported having a designated intake, assessment, and placement policy concerning EL students in their elementary schools. This is a very important aspect of an appropriate EL program. The referral and identification process is essential to providing equal opportunity to EL students.

The majority of the respondents, 65.7%, reported that their EL students have access to pullout services, which allows EL students to work with school staff in a more personal setting. “Pullout” services are the most common strategy used by schools to provide services to EL students at the elementary level. This method of intervention is followed closely by the “push-in”
method that allows for EL staff to go into the mainstream classroom alongside EL students, for support (Faltis, 2005, p 25).

In the present study, the benefits of the “pullout” and “push-in” methods vary according to the size of the EL population served and the instruction given. Respondents, who reported an EL student population of 0-20, and used both pullout and push-in services, reported a 34% higher success rate on standardized tests than schools that did not provide either service (per online D.O.E ISTEP/iREAD results). Respondents who used push-in only, versus the respondents who reported using pullout only, reported a 19% rise in the success rate of their EL students on standardized tests. The push-in method is superior to the pullout method according to the research of Lesi Maxwell. “Fulton-Scott and Calvin (1983) found that bilingual/bicultural and integrated ESL programs in which ELLs were integrated with English proficient students yielded higher achievement test scores and grade point averages than pullout ESL program that provided limited opportunities for ELLs to interact with English-proficient students” (2008).

Respondents also reported using self-containment and immersion classrooms for EL students. Of the respondents, 43.7% stated their school provided a classroom where EL students are self-contained. This means that EL students are placed in a classroom with a licensed EL teacher, and an aide or assistant where they remain for the majority of the school day. Respondents reported the success rate for self-contained EL students on state standardized tests was measurably higher than “pullout” only or “push-in” only strategies. The success of self-contained EL students was echoed in the research of McGrath and Rust (2002). “Of the fifth and sixth graders in departmentalized self-contained classroom, it was found that students in self-contained classrooms made significant gains on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program in the total battery and language and science subtests. EL students in pullout or push-in situations made less gains”. The authors warned that the methods used by the individual teachers differed greatly and this could have been the reason behind the mixed results versus the strategy of self-containment.

Almost a quarter of the respondents, 23.9%, stated that EL students were involved in some form of immersion classroom. Immersion classrooms consist of direct instruction that makes no (or very few) concessions for EL students. EL students are placed in classrooms with native speakers and learn the language through first-hand experiences and encounters of native speakers in real-time. Tara Williams Fortune, of Asia Society, says that immersed EL students
“are capable of achieving as well as, and in some cases better than, non-immersion peers on standardized measures of reading and math.” There is a longstanding argument between advocates of immersion and those who believe initial instruction is more effective in a students’ native language.

**Research question #2:** What efforts are made by school districts to professionally develop highly qualified EL staff (as determined by federal and state criteria)?

Bill Gates stated that researchers of the top 11 performing schools in the world found that all 11 schools have a formalized teacher feedback system. He went further to state that “we need a system (of teacher evaluation) to help the average United States teacher to become as well coached as the ones in Shanghai China” (TED Talks, 2013). Gates said that if the United States spent 2% of what is spent on teachers’ salaries for professional development then every teacher could get the professional development needed to make them more effective. This sentiment was echoed in the responses of the survey respondents.

Unfortunately, not one principal in the entire study indicated EL professional development opportunities for teachers is a priority in their school corporation. The large majority of respondents rated professional development opportunities as “somewhat” or “not at all” for their school districts. Further, more than 40% of respondents reported that their school or school district offers EL professional development only once a year.

Moreover, 45% of principals said that first year general education teacher were not given any training on the use of ELP standards and modifications/adaptations for instructing EL students. NCLB mandates that EL students must have annual achievement objectives that not only relate gains in English proficiency, but meet the challenging state academic standards that are aligned with Title I achievement standards. It is near impossible to reach the aforementioned standards when teachers are not trained on ELP standards or provided guidance for adaptations/modifications for EL students.

