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# Introduction

This guide is designed as a reference for district and school personnel working with English learners (ELs). The content of the guide represents a compilation of information, examples, and resources for your use. If you find an error, or feel this guide needs to be updated to reflect new or additional information please [email Leslie Casebeer](mailto:leslie.casebeer@state.or.us). Please be sure to include appropriate documentation to support your submitted recommendation, as careful review of the document will take place prior to any changes being made.

All or any part of this document may be reproduced for educational purposes without specific permission from the Oregon Department of Education.

This manual is distributed for informational and resource purposes, and does not represent legal advice.

*"There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education."*

[Lau v Nichols (1974) - Facts Of The Case](http://usedulaw.com/362-lau-v-nichols.html)

# Oregon State English Learner Program Goals

English learner programs are expected:

* To help ensure that English learners, including immigrant children and youth, attain English proficiency and develop high levels of academic achievement in English;
* To assist all English learners, including immigrant children and youth, to achieve at high levels in academic subjects so that all English learners can meet the same challenging State academic standards that all children are expected to meet;
* To assist teachers (including preschool teachers), principals and other school leaders, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools in establishing, implementing, and sustaining effective language instruction educational programs designed to assist in teaching English learners, including immigrant children and youth;
* To assist teachers (including preschool teachers), principals and other school leaders, State educational agencies, and local educational agencies to develop and enhance their capacity to provide effective instructional programs designed to prepare English learners, including immigrant children and youth, to enter all-English instructional settings; and
* To promote parental, family, and community participation in language instruction educational programs for the parents, families, and communities of English learners.

