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Implications of High Stakes Testing for Immersion

• The No Child Left Behind Act establishes annual achievement objectives & enforces accountability requirements.
• ALL students are expected to attain high standards -- regardless of language background, program type.
• Instead of test scores telling us how well students perform, the scores have become an end to themselves (Baker).
• Leads to narrowing of instructional focus.
Disadvantages of High Stakes Assessment for Language Education Programs

• Increased pressure for all students to meet high achievement expectations at early grade levels AND narrower instructional focus can have a negative impact on immersion and heritage or bilingual language programs with respect to:
  - Amount of instruction through target vs. English language.
  - School/classroom environment that highly values English over target language.
  - Denial of charter or other special permission to implement program.

Can result in lowered student outcomes -- lower levels of proficiency & achievement, and/or more negative attitudes.
Purpose of Presentation

• Examine **TWO** key sources of **EVIDENCE** that will enable YOU to
  o Demonstrate student success.
  o Promote high quality programs.
  o Support and improve practice.

• What are the **TWO** key sources of **EVIDENCE**?
  – Previous scientifically-based research and evaluation results in 1-way, 2-way, bilingual/heritage language
  – Results from your own high quality evaluation plan

**Most powerful evidence of success -- both sources yield similar results**
Program Model Types

• Will consider evidence related to additive bilingual program models
  – One-way immersion
  – Two-way immersion
  – Heritage language and maintenance bilingual programs

• Extensive body of scientifically-based and sound research and evaluation on these additive bilingual program models
ADDITIVE BILINGUALISM

L1 + L2 = Bilingual

Achievement
Language Proficiency
Motivation
Self esteem

SUBTRACTIVE BILINGUALISM

L2 - L1 = Monolingual

Achievement
Language Proficiency
Motivation
Self esteem
**Additive vs. Subtractive Bilingualism**

**ADDITIVE**
Students add a second language to their first

*L1 + L2 = Bilingual*

Higher: achievement, language proficiency, motivation, self esteem

**SUBTRACTIVE**
Students lose their first language in learning the second language

*L2-L1=Monolingual*

Lower: achievement, language proficiency, motivation, self esteem
Rationale for Language Education
Demographic

• Response to changing demography in the US: by 2050, estimates indicate:
  – Hispanic population will reach 24% of the general population.
  – Asian population will comprise 10% of general population.
  – Ever-increasing percent of ELL students entering school.

Students who are bilingual, biliterate, & possess multicultural competencies will have job skills that will enable them to take advantage of more career opportunities.
Research on bilingualism shows that students with high levels of bilingual proficiency exhibit elevated levels of academic & cognitive functioning in comparison to students with monolingual or less-well-developed bilingual skills.
Rationale: Impact of Native Language Loss On Family Relationships

Research shows that failure to develop proficiency in the native language can result in a loss of strong family connection and access to one’s culture and history. A growing body of literature suggests that there are large emotional and communication gaps between immigrant students and parents.

“Even with the Chinese I speak, I am limited to the normal yet shallow ‘everyday’ conversations I have with my parents and do not have enough of a vocabulary to have meaningful talks with them. Such was the case just the other night when they asked me what my major at Berkeley was, but I did not know the phrase for ‘biology,’ much less ‘molecular and cellular biology.’ The best I could manage was ‘science’ in Chinese and explained the rest in English; I could not communicate to them why I selected this major, what I was going to do with it, and so forth—we ended the discussion by changing the subject.”
Key Evidence For: Additive Language Programs Bilingual Education for ELLs

• 20 years of scientifically-based research and evaluation studies are consistent in showing that:
  ▪ ELLs who received instruction through L1 were able to catch up to or surpass the achievement levels of ELL peers and English-only peers who were educated in English-only mainstream classrooms.
    ▪ These results were found regardless of the student outcomes--standardized achievement tests, course grades, school attendance & dropout, student attitudes
  ▪ ELLs who participated in programs that provided extended instruction through students’ L1 (i.e., through 6th grade) outperformed students who received short-term instruction through their L1 (i.e., 1-2 years of primary language support).
Key Evidence For: One-Way Immersion Native English Speakers

- 40 years of scientifically-based research and program evaluations in the US and Canada are consistent in demonstrating that students:
  1. Develop proficiency in a second language;
  2. Perform as well as or better than English-speaking non-immersion peers in English-only classes on standardized tests taken in English of language arts & content areas.
  3. Gain cultural awareness.
15 years of program evaluations in the US are consistent in demonstrating that results for English speakers are similar to results in one-way immersion:

- English speakers develop proficiency in 2 languages.
- English speakers score as well as or better than their English-speaking non-two-way immersion peers in English-only instruction on standardized tests of math & language arts in English.

3. English speakers develop a positive sense of self & multicultural competencies.
15 years of program evaluations in the US are consistent with scientifically-based research on maintenance bilingual education in demonstrating that by middle school:

1. ELLs develop fluent proficiency in English while further developing fluent proficiency in their L1.
2. ELLs score as well as or better than their ELL non-two-way immersion peers on standardized tests of math & language arts.
3. ELLs develop a positive sense of self & school, and multicultural competencies.
Summary: Key Evidence For Additive Bilingual Programs

15-40 years of program evaluations and research **CONSISTENTLY** demonstrate that additive programs are effective for English Language Learning, Heritage language, and other native English-speaking students:

- Students develop bilingual and bicultural skills.
- Students develop a positive sense of self & school, and multicultural competencies.
- Students score similarly or outperform their comparison group peers on standardized tests of mathematics & English language arts.

**Research shows significant positive influence of bilingualism on cognition & self identity**
Key Research Evidence:
Assessment & Evaluation

• Considerable body of scientifically-based research, which shows that in effective schools:
  – Assessment & accountability play an important role, with ongoing diagnosis, evaluation & feedback.