In a 2000 survey (Henke, Chen & Geis) the duration, participation and perceived impact of teacher professional development was addressed. In specific, the survey sought teacher responses to professional developments for students of special populations, including those with limited English proficiency. The teachers typically spent 1 to 8 hours on professional development activities focused on addressing the needs students with English language
acquisition. “A core argument against the formal professional development in most school districts is that the programs are not likely to have lasting effects on the teacher’s practice” (2000). This is especially critical when thinking of the need for continuity and relevance as it relates to the EL teacher. EL student populations are growing and becoming more diverse. This makes it imperative that EL teachers are given professional development of value. Professional development must be linked to ongoing opportunities that are available to teachers and all personnel who support EL students.

**Research question #3:** What qualifications do Indiana school districts require for EL teachers, assistants and substitute teachers?

Current NCLB laws do not create federal stipulation for substitute teachers, unless they become long-term. Then they must meet highly qualified standards. However, all licensed teachers, and paraprofessionals, must meet a federal guideline. If an EL teacher is not teaching a core subject, NCLB does not stipulate that they must adhere to the highly qualified standard. It has fallen to each individual state to ensure that there is a specific measure by which teachers, assistant and substitutes are measured. According to the IDOE website, the following is true for Indiana:

EL classrooms functioning in a resource room or pullout capacity do not have to meet highly qualified teacher requirements.

However, teachers of ELL who *deliver primary instruction in English/Language Arts* must meet HQT requirements for English/Language Arts, but are *NOT* required to add English/Language Arts to their license. This would include:

1. Teachers instructing the ELL English/Language Arts credit course (code 1012) at the secondary level.

2. Teachers instructing the ELL World Language credit course (code 2188) at the secondary level.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) sets clear paraprofessional academic qualification guidelines for those who provide instructional support in Title I-funded programs.

Paraprofessionals, aides who provide instructional support services in a school, can be a valuable resource in any school setting. NCLB allows paraprofessionals to support instruction in Title I programs if they have met certain academic requirements:
1. Must have at least an associate’s degree; or  
2. Must have completed at least two years of college; or  
3. Must have passed the ParaPro test (www.ets.org)

Please note that aides in Title I schools do not need to meet these requirements if their role does not involve instructional support. Thus, paraprofessionals who serve only as hall monitors, interpreters, or parental involvement aides do not have to meet the same academic requirements. Similarly, if an aide working with special education students does not provide any instructional support (such as one who solely provides personal care services), that person is not considered a paraprofessional under Title I, and the academic requirements do not apply.

NCLB required that paraprofessionals demonstrate competency no later than four years after the law's enactment, or January 8, 2006.  
Note: Indiana paraprofessionals who do not work in Title I schools must have at least a high school diploma to work as a paraprofessional (www.doe.in.gov).

Survey respondents noted that 100% of their licensed school staff was deemed, highly qualified by the state of Indiana. More than 97% of the respondents noted that more of these (highly qualified) staff members were needed to raise the effectiveness of their school’s EL program. Of the survey respondents only 10.5% stated that they were aware of the state qualifications for paraprofessionals and EL teachers. Also, 89.5% of the respondents stated that they knew of no Indiana law for EL substitute teachers. Although not all administrators were sure of the qualification guidelines for each EL staff member, 100% of the respondents stated that their district had a “system” for NCLB/ state compliance to ensure that all staff was qualified for their positions.

**Research question #4:** Do elementary administrators believe that adequate human resources (teachers, support staff, aides, etc.) have been provided for EL students?

Of the surveyed principals, 97.3 % stated in their additional comments section that EL classrooms needed additional human resources. Many of the respondents, in their open comments section (63.1%), made the distinction between class size and student to teacher ratios. One respondent stated, “While Indiana has a student-teacher ratio that is in the top half of the country, meaning that the average student-teacher ratio is low, it does itself a disservice when considering EL class ratios. Often there are bodies in the building, but they are not focused on EL students.” This sentiment was countered by another principal. He stated, “Adequacy is about functionality. Yes our program is adequate because it is able to function successfully, but could students use more one on one? Of course! I would love to have the entire building have the 10 to
1 student ratio that our EL classes currently maintain.” Research shows that there are benefits to having class sizes where large group collaboration takes place, as well as having classes where students get individual support of small groups (Grey, p. 116, 1991).