## Acronyms, Common Vocabulary, and Frequently Used Terminology

| Acronym | What it stands for: | What it means: |
| --- | --- | --- |
| AI/AN | American Indian/Alaska Native | Aka: Native American/Alaska Native |
| BICS | Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills | The language ability required for verbal face-to-face communication. |
|  | Castañeda v. Pickard - United States Court of Appeals decision**:** | On June 23, 1981, the Fifth Circuit Court issued a decision that is the seminal post-Lau decision concerning education of language minority students. The case established a three-part test to evaluate the adequacy of a district's program for ELs: (1) is the program based on an educational theory recognized as sound by some experts in the field or is considered by experts as a legitimate experimental strategy; (2) are the programs and practices, including resources and personnel, reasonably calculated to implement this theory effectively; and (3) does the school district evaluate its programs and make adjustments where needed to ensure language barriers are actually being overcome. [648 F.2d 989 (5th Cir., 1981)] |
| CBELD | Content-Based English Language Development |  |
| CALP | Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency | The language ability required for academic achievement. |
| CM | Constructing Meaning | Sheltered English instruction methodology - created by Susanna Dutro. |
|  | Culturally Responsive | Refers to the implicit use of the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of diverse individuals (students) in order to make learning more appropriate and effective for them. |
|  | Current ELs | These are students who are identified ELs that have not exited the program as proficient. They are included in the EL and the Ever-EL accountability calculations. |
| DB | Developmental Bilingual | Like Two-Way Immersion programs, these programs share the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy, and thus typically last through elementary school or longer (preferably through high school). Also, referred to Dual Language Immersion, Maintenance Bilingual or Late-Exit Bilingual Education programs, these are programs that use two languages, the EL student's primary language and English, as a means of instruction. The instruction builds upon the student's primary language skills and develops and expands the English language skills of each student to enable him or her to achieve proficiency in both languages, while providing access to the content areas. These programs are designed for and typically enroll only ELs. |
| DL | Dual Language | Another name for Dual Language Programs |
| DLI | Dual Language Immersion | Another name for Dual Language Programs |
| DLP | Dual-Language Program | Also known as two-way or developmental, the goal of these bilingual programs is for students to develop language proficiency in two languages by receiving instruction in English and another language in a classroom usually comprised of half native English speakers and half native speakers of the other language. |
| DSA | District Security Administrators | DSAs can delegate their duties to *District Test and Security Administrators*. The only difference between DSAs and DTSAs is that DTSAs cannot create any other DTSA users. A district can only have one DSA; however, DSAs can create one or more DTSA for each district. |
| DTSA | District Test and Security Administrators | *District Test and Security Administrators*are responsible for creating STC, TA users within their district. DTSAs can set student test restrictions and access reports within their district. |
| EA | Educational Assistant | (aka: Instructional Assistant) Educational assistants who work under the supervision of an appropriately licensed teacher may provide instructional support pursuant to OAR 581-038-0005-0025. |
| EB | Emergent Bilingual | Another name for English learner |
| EL | English Learner | An identified student who qualifies for additional support in school in acquiring academic English proficiency. |
| ELD | English Language Development | A program of techniques, methodology, and special curriculum designed to teach EL students English language skills, including listening, speaking, reading, writing, study skills, content vocabulary, and cultural orientation. ELD instruction is in English with little or no use of native language. |
| ELL | English Language Learner | Another term for English Learner. |
|  | EL Plan | **(aka Local Plan or Lau Plan) From Federal** [Title III Statutes: SEC 3116 Local Plans](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg41.html)Each eligible entity desiring a subgrant from the State educational agency (SEA) under section 3114 shall submit a plan to the State educational agency at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the SEA may require. The Office for Civil Rights uses the phrase “EL Plan”. |
| ELP | English Language Proficiency | Typically used to describe the standards for English language acquisition. |
| ELPA21 | English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century | **Oregon’s annual summative assessment for all students who have been identified as English learners. This annual assessment is required whether the student received EL services or not. ELs participate in this assessment each year until they are officially exited from the program by their districts.** |
| ELSWD | English Learner Students with Disabilities | An EL who also has a disability. These students have an Individual Education Plan (IEP) or 504 Plan. |
| ESEA | Elementary and Secondary Education Act | Federal Education Law – last amended December 10, 2015 |
| EEOA | [Equal Education Opportunities Act of 1974](http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/edu/types.php) | This civil rights statute prohibits states from denying equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex, or national origin. The statute specifically prohibits states from denying equal educational opportunity by the failure of an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs. [20 U.S.C. §1203(f)] |
|  | Equity (Education Equity) | Refers to the transformed ways in which systems and individuals habitually operate to ensure that every individual (learner) in whatever environment (learning) has the greatest opportunity to work (learn) enhanced by the resources and supports necessary to achieve competence, excellence, independence, responsibility and self-sufficiency for life (school). |
|  | Ever-EL | These students are students who were identified as an EL at any time since 2006-07. This group includes: current, monitor and former ELs and is used for accountability calculations. |
|  | Exiting | When a student obtains academic English proficiency, the student is exited from ELD services. The federal term for this process is exiting; Oregon typically refers to this process as exiting or reclassification. See [Numbered Memorandum 004-2018-19](https://www.google.com/url?q=https://www.oregon.gov/ode/about-us/Documents/Executive%2520Numbered%2520Memo%2520004-2018-19%2520Exiting%2520ELs%2520as%2520Proficient.pdf&sa=U&ved=0ahUKEwjw9rzbt5PhAhVoITQIHWqWAV0QFggFMAA&client=internal-uds-cse&cx=017270664345420165392:sia_fbfaeds&usg=AOvVaw0QqPZLSNu4HoAC39Wlr8J2) for specific guidance. |
| FEP | Fluent (or Fully) English Proficient | (aka: IFEP – Initially Fluent English Proficient) |
|  | Former ELs | These students have completed monitoring. They are included in the Ever – EL calculations. |
| GLAD | Guided Language Acquisition Design (Project GLAD) | Sheltered English instruction methodology. |
| HLS | Home Language Survey | (aka: Language use survey) |
|  | HB 3499 | Adopted by the 2015 Legislature as a comprehensive approach to improving educational opportunities for students who are English language learners (ELLs). This historical legislation is the first time that Oregon has specifically supported ELL students through General Fund appropriations. [Enrolled House Bill 3499](https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2015R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB3499). |
|  | Immigrant Children (Recent Arrivers) and Youth | Immigrant Children (Recent Arrivers) and Youth are defined in[**Section 3301 of ESSA- Title III**](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg50.html)  (a) Are aged 3 through 21  (b) Were not born in any State, and  (c) Have not been attending one or more schools in any one or more States for more than three full academic years.  A required sub-grant is issued on an annual basis to qualifying school districts based on a formula measuring high rates of growth in immigrant youth. |
|  | Informed Parental Consent | Parental Notification letters are sent within 30 days of the beginning of the school year, **or** within 2 weeks after the school year has begun. These letters inform parents of a student’s language proficiency, core content knowledge, EL program placement with information on how parents can waive a student from participating in an EL program. |
| IA | Instructional Assistant | aka: Educational Assistant |
| IPT | IDEA Language Proficiency Tests | IPT is one of four state-approved assessments available in Oregon for the identification of ELs. Others referenced in this table include LAS, Stanford, and W-M (see references contained on this table). |
| JDEP | Juvenile Detention Education Program |  |
| LAS | Language Assessment Scales | LAS is one of four state-approved assessments available in Oregon for the identification of ELs. Others include IPT, Stanford, and W-M (see references contained on this table). |
|  | Language Dominance | Refers to the measurement of the degree of bilingualism, which implies a comparison of the proficiencies in two or more languages. |
|  | Language Minority Student(s) | Another way that ELs might be referred to in older legislation or documentation. |
|  | Language Proficiency | Refers to the degree to which the student exhibits control over the use of language, including the measurement of expressive and receptive language skills in the areas of phonology, syntax, vocabulary, and semantics, and including the areas of pragmatics or language use within various domains or social circumstances. Proficiency in a language is judged independently and does not imply a lack of proficiency in another language. |
|  | Lau Plan | Another name for Local Plan, ELL Plan or EL Plan. |
|  | [Lau v Nichols (1974) Ruling](http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/414/563.html) | A class action suit brought by parents of non-English-proficient Chinese students against the San Francisco Unified School District. In 1974, the Supreme Court ruled that identical education does not constitute equal education under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The court ruled that the district must take affirmative steps to overcome educational barriers faced by the non-English speaking Chinese students in the district. [414 U.S. 563 (1974)] |
| LEA | Local Education Agency, or Local Educational Agency | (aka: School District) |
| LIEP | Language Instruction Educational Program | An instructional program: SEC. 3201[20 U.S.C. 7011]  (7) Language Instruction Educational Program -- The term “language instruction educational program’ means an instruction course—  (A) In which an English learner is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency. While meeting challenging State academic standards; and  (B) That may make instruction use of both English and a child’s native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency, and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participant children to become proficient in English and a second language.  [ESSA Law](https://www2.ed.gov/documents/essa-act-of-1965.pdf). |
|  | Local Plan | (aka EL Plan or Lau Plan) From Federal [Title III Statutes: SEC. 3116 Local Plans](https://www2.ed.gov/documents/essa-act-of-1965.pdf):  SEC. 3116. [20 U.S.C. 6826]  (a) Plan Required.—Each eligible entity desiring a subgrant from the State educational agency under section 3114 shall submit a plan to the State educational agency at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the State educational agency may require. |
| LTCT | Long-Term Care and Treatment Education Programs |  |
| LTEL | Long-Term English Learners | A student who has been identified as an English learner for several years. |
| LUS | Language Use Survey | (aka: Home Language Survey) Specific questions asked during enrollment to determine which language(s) are used by students and families to determine which students are potential ELs. |
| MBE | Maintenance Bilingual Education | MBE, also referred to as late-exit bilingual education, is a program that uses two languages, the student's primary language and English, as a means of instruction. The instruction builds upon the student's primary language skills, and develops and expands the English language skills of each student to enable him or her to achieve proficiency in both languages, while providing access to the content areas. |
| MOU | Memorandum of Understanding | A signed document between two or more parties. |
|  | Monitored EL | These students have exited the EL program with the past 4 years, they are included in the Ever-EL and EL accountability calculations. |
|  | [The May 25 Memorandum](https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/may25.html) | To clarify a school district's responsibilities with respect to national-origin-minority children, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on May 25, 1970, issued a policy statement stating, in part, that "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 the instructional program to the students." |
| NEP | Non-English-proficient | A student who was found to be an identified English learner based on an identification screener. |
|  | Newcomer Program | Newcomer programs are separate, relatively self-contained educational interventions designed to meet the academic and transitional needs of newly arrived immigrants. Typically, students attend these programs before they enter more traditional interventions (e.g., English language development programs or mainstream classrooms with supplemental ESL instruction). |
| NCELA | National Center English Language Acquisition | A federal organization providing support for SEAs and LEAs regarding ELs. |
| OCR | Office of Civil Rights | Federal office of civil rights |
| OELA | Office of English Language Acquisition | A federal office in the US Department of Education providing support/guidance regarding ELs. |
|  | Potential EL | These are students having a disability or suspected of having a disability who could not be screened by the EL identification screener. These students are not current ELs but will be identified as soon as the identification screener is accessible to the student. |
| RAEL | Recently-Arrived English Learner | An English learning who has recently arrived in the US from another country, typically within the last 3 years. |
|  | Recent Arrivers | Immigrant Children (Recent Arrivers) and Youth are defined in  [**Section 3301 of ESSA- Title III**](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg50.html)  (a) Are aged 3 through 21  (b) Were not born in any State, and  (c) Have not been attending one or more schools in any one or more States for more than three full academic years.  A required sub-grant is issued on an annual basis to qualifying school districts based on a formula measuring high rates of growth in immigrant youth. |
| SDAIE | Specially-Designed Academic Instruction in English | This approach consists of strategies teachers can use to make content concepts understandable to ELs, while simultaneously promoting their English language development. More specifically, sheltered instruction refers to a model of how teachers use strategies, such as visual aids, modeling, graphic organizers, vocabulary previews, adapted texts, interactional structures, and students' prior knowledge, in a systematic way to enable students to acquire content in their new language. |
| SEA | State Education Agency, or State Educational Agency |  |
| SI | Sheltered Instruction | An instructional approach used to make academic instruction in English understandable to EL students. In the sheltered classroom, teachers use physical activities, visual aids, and the environment to teach vocabulary for concept development in mathematics, science, social studies, and other subjects. Some examples of sheltered instructional model may include SIOP, GLAD, SDAIE, Constructing Meaning. |
| SIFE | Students with Interrupted Formal Education | SIFE students are those who meet at least one of the following two categories:  1. Come from a home where a language other than English is spoken and enter a school in the US after grade two; OR  2. Are immigrant students who enter a school in the United States after grade 2;  And meet the following conditions:  a. Have had at least two years less schooling than their peers; and,  b. Function at least two years below expected grade level in reading and in mathematics; and,  c. May be pre-literate in their native language. |
| SIOP | Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol | Sheltered English instruction methodology. |
| SLIFE | Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education | Same as SIFE |
| SPED | Special Education | The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as amended in 2004 (IDEA 2004-PL 108-446), is a federal law governing special education services and federal funding for eligible infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities across the country. Children and youth (ages 3-21) receive special education and related services under IDEA, Part B. Infants and toddlers with disabilities (ages birth-2) and their families receive early intervention services under IDEA Part C. In Oregon, IDEA funds helped support the education of almost 83,000 children with disabilities in the past year. For more information about IDEA, please [visit the U.S. Department of Education’s Individuals with Disabilities Education Act website](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/). |
| SPELL | Special Education English Language Learner | Another term for ELSWD |
| Stanford | Stanford ELP | Stanford is one of four state-approved identification assessments available in Oregon for the identification of ELs. Others referenced in this table include IPT, LAS and W-M (see references contained on this table).  The [Stanford ELP Test](http://images.pearsonassessments.com/images/assets/pa/SELP_Price_List.pdf) evaluates the listening, reading, comprehension, writing, and speaking skills of ELs in Pre K–12. This assessment is developed by Pearson Assessments. |
| STC | School Test Coordinator | A person responsible to ensure test security at the local school level. |
| TA | Test Administrator | A person who administers the state assessments to students. |
| TAG | Talented and Gifted | “Talented and Gifted children” means those children who require educational programs or services, or both, beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society, and who demonstrate outstanding ability or potential in one or more of the following areas:  (a) General intellectual ability as commonly measured by measures of intelligence and aptitude.  (b) Unusual academic ability in one or more academic areas.  (c) Creative ability in using original or nontraditional methods in thinking and producing.  (d) Leadership ability in motivating the performance of others either in educational or non-educational settings.  (e) Ability in the visual or performing arts, such as dance, music, or art. |
|  | [Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act](https://www.justice.gov/crt/title-vi-1964-civil-rights-act) | Title VI prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin by recipients of federal financial assistance. The Title VI regulatory requirements have been interpreted to prohibit denial of equal access to education because of a language minority student's limited proficiency in English. |
| TBE | Transitional Bilingual Education Program | The primary goal of a Transitional Bilingual program is to facilitate the EL student's transition to an all-English instructional program while receiving academic subject instruction in the native language to the extent necessary. This program, also known as Early-Exit Bilingual Education, utilizes a student's primary language in instruction. The program maintains and develops skills in the primary language and culture while introducing, maintaining, and developing skills in English. Typically, transition to all English occurs by mid- to late elementary school. These programs are designed for ELs. |
| TWI | Two-Way Immersion | Also referred to as Dual Language Immersion, this is a program in which the language goals are full bilingualism and biliteracy in English and a partner language. Students study language arts and other academic content (math, science, social studies, arts) in both languages over the course of the program, and the program lasts at least through elementary school (and many programs continue through high school). These programs use an immersion approach (maximizing the teacher’s use of the target language during the target language’s instructional time) and enroll both native English speakers and native speakers of the partner language, with neither group making up more than two-thirds of the student population. Because of this student composition, these programs also emphasize cross-cultural awareness as a key goal of the program. If your program enrolls primarily ELs, it should be coded as a Developmental Bilingual program. |
|  | Tutor | In the context of [OAR 581-023-0100](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_tofc.html), the definition of tutors are educational assistants/instructional assistants providing tutoring services who meet the requirements of [OAR 581-037-0005](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_023.html) to 0025. According to [ORS 342.120](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/342.120), educational/ instructional assistant means a classified school employee who does not require a license to teach, who is employed by a school, district, or education service district, and whose assignment consists of and is limited to assisting a licensed teacher in accordance with rules established by the Oregon State Board of Education. |
|  | Waivered EL student | When an identified EL’s parent/guardian decides that the student will not participate in the language development program. Waivered students are required to participate in the annual summative assessment until they are reclassified |
| W-M | Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey | One of four assessments available for districts to determine if a student is an EL. Others are LAS, Stanford, and IPT (see prior acronym descriptions). |
| YCEP | Youth Corrections Education Program |  |
| JDEP | Juvenile Detention Education Program |  |