• Guidelines for assessment and evaluation have been developed based on this body of research
Key Research Evidence: Guiding Principle #1

• The program creates & maintains infrastructure that supports an accountability process -- appropriate **budget** & **staff** available for Developing & maintaining data management system, Disaggregating & interpreting data, Professional development for assessment & evaluation
Key Research Evidence: Guiding Principle #2

The program collects a variety of data using multiple measures that are used for program accountability and evaluation.

- Program systematically collects demographic data (ethnicity, home language, parent education) to help disaggregate data;
- Program systematically collects data to determine whether achievement, language proficiency, and attitudinal goals are met;
- Program consistently conducts assessment in both languages.

IF you only collect state required data in English, can jeopardize your program.
Important Background Information

• Important to understand your population and reasons for enrolling in the program
• Obvious? Yes, but more you know about your population, better you will understand program outcomes and success
Know Your Population: English Language Learners

- 10% of students - fastest growing (95% past decade).
- Speaks many languages: Spanish (79%), Vietnamese (2%), Hmong (1.6%), Cantonese & Korean (1%).
- differ in level of preparation for school:
  - oral and literate proficiency in L1
  - Amount/type schooling-home country
  - Parents’ educational backgrounds
- Some children born in US, but speak a language other than English at home. Various levels of proficiency in L1 and English. Diverse backgrounds.
Know Your Population: Native English Speakers

- Immersion students and heritage language students represent diverse ethnic, language, and socio-economic backgrounds.
Know Your Population: Parent Education

- Parent education varies tremendously.
- CRESST research with more than 30,000 students shows the significant impact of parent education on student reading achievement – as much as 15 percentile points, even within the ELL population.
- In discussing your school or program assessment or evaluation results, you need to understand parent education in your school to accurately present results to board and community.
English Math Achievement Tests: Koreans in Korean Immersion
[Scores in Percentiles]
Comprehensive Multiple Measures

• Provide information about different aspects of student performance, learning, and attitudes in both languages:
  - Teacher-made tests
  - Teacher observations
  - Portfolios of student work
  - Collective group work
  - Questionnaires/surveys
  - Standardized tests
Collecting & Disaggregating Multiple Measures: Attitudes

Follow-up Study: High School Students in 2-way

- Overall positive attitudes.
- Average masks important group differences.
- Program impact greatest for ELL, followed by heritage language students.
The data are analyzed and interpreted in appropriate ways for program accountability and improvement. Data are analyzed using appropriate procedures, disaggregated in meaningful ways, and interpreted accurately.
Non-Disaggregated vs. Disaggregated Data

Reading Achievement in English

**Aggregated Data**
Gr 4 students at grade level

**Disaggregated Data**
Eng at/above; ELL below grade level

- **Graph 1:**
  - 3rd grade: All Students
  - 4th grade: All Students

- **Graph 2:**
  - 3rd grade: ELL, Eng speakers
  - 4th grade: ELL, Eng speakers
ELL & Eng-speak - similar to non-2-way peers in reading (English tests)
Disaggregated Data with Comparison & Research Data

Strongest Case-- ELLs

ELL similar to non-2-way ELL peers in reading (English tests) AND similar to research & evaluation studies of ELLs in 2-way
Eng-speakers - higher than non-2-way Eng peers in reading (Eng tests) AND similar to/higher than evaluation studies of Eng in 2-way
Key Research Evidence: Guiding Principle #4

Student progress toward achievement objectives and program goals is systematically measured and reported.

- Progress over time is documented in both languages for oral language proficiency, literacy, and academic achievement.
- A variety of indicators are used to measure progress (required state measures, teacher ratings/rubrics, portfolios, grades, attitudinal measures, placement in special education or gifted classes, etc)
Progress Measured Over Time
Reading Achievement in Spanish
ELL Students -- Shows Growth

![Graph showing progress measured over time in reading achievement for ELL students in Spanish, with growth demonstrated in PreTest to PostTest for 4th, 5th, and 7th grades.](image)
Progress Measured Over Time
Mathematics in English & Spanish
FEP Students

- Students redesignated as Fluent English Proficient (FEP) score around average in mathematics measured on English achievement test and high in mathematics measured on Spanish achievement test
- Similar patterns between English and Spanish mathematics
Progress Over Time & Disaggregated Data

English Reading Growth -- ELL vs. FEP

- Shows significant growth over time
- Both groups making significant growth, regardless of whether they have received program with more English or less English.
- More English in instructional day NOT lead to higher achievement.
Key Research Evidence: Guiding Principle #5

Student assessment is aligned with state content and language standards as well as program goals, and is used for evaluation of the program and instruction. Evaluation is ongoing, aligned with program/classroom goals and state standards. Assessment data are integrated into planning related to program development and instructional practices.
Use of Evaluation Data for Program Changes

- At 2 two-way partial immersion (5050) programs, increased emphasis on English over past 2 years has resulted in:
  - Fewer English speaking students at upper grade levels who are rated as proficient in Spanish
  - Lower reading achievement scores when measures are tests of reading in Spanish
  - While still positive, attitudes are less positive attitudes than previously
- Using this data in planning meetings to re-examine status of languages in school & classroom, and how to promote Spanish language & literacy.
Use of Evaluation Data for Program Changes

Attitudes Toward Spanish & Program

Percent of Grades 5-6 students in Agreement with Attitudinal Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prev Years</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read well in Sp</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write well in Sp</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span too hard</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read pleasure</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sch respect cult</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 lang confid</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glad in Prog</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Research Evidence:
Guiding Principle #6

The program communicates with appropriate stakeholders about program outcomes.

Parents

School Board

Community (newspapers)