The majority of respondents, 63.1%, believe the State is not adequately funding the education of EL students. When rating the adequacy of the teacher/assistant support that EL students receive in their schools, 52% of the respondents said that the support was adequate and 36.8% said the support was somewhat adequate. The acquisition of proper human resources is vital in creating a learning environment for EL or any population of students. School districts must make a priority of properly training administrators to select and develop EL staff.

When asked about their involvement in the hiring of EL teachers and assistants, 89.4% of respondents stated they were directly responsible for hiring them. What role each respondent played is unknown. But when the number of direct hires is high and principals’ knowledge of the qualifications for EL staff is low, one would expect a negative impact on student learning.

Research question #5: How are EL staff evaluated, and by whom?

Along with playing a role in hiring, the principals evaluate EL teachers and staff. Of the respondents, 23.6% said that they did not consider themselves qualified to evaluate EL teachers. With more than 60% of the respondents using the new Indiana RISE teacher’s evaluation, the high number of principals who do not believe they are qualified to evaluate EL teachers could be seen to mean one of two distinct things. One, administrators could be saying they do not feel qualified to evaluate EL teachers using the new RISE model or, two, the principal feels that EL teachers should be evaluated by someone who has more EL program expertise.

The current RISE evaluation model does not make a contingency for the specialization of EL instruction. RISE is predicated on the belief that it gives meaningful feedback to teachers in the areas of planning, instruction, leadership, and student learning. The IDOE website states “RISE looks at a teacher’s professional practice as well as evidence of student learning to paint a fair, accurate, and comprehensive picture of an educator’s performance. By using multiple sources of information, RISE identifies strengths and areas for improvement, which can help teachers grow year after year” (ww.idoe.gov). With so much of RISE evaluation being based on student standardized testing, many wonder how it coincides with the EL instructor’s three-fold task of teaching for academic success, cultural assimilation and English language acquisition.
Even in evaluations where there is a “value added,” for the progress observed from the beginning of the year to end of the student’s year, EL students must acquire more skills than can be tested.

**Implications of the Results for Practice**

**Benefits and Long-lasting Benefits**

The results identified in this study that could be replicated in the practice of EL education at the elementary level include planning for a formative EL program. The results of this study support the need for formative assessments of EL programs as student populations and needs change. The Obama administration continues to support NCLB and its regulations, consequently there is a need for more research on what EL students need for success. Diane August stated the following:

“[There is] a great need for more and better research into what schools should do to improve literacy among English language learners. Beyond the obvious need for more studies and more replications further evaluating promising instructional innovations, there is a need for a more sophisticated approach to research [which takes into account that] educational outcomes may be influenced by individual, sociocultural, cross-linguistic, and developmental factors. What is needed is an ambitious research agenda that pursues the development and systematic analysis of the effectiveness of instructional routines to foster success within the context of these individual and contextual factors that moderate and mediate literacy learning outcomes for language minority students” (August & Shanahan, 2006a, p. 361).

Families of EL students need to be surveyed, schools need to be visited, staff/teachers would to be identified and individual students to be interviewed to get a clearer understanding of the factors that lead to or inhibit EL success in Indiana elementary schools.

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development suggest that research is needed in several areas of EL programming, including the various instructional methods used. To get a true understanding of what it takes to create success among EL students it is imperative that mixed methods be used to get clear answers to the research questions posed (2000).

**Teacher Quality**
Another result of the study that could be replicated in practice is properly staffing EL classrooms with certified/licensed teachers, assistants, and knowledgeable administrators. This is required by NCLB. Great schools begin with great people and programs.

"Of all the things schools can give students to help them succeed, effective teachers are the best bet. In education research, having an effective teacher consistently rises to the top as the most important factor in learning—more so than student ethnicity or family income, school attended, or class size" (Center for Public Education, 2005).

And while the exact components of what makes a teacher effective may differ from those stipulated to make them highly qualified; respondents are confident that the combination of highly qualified characteristics has led to teacher/student success. As No Child Left Behind created a standard for teachers (professional development, content knowledge, accountability for student achievement, etc.), it also allowed teachers the opportunity to grow as educators and be more aware of the effects of their teaching methods. This alone allows teachers the vehicle to become more effective, as they prove their qualifications.