# Title III Program Administration Procedures and Requirements

## Purpose

Sec. 3102. [20 U.S.C. 6812] Purposes. (ESSA Law)

The purposes of this part are—

1. to help ensure that English learners, including immigrant children and youth, attain English proficiency and develop high levels of academic achievement in English;
2. to assist all English learners, including immigrant children and youth, to achieve at high levels in academic subjects so that all English learners can meet the same challenging State academic standards that all children are expected to meet;
3. to assist teachers (including preschool teachers), principals and other school leaders, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools in establishing, implementing, and sustaining effective language instruction educational programs designed to assist in teaching English learners including immigrant children and youth;
4. to assist teachers (including preschool teachers), principals and other school leaders, State educational agencies, and local educational agencies to develop and enhance their capacity to provide effective instructional programs designed to prepare English learners, including immigrant children and youth, to enter all-English instructional settings; and
5. to promote parental, family, and community participation in language instructional educational programs for the parents, families, and communities of English learners.

Title III does not require sub-grantees to use a specific or particular curriculum or approach to language instruction, but it does require the use of a high quality, effective language instruction curriculum for teaching English learners; and in the manner the eligible entity determines to be the most effective as required in SEC 3113 [20 U.S.C. 6832] (5)(A)(B).

Title III, like ORS 336.079, requires instructional *‘courses’*, or educational units consisting of a series of instruction periods dealing with a particular subject. The difference between ORS 336.079 and Title III is that courses under ORS 336.079 are designed specifically to teach English proficiency, whereas courses under Title III must, in addition to teaching English proficiency, simultaneously ensure that ELs meet state academic content and student achievement standards.

