

Question	Answer	Link(s)			Recommendations	Intended Outcomes
1. Does the evaluation cover all procedural and service provision requirements set forth in the LEA's EL Plan, including a. identification/screening	All process, procedures, and service provision requirements are fulfilled.	Home Language Survey for Screening Determination	Parent Permission form		1. Provide systematic, systemic training to new and returning EL staff on EL processes (Individual Learning Plans, ACCESS testing, WIDA screener, Exit Monitoring, etc.) during back-to-school staff development days. 2. Provide monthly opportunities for EL dept. meetings for collaboration and ongoing training. 3. Provide transportation services to all NC and SRB for up to 5 years from time of arrival in AASD to proactively address attendance and truancy concerns.	Professional Learning- 1. Increase access to universal content and language for all EL students. 2. Increase student outcomes in standardized assessments (Ready, Forward, ACT, preACT, ACCESS) Staffing- 1. Increase access to universal content and language for all EL students. 2. Increase student outcomes on standardized assessments (Ready, Forward, ACT, preACT, ACCESS) Transportation 3. Decrease number of students with attendance and truancy concerns.
b. assessments		WIDA 1-12 Screener	WIDA K Screener	ACCESS testing		
c. provision of EL programs and services in way that avoid unnecessary segregation of EL students		AASD EL Programs	Plan of Service process	Newcomer Program		
d. qualified staff and resources		List of EL Staff- EL Teachers and Interpreters EL Enrollments and Projected Staffing	Transportation Resources			
e. equal opportunities to participate in activities		AASD EL Programs				
f. exit		Exit Criteria	MIP process			
g. exit monitoring		Exit Monitoring Process				
2. Is the information collected on each EL program element being assessed with reference to the specific requirements of the district's EL plan? For example, when looking at the process for identifying potential EL students, does the evaluation determine whether the LEA has followed the established plan for identifying potential EL students with a home language survey (HLS) and timely referral for an ELP assessment?	Yes, each element is assessed with reference to the specific requirements					
3. Does the evaluation determine whether staff are adequately trained and have followed applicable procedural and service requirements, including frequency, timeliness, and documentation to ensure no lapses in EL services?	Yes, staff are trained at EL dept. meetings and receive training via WIDA online training modules.					

Question	Answer	Link(s)		Recommendations	Intended Outcomes
1. Do classroom teachers have the resources, skills and knowledge to address the needs of EL students in their classroom?	EL Program Review Survey Form			Professional Learning 1. Revise and Focus District CSIP Pillar 2 goals on improving outcomes for EL students, students with disabilities, and AfricanAmerican/Black students rather than on incremental changes for all students 2. Provide district-wide staff development in SIOP or other research-based framework for EL (SDAIE, SFL) 3. EL best practices training (SIOP, SDAIE, SFL) in 23-24 for all instructional coaches and EL Teachers/Program Support Teachers/Coaches. 4. District-wide EL training in 24-25 5. Provide continuous job-embedded coaching through co-teaching in content areas at elementary, middle, and high school levels.	Professional Learning- 1. Increase access to universal content and language for all EL students. 2. Increase student outcomes in standardized assessments (Ready, Forward, ACT, preACT, ACCESS)
2. Are content teachers trained in specific methodologies to provide EL students with meaningful access to the content?	Training and workshops are provided but are not required.				
3. If ESL teachers teach in content areas, do they have certification in their specific content areas, as well as ESL certification?	Yes, however we currently do not have any EL teachers teaching in content area.				Staffing- 1. Increase access to universal content and language for all EL students. 2. Increase student outcomes on standardized assessments (Ready, Forward, ACT, preACT, ACCESS) 3. Decrease number of students with attendance and truancy concerns.
4. Does the LEA provide adequate professional development and follow-up training in order to prepare EL program teachers and administrators to implement the EL program effectively?	EL program training occurs via New EL Teacher cohort, virtual meetings, emails and electronic resources. The EL dept. does not have time built into the school day to meet as a dept. for program training.				
5. Are administrators who evaluate EL program staff adequately trained to meaningfully evaluate whether EL teachers are appropriately employing their training in the classroom?					
6. Does the school use mainly paraprofessionals to serve EL students or teachers who are qualified to deliver EL services?	No. EL teachers delivery primary EL services via content-based, sheltered, and inclusion models. EL interpreter paraprofessionals assist in the instruction of EL students by working with small groups or individual students, interpreting for students and families, and scaffolding with home language, under the supervision of the EL teacher.	AASD EL Program	AASD EL Staff List	Staffing- EL Enrollments and Projected Staffing 5. Revise current students/staff ratio to align with DPI guidelines. (30:1 for EL students, 10:15:1 for Newcomer students) 6. Increase Newcomer and Refugee support- add Newcomer and Refugee Social Worker to meet the increasing needs of students and families. 7. Add EL Program Support teachers at elementary and secondary level.	