Other Quality Characteristics

The other results of this study were less direct, but align with the need for proficient people and well-implied programming. Results of this study showed that all respondents to the survey acknowledged that they recognized a need for specialized EL instruction. More than half of the respondents, who did not acknowledge a rising EL success rate on ISTEP/iREAD, stated that the lack of funding was the primary reason they were unsuccessful. Principals cited the need for more resources that they could not acquire due to monetary constraints. Furthermore, many principals did not believe that they were adequately versed in EL law. This would include NCLB and case law. Clearly schools need more resources and funding of their EL programs. Principals,
as instructional leaders and managers, must become proficient in the area of EL law and policy if they are going to support EL students properly. This includes professional development for administrators, teachers and staff.

**Further Research**

The scope of this study was not able to determine what specific data would be beneficial to school districts planning to better address the academic needs of EL students. Therefore, over the course of this study several recommendations for further research were realized:

1. Study correlations between school size and EL success.

2. Study specific EL programs, deemed academically successful, for characteristic alignment.

3. Conduct a study into the teaching methods of the EL teachers and their knowledge of EL needs. Afterwards, cross-reference these results with the success rates of their students on assessments.

4. Study the effects of highly proficient and knowledgeable school principals with respect to EL laws and programming on EL student achievement.
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Appendix A

Survey of Indiana School Administrators and Their Practices at the Elementary Level

Date: March 26, 2013

Dear Participant:

My name is Michael D. Sullivan and I am a doctoral student at Ball State University. For my dissertation I am examining English Language Learners in Elementary School settings. Because you are an administrator at an Indiana elementary school, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the attached survey.

The following questionnaire will require approximately five minutes to complete. There is no compensation for responding nor is there any known risk. In order to ensure that all information will remain confidential, please do not include your name. Copies of the project may be provided to you as well as my Ball State University Chair (Dr. J. McKinney) and my BSU doctoral committee.

Please answer all questions as honestly as possible and return the completed questionnaires promptly. Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in my educational endeavors. The data collected will provide useful information regarding English Language Learners in Elementary settings. If you would like a summary copy of this study please complete and detach the Request for Information Form and return it to me in a separate envelope.

Online completion of the questionnaire will indicate your willingness to participate in this study. If you require additional information or have questions, please contact me at the number listed below.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Sullivan

317-910-6341/ sullivan2447@sbcglobal.net

Dr. Joseph McKinney

jmckinne@bsu.edu
Appendix B

Thank you for taking the time to answer this questionnaire regarding “EL Services in Elementary Education”. The research aims to identify the issues involved in elementary EL education. The questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to answer and asks 20 general open and closed ended questions. All answers will be confidential and the questionnaire is being sent to as many Indiana elementary administrators as possible.

Results will be available in June, of 2013, by calling 317-910-6341.

Please start the questionnaire by completing the following information, then clicking the appropriate answer boxes.

Are you the principal of the school? _____ yes _____ no _____ other title

Gender _____ female _____ male

Years as principal 1-3 _____ 4-7 _____ 8-12 _____ 13-20 _____ 20+

Location of school _____ urban _____ suburban _____ small town _____ rural

Your county ______________________ District name________________

Number of students in your district________ 1-5k _______5-10k______10k-20k _____20-30K _____30k+

What is your current building enrollment? 1-100_______ 101-200_______ 201-300_______ 301-400_______ 401-500_______ 500-600_______ 600+_______

What percentage of your students is EL? _____1-10% _____11-20% _____21-30% _____31-40% _____40-50% _____50%+

At your school, what percentage of students passed iREAD or ISTEP last year? 0-20%_______ 21-50%_______ 51-75%_______ 75-100%_______

How many EL students, receiving services, does your school have? 1-20_______ 21-50_______ 51-100_______ 100-200+_______
1. How familiar would you say you are with the legal rights and responsibilities that schools owe to EL students? 