## Local Educational Agency (LEA) Responsibilities

* Provide high quality, research based, language instruction educational programs that are effective in increasing English proficiency and academic achievement of EL students.
* Provide high quality, researched-based professional development to teachers, administrators, and other school/community-based organizations, of sufficient intensity and duration.
* Provide a biennial evaluation to the SEA.
* Provide outreach to parents of EL children.

## EL Plan (aka: Local Service Plan, Local Plan, Lau Plan)

Districts submit updated EL Plans as required by ODE, typically in the spring. District plans are reviewed and feedback is provided back to districts. The [ODE District Local Plans for Title III](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/District-Local-Plans.aspx) web page includes documents to assist with EL Plan development.

To be effective, an EL Plan needs to be comprehensive. It must address each aspect of the district's program for all ELs, at all grade levels, and at all schools in the district. To ensure its ongoing value, it needs to be viewed by district staff as containing useful information. It should contain enough detail and specificity so each staff person can understand how the plan is to be implemented, and contain the procedural guidance and forms the staff needs to use to carry out his/her responsibilities under the plan. Districts have indicated to OCR they have found their EL Plans most useful when they contain sufficient detail to inform staff fully of each action step in the EL Plan.

Does your plan answer the following questions:

* Who is responsible for the step?
* When is the step expected to be completed?
* What standards and criteria are to be applied to the step?
* How will the district document implementation of the step?

[Office for Civil Rights - Developing Programs for English Language Learners: Plan Development](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/plandev.html)

Many districts have found it is useful, when developing or revising an EL program, to establish a committee or work group that includes administrators, teachers (both EL program teachers and regular classroom teachers), educational assistants, school counselors, and other staff who work with the district's EL population. The district may also want to include parents, students, or community representatives who work with the same students in other settings. By working with a group that includes these stakeholders, the district can receive more comprehensive input from those whose support and efforts may be important to the success of the district's EL program. Inclusive approaches in program design and development tend to promote overall community awareness and support. In addition, these individuals will be valuable resources to draw upon during program evaluation and program improvement activities.

The questions in the EL Plan outline are organized around key components of a comprehensive plan:

* The district's educational theory and goals for its program of services;
* The district's methods for identifying and assessing the students to be included in the district's EL program;
* The specific components of the district's program of ELD and academic services for ELs;
* The specific staffing and other resources to be provided to ELs under the district's EL program;
* The district's method and procedures for transitioning and/or exiting students from its EL program, and for monitoring their success afterward; and
* The district's method for evaluating the effectiveness of its program for ELs (discussed in the [U.S. Department of Education’s Developing Programs for English Language Learners: Introduction website materials, Part III](https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/ell/programeval.html)).

## How to Develop an EL Plan

* Consult with stakeholders and form a work group that includes:
  + Parents, teachers, building administrators, community members, as well as other people having interest in EL student success.
* Describe the EL program, addressing the eight requirements for an EL program as outlined by the USDOE OCR.
* Describe activities that will be implemented with the Title III funds.
* Describe how the EL program will ensure ELs develop English proficiency.
  + Describe how Title III funds will be used to meet AMAOs, and how schools will be held accountable for meeting AMAOs and annually assessing ELs with ELPA21.
* Describe how parental and community participation in the EL program will be promoted.
* Consult in a timely and meaningful manner with private schools within the district (if any) and document this collaboration with meeting agendas, etc.

# Types of Program Service Models

Below is a chart of the program model codes used to describe the specific ELD program for each EL. These codes explain the types of programs provided to assist the student in acquiring the English language. These codes are used in the EL data collection (see data collection section).

## English Language Development Programs

| Program Model Code 1 (ELPrgMdl TypCd1) Valid Values | Description |
| --- | --- |
| 21 | **ELD Push-in** ELD instruction is provided within the student’s mainstream or content-area classroom. |
| 22 | **ELD Pull-out** ELs spend part of the day in a mainstream classroom, and are “pulled out” for a portion of the day to receive ELD instruction. This approach is more common in elementary school settings. |
| 23 | **ELD Class Period** ELs receive their ELD instruction during a regular class period and also receive course credit for the class. This approach is more common in middle schools and high schools. |
| 41 | **Newcomer Program – ELD** Separate, relatively self-contained educational interventions designed to meet the academic and transitional needs of newly arrived immigrants. Typically, students attend these programs on a short-term basis (usually no more than two years) before they enter more traditional programs (e.g., Bilingual, English language development and/or Sheltered Instruction courses or programs). ELs receive their ELD in this program. |
| 51 | **Not participating in a ELD program** NOTE: Used only for students in:  Category 3 – EL Placement score excludes ELD program eligibility (3-H), or  Category 4 – ELD Program eligible but declined services (4-N, 4-O, 4-P) |
| 60 | **Monitored year 1 –** Exited as proficient in the prior school year - Category 5-M |
| 61 | **Monitored year 2 –** Exited as proficient two school years prior - Category 5-M |
| 62 | **Monitored year 3 –** Exited as proficient three school years prior - Category 5-M |
| 63 | **Monitored year 4 –** Exited as proficient four school years prior - Category 5-M |
| 70 | **Former EL –** Exited as proficient more than 2 school years prior - Category 5-F |

Below are the program model codes used to describe the specific sheltered content programs for each EL. These codes are used for the EL data collection. Districts are required to provide the program model(s) used annually in the budget narrative with complete explanation of the district’s selected program models included in the district’s local plan.