Question	Answer	Link(s)			Recommendations	Intendend Outcomes
Rate of English Language Development Are EL students acquiring English language skills in all four language domains (e.g., listening, speaking, reading, and writing) at a pace that is consistent with EL program goals or expectations and with EL students at comparable ages and initial ELP levels?	Students are making progress but not at an expected rate and the student on-track percentage is below the state level.	ACCESS On-Track Percentage	Overall Growth 19-20	Overall Growth 21-22	The recommendation is to increase EL FTE to provide necessary supports for EL students in EL courses and through co-teaching in content area classrooms. Staffing 1. Revise current student:staff ratio to align with DPI guidelines. (30:1 for EL students, 10-15:1 for Newcomer students) 2. Increase Newcomer and Refugee support to add Newcomer and Refugee Social Worker to meet the increasing needs of students and families. 3. Add EL Program Support teachers at elementary and secondary level.	Staffing- 1. Increase access to universal content and language for all EL students. 2. Increase student outcomes on standardized assessments (Ready, Forward, ACT, preACT, ACCESS) 3. Decrease number of students with attendance and truancy concerns.
Is the rate of language development compatible with the LEA's objectives for academic progress?	No. Wisconsin has set a state-level six-year goal for an 18 percentage point increase in the percentage of ELs on track to English proficiency. This necessitates a 3-point increase in the percentage of ELs on track to reach English language proficiency each year. We have not met this goal.	ACCESS On-Track Proficiency 20-21	ACCESS On-Track Proficiency 21-22			
Is the language progress of intermediate and advanced ELs or ELs with disabilities stagnating? If so, what supports are these ELs receiving in addition to continued ELD instruction targeted to their language needs?	Yes, it is stagnating. We do not have the capacity to provide additional supports based on our current FTE.	ACCESS Overall Performance SWD and SwDd 19-20	ACCESS Overall Performance SWD and SwDd 20-21	ACCESS Overall Performance SWD and SwDd 20-21		
English Language Proficiency How are EL students performing in English language skills compared to the LEA's goals and standards?	Our expected rate of proficiency is 7-10 years. The state expected rate of proficiency is typically 7-8 years. Based on 21-22 ACCESS results, we have 77 students who have exceeded 10 years in the EL program.	ACCESS Results Years in EL				
Are EL students progressing in English language skills so they will be able to successfully manage regular coursework?	Current EL students are struggling in regular coursework. Co-teaching within content areas provides some support, but not at the level of support needed, especially at the secondary level.					
Do former EL students, who no longer receive English language development services, continue to demonstrate English language skills that enable them to successfully manage regular coursework?	Yes, former ELs continue to manage regular coursework. This is monitored via our exit monitoring process.	Exit Monitoring Report				

Question	Answer	Link(s)	Implications	Recommendations	Intended Outcomes
Rate of Academic Progress Are EL students receiving ELD services targeted to their language needs and progressing academically relative to EL program goals or expectations? AASD EL Mission: The mission of the EL Program is to provide high-quality instruction that enables students to attain English language proficiency, develop high levels of academic achievement, and meet the same challenging state academic standards that all children are expected to meet.	Students receiving EL services in the Appleton Area School District continue to lag behind their non-EL peers in terms of achieving academic outcomes. Results from state assessments, district interim assessments, and semester letter grades all indicate a continued performance gap between EL and non-EL students within ELA and Mathematics.	ELA and Math Historical Data for AASD EL/Non-EL Students EL v. Non-EL Failure and Incompletes Historical Data for 1st Semester		The recommendations are to provide training in EL best practices district-wide, and to increase EL FTE to provide necessary supports for EL students in EL courses and through co-teaching in content area classrooms. Professional Learning 1. Revise and Focus District CSIP Pillar 2 goals on improving outcomes for EL students, students with disabilities, and AfricanAmerican/Black students rather than on incremental changes for all students 2. Provide district-wide staff development in SIOP or other research-based framework for EL (SDAIE, SFL) 3. EL best practices training (SIOP, SDAIE, SFL) in 23-24 for all instructional coaches and EL Teachers/Program Support Teachers/Coaches 4. District-wide EL training in 24-25. 5. Provide continuous job-embedded coaching through co-teaching in content areas at elementary, middle, and high school levels.	
Are EL students learning grade-level core content in addition to English language development?	Yes, our EL service model is content-based and supports acquisition of content and language.	ELA and Math Historical Data for AASD EL/Non-EL Students EL v. Non-EL Failure and Incompletes Historical Data for 1st Semester			
Depending upon the LEA's EL program model(s) and goals, are EL students making sufficient academic progress in the core-content areas so that they are either at academic grade level or will be able to "catch up" academically within a reasonable period of time?	MS and HS EL students have the same course requirements as non-EL peers. However, EL students are struggling in mainstream courses and would benefit from EL support in the content areas.				
Are middle and high school EL students receiving meaningful access to courses needed to graduate on time?	Yes, EL students participate in universal instruction and have access to the same guaranteed, viable curriculum as non-EL students				
Comparison to Other Students Once EL students have exited EL programs and services, are they able to participate meaningfully in the standard curriculum comparable to their never-EL peers?	Students receiving EL services in the Appleton Area School District continue to lag behind their non-EL peers in terms of achieving academic outcomes. Results from state assessments, district interim assessments, and semester letter grades all indicate a continued performance gap between EL and non-EL students within ELA and Mathematics.	ELA and Math Historical Data for AASD EL/Non-EL Students EL v. Non-EL Failure and Incompletes Historical Data for 1st Semester		Staffing 1. Revise current student:staff ratio to align with DPI guidelines, (30:1 for EL students, 10-15:1 for Newcomer students) 2. Increase Newcomer and Refugee support to add Newcomer and Refugee Social Worker to meet the increasing needs of students and families. 3. Add EL Program Support teachers at elementary and secondary level.	
How are EL and former EL students doing, over time, as compared to the academic performance of never-EL students in core-content subjects and with respect to on-time graduation?					
How do the percentages of current ELs, former ELs, and never-ELs compare in special education, advanced courses, and extracurricular activities? Does such access differ by EL program or language background? If there is disproportionate participation, what are the barriers to participation? Are the barriers based on language needs or EL status?		Reach out to Amber for a report for 9-12			
Are multiple measures used to assess the overall performance of current EL and former EL students in meeting the educational goals the district has established for its EL program?	Yes, AASD assesses overall performance using the following measures: ACCESS iReady Forward ACT pre-ACT HS course grades				