5  4  3  2  1  
Very                      not at all

2. How many, if any, EL professional development seminars, workshops, or sessions have you attended in the past 2 years?  

4 or more  3  2  1  0  

* How often does your school/district you offer EL PD/PL?  _____Never  _____Weekly  _____Monthly  _____Quarterly  _____Other

3. Are EL professional development opportunities for teachers a priority in your school corporation?  

5  4  3  2  1  
Very much                      not at all

* Are the EL P/D sessions more than one day?  _____Often  _____Sometimes  _____Rarely  _____Never

4. How culturally diverse are your general education classrooms?  

5  4  3  2  1  
Very much                      not at all

5. Do you have any “self-contained”/designated EL classrooms?  

_____  _____  If yes, how many  _____  
Yes  no

*Are ONLY “pullout” services offered for EL students?  _____Yes  _____No  
*Push-in services only?  _____Yes  _____No  
*Both “pullout” and push-in  _____Yes  _____No
6. Do you (or will you) evaluate EL teacher(s) who teach at your school?
   Yes     no
   ___   ___  If no, who evaluates EL teachers ________

7. At your school, what percentage of EL students is receiving waivers from mandated assessments?   
   1-3%  4-5%  6-8%  9-10%  11%+  Other (explain) ______________________________________

8. In your school district, are EL teachers required to be bilingual? YES___, NO___

9. How many EL teachers/assistants work in your building?   
   1-3  4-5  6-9  10+

10. Do you personally hire Instructional Assistants to assist EL teachers?
    __________  __________
    Yes     no

11. What is the minimum educational requirement for EL Instructional Assistants?
    Circle one
    A. High school diploma
    B. 60 college hours
    C. Other
    Explain Other:  _______________________________________________________________

12. Do you personally hire substitute teachers to work with EL teachers and students?
    __________  __________
    Yes     No

   *Are you aware that there are mandated Indiana laws that specifically govern EL
   paraprofessionals and substitute teachers?  _______Yes  _______No

13. What is the minimum educational requirement for EL substitute teachers? (High school diploma, 60 college hours, etc.)
    Circle one
    A. High school diploma
    B. 60 college hours
    C. Etc.
    D. Other; Describe_____________________________
* Does your district/school have a screening process to ensure NCLB EL teacher quality
  _____Yes _____No _____ I Don’t Know

14. Who creates the lesson plans for Instructional Assistants?

Circle one
  A. Assistants
  B. Teachers
  C. Administrators
  D. Other: Who__________

15. Are new 1st year general education teachers given training on the use of ELP standards and modification/adaptations for instruction for EL students?

  ___ Yes ___ No

16. Do you believe that the lowest level of EL proficiency students should be served by their EL teachers or Instructional Assistants as “pull out” students (as opposed to the current “push in” model with respect to the state’s mandated reading period)?

  ___ Yes ___ No

17. Does your school distribute parent surveys as a parental outreach effort?

  ___ Yes ___ No

18. Does your school distribute school newsletters translated into Spanish or other languages to EL families?

  ___ Yes ___ No

19. Do you believe that all core-content teachers who work with EL students should be mandated to earn an “endorsement” in “sheltered English immersion” (the instructional strategies and practices that make up ESL or sheltered English immersion)?

  ___ Yes ___ No

20. Do you believe that all administrators who supervise core-content teachers who work with EL students should be mandated to earn an “endorsement” in “sheltered English immersion” (the instructional strategies and practices that make up ESL or sheltered English immersion)?
21. Please note the most common assessment used for tracking the success of EL students at your school.

a. Informal _____
b. Conferencing _____
c. LAS links scores _____
d. ISTEP scores _____
e. Other _____

22. Does your school offer “immersion” classes, for EL students? ______Yes ______No
*Immersion classes are those that offer no/few concessions

23. Do you believe that the lowest test-scoring EL students are receiving enough “pull out” services at your school?

_____  ____
Yes  no

24. How important is the EL school staff to EL success?

5  4  3  2  1
Very  Somewhat  Not at All

25. Do you believe that the State of Indiana is providing adequate funding for the education of EL students?

_____  _____
Yes  no

26. Rate the adequacy of the teacher/assistant support that EL students receive in your school.

5  4  3  2  1
Very  Not at all

Explain ________________________________

Is success, for EL students, seen as passing the ISTEP/ iREAD? ______Yes__No

27. Do you consider yourself qualified to evaluate EL teachers

Yes  No
Describe your qualifications ________________________________

28. Does your school have an EL process/procedure specifically for new EL students?

    _____ Yes  _____ No

Describe the your EL program/process and what the EL student experiences from the time they enter your school, until their exit (intake, testing-when?, etc.)