## Access to Core Content Program Models

| ELPrgMdl TypCd2) Program Model Code 2 Valid Values | Description |
| --- | --- |
| 12 | **Two-Way Immersion** Also referred to as Dual Language Immersion, this is a program in which the language goals are full bilingualism and biliteracy in English and a partner language. Students study language arts and other academic content (math, science, social studies, arts) in both languages over the course of the program, and the program lasts at least through elementary school (and many programs continue through high school). These programs use an immersion approach (maximizing the teacher’s use of the target language during the target language’s instructional time) and enroll both native English speakers and native speakers of the partner language, with neither group making up more than two-thirds of the student population. Because of this student composition, these programs also emphasize cross-cultural awareness as a key goal of the program. If your program enrolls primarily ELs, it should be coded as a Developmental Bilingual program. |
| 13 | **Transitional Bilingual (13)** The primary goal of a Transitional Bilingual program is to facilitate the EL student's transition to an all-English instructional program while receiving academic subject instruction in the native language to the extent necessary. This program, also known as Early-Exit Bilingual Education, utilizes a student's primary language in instruction. The program maintains and develops skills in the primary language and culture while introducing, maintaining, and developing skills in English. Typically, transition to all English occurs by mid- to late elementary school. These programs are designed for ELs. |
| 14 | **Developmental Bilingual (14)** Like Two-Way Immersion programs, these programs share the goals of bilingualism and biliteracy, and thus typically last through elementary school or longer (preferably through high school). Also referred to Dual Language Immersion, Maintenance Bilingual or Late-Exit Bilingual Education programs, these are programs that use two languages, the EL student's primary language and English, as a means of instruction. The instruction builds upon the student's primary language skills and develops and expands the English language skills of each student to enable him or her to achieve proficiency in both languages, while providing access to the content areas. These programs are designed for and typically enroll only ELs |
| 15 | **Other Bilingual (15**) This could include Heritage language preservation or other bilingual program models that are not easily classifiable into another program definition. You must have prior approval to use this code and will need to include a description of your program’s goals, instructional approach, duration of the program, and target population when this code is used. |
| 30 | **Sheltered Instruction** Teacher provides instruction that simultaneously introduces both language and content, using specialized techniques to accommodate ELs’ linguistic needs. Instruction focuses on the teaching of academic content rather than the English language itself, even though the acquisition of English may be one of the instructional goals. Some examples of sheltered instruction models may include SIOP, GLAD, SDAIE, and CM. Classes using a Sheltered Instruction approach can be designed exclusively for ELs or for a mixture of ELs and non-ELs. |
| 31 | **Newcomer Program – Core Content instruction** Separate, relatively self-contained instructional program designed to meet the academic and transitional needs of newly arrived immigrants. Typically, students attend these programs on a short-term basis (usually no more than two years) before they enter more traditional programs (e.g., Bilingual, English language development and/or Sheltered Instruction courses or programs). ELs receive their core content instruction in this program. These programs enroll ELs exclusively. |
| 60 | **Monitored year 1 –** Exited as proficient in the prior school year - Category 5-M |
| 61 | **Monitored year 2 –** Exited as proficient two school years prior - Category 5-M |
| 62 | **Monitored year 3 –** Exited as proficient three school years prior - Category 5-M |
| 63 | **Monitored year 4 –** Exited as proficient four school years prior - Category 5-M |
| 70 | **Former EL –** Exited as proficient more than 4 school years prior - Category 5-F |
| 51 | **Not participating in a program. NOTE: Used only for students in**  Category 3 – EL Placement score excludes ELD program eligibility (3-H) or  Category 4 – ELD Program eligible but declined services (4-N,4-O, 4-P)  Category 1-E – only if the student exited as proficient at the beginning of the academic year. |

Other evidence-based, researched services models can be used as determined effective at district discretion; however, one of the codes in the charts above must be used in the EL data collection.

Districts may opt to select a third program model using any of the codes in program model 1 or 2.

# Program Requirements

## Identifying a Student as an EL

There are two ways to identify potentially eligible students for ELD services: HLS and teacher referral. Both are described in this section, below.

New for 2019-20:

ELPA Screener will be the sole identification tool used beginning August 15, 2019. Districts identifying ELs prior to this date may continue to use their “off-the-shelf” identification screeners as long as the scores in the Numbered Memo below are used to determine initial fluency.

### Executive Numbered Memo 005-2017-18, Identification of English Learners (EL) under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

**To**: All District Superintendents, ESD Superintendents, Principals, and Special Education, Title I, and Title III Directors

**From**: Theresa Richards, Interim Assistant Superintendent, Office of Teaching, Learning and Assessment; Darryl Tukufu, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

**Date**: September 21, 2017

Under the Every Student Succeeds Act, states are required to have a statewide identification procedure for all English Learners. Oregon plans to phase in the requirements over the next three school years (2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20):

1. Phase 1 (2017-18): Districts must use one of the four state approved English language proficiency (ELP) screeners and the state’s established fluent score for the selected screener.

2. Phase 2 (2018-19): Districts must use the state Language Use Survey, a state approved ELP screener, and the state’s established fluent score for the selected screener. An additional ELP screener may be approved by the state and used by districts this year.

3. Phase 3 (2019-20): If the state adopts a single ELP screener, districts must use this ELP screener, the state’s established fluent score, and the state Language Use Survey.

**DETAILS**:

On December 10, 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law, reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Under ESSA, states are required to have a statewide identification procedure for all English learners (EL) that is consistently implemented across all districts within the state.

A common identification procedure provides a more cohesive educational program for Oregon’s English Learners. A statewide procedure reduces the likelihood that a student would be retested to determine the student’s EL status whenever the student moves from one district to another. This should foster a more seamless transition between districts for Oregon English Learners.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) has been working with district EL coordinators and community partners to develop a statewide identification procedure as part of Oregon’s Consolidated ESSA State Plan. The new statewide procedure builds on the existing EL identification policy currently implemented in Oregon districts. (See former numbered memorandum issued in 2003-04.)

Oregon’s new EL identification procedure will be phased in over the next three school years, 2017-18, 2018-19, and 2019-20 (see Table 1 below). ODE staff will provide professional development and support during these first years of implementation. Training materials will be posted to the English Learner Local Plans web page.

In 2017-18, districts will have the option of using the state-developed Language Use Survey (link available on the English Learner Local Plans web page) or the Home Language Survey used by the district in 2016-17. Additionally, districts must use one of four approved English language proficiency (ELP) screeners as described in Table 1. In 2018-19, districts will have the option to use one of five approved ELP screeners as described in Table 1. Beginning with the 2019-20 school year, all districts in Oregon will be required to use the state’s Language Use Survey and the state-approved ELP screener(s).

**Table 1: Timeline for Oregon Statewide EL Identification Procedure and Criteria**

| **2017-18**  **(Transition Year)** | **2018-19**  **(Transition Year)** | **2019-20**  **(Transition Year)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Districts have an **option** of using the Language Use Survey developed collaboratively with district, stakeholders, and ODE, **or** the Home Language Survey used by the district in 2016-17.  ***Districts are also required to use one of the following ELP screeners:***   * Language Assesment system (LAS) * Woodcock-Munoz * IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT) * Stanford | Districts are **required** to use the Language Use Survey.  ***Districts are also required to use one of the following ELP screeners:***   * Language Assessment System (LAS) * Woodcock-Munoz * IDEA Proficienty Test (IPT) * Stanford * ELPA21 Screener (if adopted by the state) | District are **required** to use the Language Use Survey **AND**  if the adopts a single ELP screener, the districts must use this particular ELP screener. |

Districts must use the scores below (Table 2) when determining which students are initially fluent on the state-approved ELP screeners. ELPA21 Screener fluency scores will be required once they become available.

**Table 2: ELP Screener – Initially Fluent Score**

| **TEST** | **K** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Woodcock-Munoz | Level 4 Broad English Overall | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LAS | Level 4 Overall | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IPT | D | E | F | | | | E | | | | F | | | |
| Stanford | Level 5 Overall | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Districts must ensure identification and exiting records for all potential English Learners who are screened by the district for EL services (this includes current and former English Learners as well as students determined not to qualify for EL services) are filed in the student’s permanent file. This will aid in providing EL services when students move across districts. How the items are organized is determined by the district; however, it is recommended that a district-wide policy is established. The following list of items must be maintained in the student’s permanent file to be consistent with OAR 116-400-0060(10), (12), (26):

* Initial Language Use Survey (Home Language Survey)
* Initial identification screener results
* Initial EL program placement letter, if student qualifies for EL services
* “Initial fluent” letter, if student does not qualify for EL services
* “Waiver of service” letter, signed by parent/guardian
* Annual state English language proficiency assessment results
* “Exit-as-proficient” letter, when student has reached English proficiency
* “Completion of monitoring” letter, when student has been monitored for all four years.
* Re-entry into EL program during monitoring letter

**New for 2019-20:**

**Districts are required to use the Language Use Survey and the ELPA Screener beginning August 15, 2019. Districts identifying ELs prior to this date were able to use their “off-the-shelf” identification screeners as long as the scores in the Numbered Memo were used to determine initial fluency for students identified prior to August 15, 2019**.

