

1. Good that the report made such sharp critiques of the current ELLs programs. An ongoing disaster: the presenters summarized "ELLs work is not always focused, sustained or coordinated."
2. The report was explicitly designed so that it could not be used to make assessments of the ELLs instruction performance of specific schools and teachers, or non-performance.
3. Main substance of the report findings re deficiencies found in APS ELLs programs  
**[compare these findings with the three main legal criteria in the US Supreme Court's *Casteneda* decision which both US Departments of Education and Justice use in their Offices of Civil Rights complaint rulings:**
  - a. **Is the ELL program designed well, research-based?**
  - b. **Has the program been implemented as intended?**
  - c. **Has the program resulted in student success?]**
    - a. Huge achievement gaps in 8th grade Algebra, and in high school completion. Fewer ELLs than non-ELLs are enrolled in rigorous courses.
    - b. Individual programs designed well enough, but "no cohesive design" in overall ESOL-HILT program. Implied that APS's long-standing system of "site-based school management" was a hindrance to effective ELL program implementation.
    - c. Leadership gaps: No way to ensure adequate implementation, which is uneven.
    - d. No accountability systems.
    - e. No good data systems for monitoring ELLs, so lacking support for evidence-based instructional improvements.
    - f. Outreach efforts are being made, but often not effective in ensuring parents know about and can use the training and support made available.
    - g. Some teachers observed to teach poorly, lack training either in ELLs programs or in the academic subject they teach -- need support and professional development. Reading instruction is a key need.
    - h. Cultural competence training viewed by staff [interviews] as ineffective.
4. Board members pointed out the report **lacked "benchmark" data** comparing APS programs and outcomes to those in other school districts. Researchers pointed out that in some comparisons with other district's ELLs programs, APS does not compare well.
5. The report [perhaps because of severe data shortages] did not systematically evaluate APS **inputs** (types of ELL models of delivery, implementation by individual schools and teachers, etc.) with **outcomes**, by using **quantitative** analysis of data on the latter.
6. **Major APS structures impacting ELLs but which the report did not examine at all or only inadequately:**
  - a. Grouping in classrooms. Report: "All ELL students are flexibly grouped in their classes."

- b. Course selection process. Report noted ELLs under-enrolled in advanced classes, but did not investigate why ELLS might be "under-identified" for their potentials to take advanced courses.
- c. Tracking processes [segregation within schools].
- d. Segregated APS schools by neighborhood school attendance zones -- no analysis of impact of these, even though prime CEEE researcher Barbara Acosta did mention that integration of ELLs in dual language programs works best.

**BACKGROUND:** We had heard much from anguished ESOL-HILT teachers that things were bad and getting worse over time.

- 7. Much of the problem was said to stem from "site-based management", decentralized system in which principals can shape and allocate educational resources in significant ways, presumably to meet best the needs of their particular groups of students, but opening the way to significant failures to implement even well-designed instructional programs and to lack of accountability from the Central Office for non-performance in teaching ELLs.
- 8. ELL parents have many stories of their difficulties getting their children into higher level courses. Some gave up, did not know where to turn for assistance, finally left the matter in the hands of the children to "prove to the teachers that I did not belong in these low-level classes." A Republican success story, but hardly an admirable one for a district that prides itself on welcoming our newest citizens.
- 9. Board discussion implied that no new resources [e.g., staff] will be available, nor shift of existing resources.