______________________________________________________________

29. How do you evaluate EL teachers (RISE, TAP, other)? Leave this question blank if you do not evaluate EL teachers. TAP_______ RISE_________ Other_________  

30. Please elaborate on any point you feel valuable to the researching of EL students in your school. Please include reasons for EL student success or challenges in your building, the current achievement gap and what you believe would help your EL students be more successful.

________________________________________________________________________
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IRBNet Board Action

From: John Mulcahy <no-reply@irbnet.org>

To: Joseph McKinney <jmckinnee@bsu.edu>; Michael Sullivan <sullivan2447@sbcglobal.net>

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2013 8:22 AM

Subject: IRBNet Board Document Published

Please note that Ball State University IRB has published the following Board Document on IRBNet:

Project Title: [435418-1] EL Students in Indiana at the Elementary Level
Principal Investigator: Michael Sullivan, Ed.S

Submission Type: New Project
Date Submitted: February 23, 2013

Document Type: Exempt Letter
Document Description: Exempt Letter
Publish Date: March 7, 2013

Should you have any questions you may contact John Mulcahy at jmulcahy@bsu.edu.

Thank you,
The IRBNet Support Team

www.irbnet.org
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Survey Question 1

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you the principal of the elementary school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (Assistant Principal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

Graph 1

Demographics: Are You the Building Principal?

- Yes 82%
- No 18%
Survey Question 2

### Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

Graph 2

**Demographics: What is Your Gender?**

- **Male**: 18%
- **Female**: 82%
### Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

**Survey Question 3**

**How long have you been a principal?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12 years</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-20 years</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

### Graph 3

**How Long Have You Been Principal?**

- **More than Twenty**: 0
- **Thirteen to Twenty**: 2.60%
- **Eight to Twelve**: 7.80%
- **Four to Seven**: 52.60%
- **One to Three**: 37%
Survey Question 4

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Our school corporation is located in an area that is primarily:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

Graph 4

Corporation Location
Survey Question 5

**Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators**

In What County/District is your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>Indianapolis Public Schools</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Fort Wayne Community Schools</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Marion Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Franklin Community Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Carmel Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td>Danville Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Martinsville Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Answered question</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 5

**Percentage of Respondents From Indiana School Districts**
### Survey Question 6

**Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators**

Our school district/corporation has a student enrollment of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5000 students</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 to 10000 students</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10001 to 20000 students</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001 to 30000+ students</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 38

#### Graph 6

**School Corporation Size of Respondents**

- **20001-30000+ students**: 65.70%
- **10001-20000 students**: 23.60%
- **5001-10000 students**: 10.70%
- **100-5000 students**: 0%
Survey Question 7

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

What is your current building enrollment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-600</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600+</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

Graph 7

Current Enrollment Range

- [Current Enrollment Range chart]
Survey Question 8

Survey of Indiana Elementary School Administrators

What percentage of your students is EL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50%</td>
<td>5.2 %</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%+</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

Graph 8

**Percentage of Student Population That is EL**

- Up to 10
- Up to 20
- Up to 30
- Up to 40
- 41 or More

Percentage of Student Population That is EL
### Survey Question 9

#### Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Percentage of your EL population passed iREAD or ISTEP last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Passing Rate</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0% -20%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

- The State of Indiana iREAD success percentage (2011) : 84%

**Graph 9**

#### EL Students iREAD Success

- **0 to 20%**
- **21-50%**
- **50-75%**
- **76-100%**
Survey Question 10

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

How many EL students, receiving services, does the school have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 20 students</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 50 students</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 100 students</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

Graph 10

**EL Student Receiving Services**

- 1 to 20: 66%
- 21 to 50: 18%
- 51 to 100: 16%
- 100 or more: 0%
Survey Question 11

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

As an elementary administrator, what is your EL law familiarity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very (5)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than somewhat/less than very (4)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat (3)</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Somewhat (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