## Language Use Survey (LUS)

The Language Use Survey and rubic are available for districts on the ODE Title III [Local plans web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/District-Local-Plans.aspx) in English. Districts can access this survey in other languages through TransACT. [TransACT Website](http://www.transact.com/).

Districts must:

* Identify the Primary Home Language Other than English (PHLOTE) of *all* students.
* Using Oregon’s Language Use Survey to identify students as potentially eligible for ELD services. Templates for LUS are available on the [TransACT Website](http://www.transact.com/)
* Then the child qualifies for initial program assessment. As such, the child is classified as a primary home language other than English PHLOTE student.

The purpose of the Language Use Survey is to determine if the student’s current language exposure and use might make the student eligible to receive support in academic English. Students who are learning a second language (i.e., bilingual preschool, enhancing cultural learning, etc.) are not students who would be given the ELPA screener.

Finally, the LUS is administered to ***all*** students after the student is registered in a district, rather than each year the student is enrolled in the same district.

Language Use Survey

The purpose of this survey is to determine if your child’s current language exposure and use might make your child eligible to receive support in academic English instruction.

Student Name**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** Grade Level**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

School**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** Date of Birth**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**1.** What language(s) does your child **hear or use** regularly in your household (i.e. spoken, media, music, literature, etc.)? hear\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ use (e.g., American Sign Language (ASL)) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**2.** Describe the language(s) your child **understands**.

* No English
* Mostly another language and a little English
* English and another language equally
* Mostly English and a little of another language
* Tribal/Heritage/Native Language (e.g., languages spoken by American Indian/Alaska, Native Hawaiians, and citizens of U.S. Territories)
* Only English

**3.** What language(s) do **adults** most frequently **use** when speaking/conversing to your child?

Parent/Guardian: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Parent/Guardian**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Other Adults in the Home: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Child-care Providers**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**4.** What language(s) does your **child CURRENTLY speak/express** most frequently ***outside of school***?

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**5.** Does your child frequently participate in cultural activities that are in a language other than English? Please list the activity and how often your child participates in the activity (e.g., once/week, 2 times/week, once a month, etc.). **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**6.** Is there anything else you think the school should know about your child’s language use (e.g., what language did your child speak/express from ages 0-4; did your child have speech classes; did your child attend a bilingual pre-school, etc.)?

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Parent Questions: In what language(s) do you want to receive information from the school (if available)?**

Parent/Guardian:

Oral \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Written \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ American Sign Language\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Parent/Guardian:

Oral \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Written \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ American Sign Language\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Parent or Guardian Signature** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Date \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**What is your relationship to the student? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., parent, grandparent, etc.)**

Once a student is identified as an EL, the district must notify parents within the first 30 days of the school year, or within two (2) weeks after the school year has begun (forms are available through [www.TransACT.com](http://www.TransACT.com) ).

## Notifications to Parents/Option to Waive Services

Parents can choose to remove their children from an EL program. This decision must be an independent decision of the parent/guardian. Districts are required to provide parents with student English proficiency levels and describe what educational supports the student is eligible to receive. When a parent declines participation, the district retains a responsibility to ensure the student has an equal opportunity to have his or her English language and academic needs met. Districts can meet this obligation in a variety of ways (e.g., adequate training to classroom teachers on second language acquisition; monitoring the educational progress of the student). For more information please visit the [U.S. Department of Education – Questions and Answers on the Rights of Limited-English Proficient Students](https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/qa-ell.html) web page.

Students not served by district programs **are required** to participate in all state-required assessments, including ELPA21, and are counted in the district’s accountability requirements.

Students with a waiver for services are reported annually to the district’s EL Collection, and they are coded 4-N (waiver and participated in ELPA summative); 4-O (waiver and not enrolled during the ELPA summative testing window); 4-P (waiver returned to EL status after exiting for proficiency). The State uses these codes to review trend data for ELs regardless of participation in a district’s EL program.

## Student Identification Scenarios

* A LUS has ASL and English as languages spoken in the home. Do we proceed with identification assessment for the student?
  1. What is the student’s national origin? Is the student Native American/Alaska Native?
     1. If Native American/Alaska Native, then proceed with identification assessment.
     2. If the student is not Native American/Alaska Native, then the student does **not require identification screener** – do not administer the identification assessment.
* We have a foreign exchange student enrolled in our district, do we identify the student as an EL?
  1. First, check the agreement with the company sending the student - most say “have English skills needed for school participation"; second, observe how they are doing for a little while - they tend to have ‘language fatigue’ when they first arrive; they are not used to English 24 hours a day, but could be okay in classes as soon as they become accustomed to this cultural shift.
  2. Some schools have placed them in an ELD class as a class aid - not really in the class as an EL, but ‘assisting in class’ - the work in class supports their transition, as well as meet other kids through conversations and group work.
  3. If after about a month the student is still struggling in English, you can administer your identification assessment to the student; if the student qualifies for service you will not need to revise the student’s whole schedule. If you do end up serving the student and claiming the state school fund, we will expect the student to participate in ELPA summative. Also, remember they are most likely recent arrivers for the Recent Arrivers data submission this spring!

Additional scenarios will be added overtime.

## Program Exit Criteria

The program exit criteria must assess whether a child understands English well enough to profit from classes conducted in English. Accordingly, the exit criteria must be the student’s level of English language proficiency, rather than whether the student meets state academic content standards expectations.

ODE [Executive Numbered Memo 004-2018-19](https://www.google.com/url?q=https://www.oregon.gov/ode/about-us/Documents/Executive%2520Numbered%2520Memo%2520004-2018-19%2520Exiting%2520ELs%2520as%2520Proficient.pdf&sa=U&ved=0ahUKEwjw9rzbt5PhAhVoITQIHWqWAV0QFggFMAA&client=internal-uds-cse&cx=017270664345420165392:sia_fbfaeds&usg=AOvVaw0QqPZLSNu4HoAC39Wlr8J2) states the only allowable exit process for ELs is by scoring proficient on the ELPA21 assessment. This policy change is based on the January 2015 Dear Colleague Letter by the US Office for Civil Rights.

This Executive Numbered Memo removes the district portfolio exiting option effective February 28, 2019.