Graph 11

EL Law Familiarity
**Survey Question 12**

**Survey of Indiana Elementary School Administrators**

How many, if any, EL professional development seminars, workshops or sessions have you attended in the last year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four or More</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One (1)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None (0)</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered the question 38

**Graph 12**

**EL PD in Attended**

- Four or More Events
- Three Events
- Two Events
- One Event
- I Have Not Attended Any EL PD in 2012

EL PD in Attended
Survey Question 13: Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Adminstrators

How often does your school/district offer EL PD/PL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (yearly)</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (I don’t know)</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered Question: 38

Graph 13: Frequency of EL PD
### Survey Question 14

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Are EL PD opportunities for teachers a priority in your corporation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Much So (5)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (4)</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat (3)</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than Somewhat (2)</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All (1)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

Graph 14

Is EL PD a Priority?
Survey Question 15

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Are your schools/districts EL PD sessions more than one day?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question 38

Graph 15

![Bar graph showing response distribution](attachment:image.png)
**Survey Question 16**

**Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators**

How culturally diverse are your general education classrooms?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very diverse (5)</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse (4)</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat diverse (3)</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very diverse (2)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Diverse (1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey Question 17

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Do you have self-contained EL classrooms?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Does Your Building Have Self-contained Classrooms??

- Yes 42%
- No 58%
Survey Question 18

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Concerning push-in/ pullout EL services, what does your school offer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Push-in only</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullout only</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Push-in and Pullout</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Types of EL Services Provided

- Push-in Only
- Pullout Only
- Both
- Neither
### Survey Question 19

**Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators**

**Do you evaluate EL teachers?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Do You Evaluate Teachers?

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%
Survey Question 20

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

At your school, what % of EL students is receiving waivers from State mandated assessments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%+</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (I don’t’ know)</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Number of EL Students Receiving Testing Waivers

- Receiving Waivers
Survey Question 21

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

In your school/district are EL teachers required to be bilingual?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Must School/District EL teachers be Bilingual?

- Yes 69%
- No 18%
- I Don't Know 13%
Survey Question 22

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

How many EL teachers/assistants work in your building?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Number of EL Teachers in Your Building

- Ten or More: 0.00%
- Six to Nine: 18.40%
- Four or Five: 31.50%
- One to Three: 50%
Survey Question 23

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Do you personally hire EL teachers and/or Instructional Assistants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Do You Personally Hire EL Faculty and/or Staff?

- Yes: 82%
- No: 18%
Survey Question 24

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

What is the minimum educational requirement for EL Instructional Assistants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Credit Hours</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (explain)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Minimum Education for EL IA's
Survey Question 25

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Do you personally hire substitute teachers to work with EL students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Do You Personally Substitute EL Teachers?**

- Yes 0%
- No 100%
Survey Question 26

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Are you aware that there are mandated Indiana laws that specifically govern EL paraprofessionals and substitute teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Do You Have Knowledge of EL Laws for Paraprofessionals and EL Substitues?

- Yes 11%
- No 89%
Survey Question 27

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

What is the minimum educational requirement for EL substitute teachers? (High school diploma, 60 college hours, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Credit Hours</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Don’t Know</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Minimum School Requirement for EL Substitute Teachers

- High School Diploma
- 60 College Credit Hours
- Other
- I Don’t Know
Survey Question 28

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Does your school/district have a screening process to ensure NCLB required EL teaching quality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Does Your School/District Have an EL Faculty Screening Process?

- Yes 100%
- No 0%
Survey Question 29

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Who creates the lesson plans for Instructional Assistants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Assistant</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Who Create Lesson Plans for IA's

[Bar graph showing response counts for each category: Instructional Assistants, Teachers, Administrators, Other. Teachers have the highest response count.]
Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Are first year general education teachers given district/school training concerning EL needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Beginning General Education Teacher PD Given?**

- Yes 45%
- No 55%
Survey Question 31

**Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators**

Do you believe that the lowest level of EL proficiency students should be served by their EL teachers or Instructional Assistants as “pull out” students (as opposed to the current “push in” model with respect to the state’s mandated reading period)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Should All Low Language EL Students Have Pull-out Services?**

- **Yes**: 71%
- **No**: 29%
Survey Question 32

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Does your school distribute parent surveys as a parental outreach effort?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Do You Send Parent Surveys?