## Monitored Students

A student is monitored for four years from the date the student is exited from the ELD program. Monitoring consists of reviewing student academic progress in class(es). Teacher observations, work samples, grades, and state assessment data may be reviewed as part of monitoring. If a student is struggling academically due to academic language, it is possible for the student to be re-entered into the ELD program. This type of determination is made by a team of educators, who review evidence of the student’s academic English. The team should consider if the student is in need of assistance due to academic language needs, or if the student could benefit from core instruction interventions prior to re-entered the student in the EL program.

***Ideally, students would be monitored frequently enough so that the district can address any necessary remediation needed for the student to be successful in school. Monitoring only on the semesters may not provide for needed support in a timely manner.***

## Allocation of Federal Title III Funds

The ODE receives a formula allocation that is determined by the USDOE on an annual basis. This annual amount requires a percentage (up to 15%) be set aside for distribution as the Recent Arriver’s (Immigrant) sub-grant. The ODE is allowed up to 5% of the total funds to be used for state administration of the program. The remainder is distributed to each EL program participating in Title III, based on a per-pupil allocation.

## Steps to Title III Allocations

Each spring districts are asked to provide a District Grant Intent form. This form requires the districts to provide a list of all private schools participating in Title III, and a count of all ELs enrolled in these private schools. The districts must also confirm their intent to participate in Title III for the following school year. Districts must choose between one of the following three options:

* Have a district Title III sub-grant, if the district has an allocation of at least $10,000.00.
* Continue to participate in the district’s current Title III consortium.
* Join a Title III consortium.
* Decline to participate in Title III for the following school year.

District Grant Intents are due to the ODE in mid-June, so the State can disseminate the next year’s allocations in a timely manner. Technical assistance is provided to districts in making their district Grant Intent and Consortium Membership. Funding and grant information forms are located on the [Funding & Grant Information for Title III web page](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/Funding-Grant-Information.aspx).

## Sub-grantee Allocations

Sub-grantees receive allocations based on a per-pupil basis following the approval of their budget narrative outlining how they plan to expend the available funds. Budget narratives include questions on the program of service, improvement plans, parent involvement, immigrant youth, and private schools. Sub-grantees must respond to these questions, plus include a budget for all activities funded by Title III. The budget narrative is a secure application available through the [ODE District Web Site](https://district.ode.state.or.us/home/).

Allocations are disseminated in August of each school year at the same time as the other Federal Title grants. School year budget narrative submissions are due in early November of each school year.

## Carryover Budget Narratives

Sub-grantees not expending the previous school year’s allocations may apply for a no-cost extension for one additional year. Carryover budget narratives open in mid-November and are due in mid-December. All carryover funds must be claimed by the following September 30th.

## Consortia Allocations

Districts serving ELs who do not qualifying for a minimum of a $10,000.00 Title III federal grant allocation may opt to join a Title III consortium. A Title III consortium is a group of districts working together to support ELs. Allocations generated by consortium member districts are disseminated to the consortia lead (district or ESD). The consortium members work together planning activities to assist all member districts with services to support ELs. The consortium member districts develop the consortia budget narrative and submit it to the ODE as a team with the consortium lead submitting the budget narrative on behalf of the consortia. Each consortium member district must provide a Consortium Membership Certificate that gives ODE the authorization to transfer the Title III allocations to the consortium lead. The certificate is available on the [Funding & Grant Information for Title III web page](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/Funding-Grant-Information.aspx).

## Immigrant Sub-grant Allocation

Up to 15% of the total Title III allocation is required to be distributed to the EL program demonstrating the highest increase in immigrant student population by Title III law. Oregon has selected to reserve .5% of the total Title III sub-grant for the Immigrant sub-grant.

## Oregon Definition of Significant Increase

**LEAs must have at least a .5% increase of immigrant students over the prior 2 academic school years and a minimum of 10 immigrant students, as identified on the current year’s recent arrivers data collection.**

LEAs meeting the above criteria will be notified and invited to participate, and will be given a preliminary immigrant allocation amount (per student allocation and guidance on allowable expenditures). Upon acceptance from the LEAs, the allocation amount will be divided on a per student basis based on the number of immigrant students in the participating LEAs. Immigrant grants will be entered into EGMS and managed through that system. Immigrant fiscal records will be reviewed when the LEA participates in Title III monitoring or on a 3-year cycle.

(See the Recent Arrivers in this document, under State Data Collections section for more information on this collection.)

The districts receiving this allocation must complete the Title III Immigrant Budget Narrative and submit that budget within 45 days of the allocation being disseminated. The narrative must include a description of each activity and the budget for each activity. As with all Title III sub-grants, the districts must consult with local private schools to ensure recent arrivers enrolled in private schools participating in Title III are included in all activities.

The districts receiving this allocation must also respond to additional data submission questions that are used in the State’s annual Immigrant EdFacts report.

## Indirect/Administrative Rate

All Title III sub-grants are subject to a maximum 2% of the allocation for indirect/administration requirements. Sub-grantees are asked to provide copies of all staffing job descriptions as part of their budget narrative to ensure that personnel funded by Title III are not performing activities that supplant other federal or state requirements.

## Supplement, Not Supplant

Sub-grantees will be asked to provide documentation that activities funded with Title III allocations do not supplant other state or federal-required activities in accordance with federal law ([ESSA Law](https://www2.ed.gov/documents/essa-act-of-1965.pdf)):

(g) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT -- Federal funds made available under this subpart shall be used so as to supplement the level of Federal, State, and local public funds that, in the absence of such availability, would have been expended for programs for English learners and immigrant children and youth and in no case to supplant such Federal, State, and local public funds.

In practice, the prohibition against supplanting under Title III means that recipients may not use those funds to pay for services that, in the absence of Title III funds, would be necessary to be provided by other Federal, or State, or local funds. Districts provide this information annually in the Budget Narrative application.

## EL Program Monitoring

Program monitoring is designed to provide technical assistance to schools, districts, and consortia, as well as ensuring compliance with federal and state laws applicable to serving ELs. Monitoring documents and guidance is available on the [Monitoring for Title III web page](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/Monitoring.aspx) .

Generally, all districts and consortia are monitored by the ODE every three years, as required by USDOE program requirements. ODE staff are required to use a Risk Assessment to determine which districts/consortia are to be monitored. This process will begin with a desk audit, and may include on-site monitoring.

Occasionally, districts may be selected for a targeted monitoring. Targeted monitoring allows the State to focus attention on specific areas for careful review. Targeted monitoring includes an on-site visit specifically designed based on the area(s) of review. Districts are notified by official letter, required to submit documentation and coordinate the on-site visit with the State.

# Data Collection and Analysis

Several data elements should be tracked by EL program staff to meet legal requirements and to evaluate EL programs. Many of these elements are listed in the table below. Due to the complexity of the data process, EL program staff should work closely with their district’s designated data personnel to ensure a comprehensive, cohesive, and accurate school and district data plan to serve ELs. Additional information relating to data collections can be found on the [Data Collections for Title III web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/Data-Collections.aspx).