- Yes 92%
- No 8%
Survey Question 33

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your school distribute school newsletters translated into Spanish or other languages to EL families?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Do You Translate School Newsletters?

- Yes: 95%
- No: 5%
**Survey Question 34**

**Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators**

Do you believe that all core-content teachers who work with EL students should be mandated to earn an “endorsement” in “sheltered English immersion” (the instructional strategies and practices that make up ESL or sheltered English immersion)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Should All Core-Content Teachers Receive an EL Endorsement?**

- Yes: 55%
- No: 45%
Survey Question 35

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Do you believe that all administrators who supervise core-content teachers who work with EL students should be mandated to earn an “endorsement” in “sheltered English immersion” (the instructional strategies and practices that make up ESL or sheltered English immersion)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Should All Core-Content Administrators/Supervisors Receive an EL Endorsement?

- Yes 55%
- No 45%
Survey Question 36

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Please note the most common assessment used for tracking the success of EL students at your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferencing</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS Links</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTEP</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Main EL Assessments

- Informal
- ISTEP Scores
- LAS Links Improvement
- Conferencing
- Other

Main EL Assessments
Survey Question 37

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Does your school offer “immersion” classes, for EL students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Do You Provide Immersion Classes for EL Students?

- Yes 24%
- No 76%
Survey Question 38

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Do you believe that the lowest test-scoring EL students are receiving enough “pull out” services at your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Pull-Out Strategy Used Enough for Lower EL Students?

- Yes: 68%
- No: 32%
Survey Question 39

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

How important is the EL school staff to EL success?

Answer options  | Response Percent | Response Count |
-----------------|------------------|---------------|
Very (5)         | 73.6%            | 28            |
Important (4)    | 23.6%            | 9             |
Somewhat (3)     | 2.6%             | 1             |
Less than somewhat (2) | 0%         | 0             |
Not at all (1)   | 0%               | 0             |

Answered Question | 38
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How Important is Staff to EL Success?
### Survey Question 40

**Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators**

Do you believe that the State of Indiana is providing adequate funding for the education of EL students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Answered Question**

38

---
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**State Provides Adequate Funding?**

- **Yes**: 37%
- **No**: 63%
Survey Question 41

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Rate the adequacy of the teacher/assistant support that EL students receive in your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than somewhat</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at All Adequate</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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General Adequacy of Schools EL Program
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Survey Question 42

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Is success, for EL students, seen as passing the ISTEP/iREAD tests?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Is Passing State Assessments Seen as Ultimate EL Student Success?

- Yes: 68%
- No: 32%
### Survey Question 43

**Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators**

Do you, as an administrator, feel qualified to evaluate EL teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response%</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel qualified</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel qualified to evaluate EL teachers</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answered question: 38
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**EL Staff Evaluation Qualifications**

- **Do I Feel Qualified to Evaluate EL Teachers**
  - NO: 23.7%
  - YES: 76.3%
Survey Question 44

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

Does your school have an EL process/procedure specifically for new EL students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Does Your School Have an Actual Protocol for New EL Students?
Survey Question 45

Survey of Indiana Elementary School EL Administrators

How do you evaluate EL teachers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISE evaluation</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP evaluation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/School Creation</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What Evaluation Tool Do you Use for EL Teachers?

- RISE: 65.7%
- TAP: 0%
- District Created: 34.2%
- Other: 0%
Appendix E

Survey questions that answer the research questions

1. What measures are school districts taking to ensure that students who are eligible and receive EL services are doing so appropriately, as determined by federal law?
   1, 2, 4, 5, 12a, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 26, 28

2. What efforts are made by school districts to professionally develop highly qualified EL staff (as determined by federal and state criteria)? 2a, 3, 3a

3. What qualifications do Indiana school districts require for EL teachers, assistants and substitute teachers? 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13b

4. Do elementary administrators believe that adequate human resources (teachers, support staff, aides, etc.) have been provided for EL students?
   4, 14, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26

5. How are EL staff evaluated, and by whom?
   6, 19, 20, 21, 27, 29