Note: Bolded names below are the codes used in the State data system. This information may be helpful when discussing data submissions with district data personnel.

| Data Element | Purpose | Included in State Data Collection | State Data Collection Name and Field Name for this Element |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recent Arrivers | Identify the number of qualifying recent arrivers a district has to calculate the rate of growth. | Yes | Recent Arrivers Collection |
| EL Start Date | Represents the date on which the student was first identified as an EL. | Yes | EL Collection – **LEPStrtDt** |
| EL Program Code | Identifies the type of ELD class instruction provided for the student. | Yes | EL Collection – **LEPProgCd 1** (ELD class) Cd 2 (access to core content)  Cd 3 (optional can pull from both list 1 and 2). |
| EL Identification Assessment Data | District-level assessment data for the purpose of identifying students ineligible to receive ELD services. | Yes | Students found ineligible are reported the year the student is assessed (LEP Record Type code 3-H)  Students identified in the current school year have this data reported (LEP Record Type 1-A, 1-E, 4-N, or 4-O) |
| EL Record Type | Identifies the specific code defining the status of an EL. | Yes | EL Collection – **LEPRecTypCd** – identifies the status of an EL in the district program (first year, continuing, exiting as proficient, waiver for ELD services, did not participate in ELPA21, or not eligible for services)  Students on monitor status and Former ELs are also identified. |
| EL Exit Date | Specifies the date the district determines the student has obtained academic English proficiency. | Yes | EL Collection – **LEPExtDt** |

**It is recommended that the district collect and store the following data elements annually. The district does not submit this information to the state data collections; however, this information may be reviewed during Title III monitoring.**

| Data Element | Purpose |
| --- | --- |
| ELPA screener and summative scores | The statewide assessment for ELP (formerly “ELPA”) – districts should track the progress of students from year to year. |
| Oregon content assessment scores | The statewide assessments for English Language Arts and Math taken by all students – districts need to track the progress of former and monitored ELs to ensure the students continue to make academic progress.  **New guidance from DC encourages districts to track the academic progress of all former ELs in addition to monitored ELs(ESSA allowable – 4 years of monitoring)** |
| Years identified as EL | The number of years a student has been identified as an EL – ESSA requirement. |
| ELSWD | Progress of English Learner Students with Disabilities making gains in English proficiency, obtainment of English proficiency, and progress on academic core content. |
| Parent Program Placement letters | Federal Requirement:  Districts must provide parents with an annual notice of the placement of their student’s ELD program. |

## State Data Collections

There are two main data collections relating to Title III: the EL Collection and the Recent Arriver’s Collection. Districts not participating in Title III are required by OAR to submit data to all ODE data collections.

The EL Collection is a part of the consolidated collections application located on the [ODE District Web Site](https://district.ode.state.or.us/home/). This collection represents an annual count of all ELs enrolled at any time during the school year. This collection is also used for districts to report any potential ELs found ineligible for services as defined by the district’s chosen EL identification assessment.

The EL Collection opens in the fall and spring of each year and is used to determine the:

* EL sub-group used to calculate academic and linguistic progress
* EL count reported by each district used to determine Title III allocations;
* EL count used for accountability purposes;
* State report to the USDOE;
* Verify the student’s EL status to confirm the district is entitled to claim the weighted State school funding for ELs.

Additional information relating to the EL collection can be found at the ODE District Secure web page, schedule of due dates or the [Data Collections for Title III web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/Data-Collections.aspx). On the schedule of due dates, look for the ESEA: EL Collection –opening in October (fall collection) and April (spring collection). From that page, documents to assist districts are located under the Help menu.

The Recent Arrivers Data Collection is part of the consolidated collection located on the [ODE District Web Site](https://district.ode.state.or.us/home/). The purpose of this collection is to gather information related to students aged 3-21 who were born outside the United States, and who have not been enrolled in school in the U.S. for more than three cumulative years (540 days).

This information is submitted to the ODE for a required calculation to distribute a sub-grant of the Title III grant providing funds for districts experiencing a sudden influx of students recently arriving in the U.S. The calculation includes a three-year average of the growth of immigrants within a district. Recent Arrivers data is used to submit data to the USDOE, as well as to determine the sub-grant for Title III.

## Data Collection Requirements

Districts are required to report initial assessment data for students identified as EL for the first time in the current school year and data for students not qualifying as EL (proficient on initial assessment) is reported to the EL collection. Required data for student’s found proficient include name of assessment, date of assessment, and student proficiency level.

Please see the ODE secure application – Consolidated Collections for the specific data collection help documents.

# Equal Access

In 1970, the federal [Office for Civil Rights (OCR)](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/lau1970.html) issued a memo regarding school districts' responsibilities under civil rights law to provide an equal educational opportunity to ELs. This memorandum stated:

*“Where the 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.”*

Although the memo requires school districts to take affirmative steps, it does not prescribe the content of these steps. It does, however, explain that federal law is violated if:

* Students are excluded from effective participation in school because of their inability to speak and understand the language of instruction;
* National origin minority students are inappropriately assigned to special education classes because of their lack of English skills;
* Programs for students whose English is less than proficient are not designed to teach them English as soon as possible, or if these programs operate as a dead end track; or
* Parents whose English is limited do not receive school notices or other information in a language they can understand.

In its 1974 decision in [Lau v Nichols (1974) Ruling](http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/414/563.html) the United States Supreme Court upheld OCR's 1970 memo. The basis for the case was the claim students could not understand the language in which they were being taught; therefore, they were not being provided with an equal education. The Supreme Court agreed, saying that:

*“There is no equality of treatment merely by providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum; for students who do not understand English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education.”*

The case reaffirmed that all students in the U.S., regardless of native language, have the right to receive a quality education. It also clarified equality of opportunity does not necessarily mean the same education for every student, but rather the same opportunity to receive an education. An equal education is only possible if students can understand the language of instruction.

Within weeks of the [Lau v Nichols (1974) Ruling](http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/414/563.html), Congress passed the [Equal Educational Opportunity Act (EEOA)](http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/edu/types.php) mandating no state shall deny equal education opportunity to any individual, *"by the failure by an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by students in an instructional program."* This was an important piece of legislation because it defined what constituted the denial of education opportunities.

The USDOE’s OCR oversees school districts and has broad discretion concerning how to ensure equal educational opportunity for ELs. This means that the OCR recognizes that there is not one program model that works for all districts or all students and reviews each district individually. OCR does not prescribe a specific intervention strategy or program model a district must adopt to serve ELs.

The following guidelines have been outlined for school districts to ensure their programs are serving ELs effectively. Districts should:

* identify students as potential ELs;
* assess student's need for EL services;
* develop a program which, in the view of experts in the field, has a reasonable chance for success;
* ensure that necessary staff, curricular materials, and facilities are in place and used properly;
* develop appropriate evaluation standards, including program exit criteria, for measuring the progress of students; and
* assess the success of the program and modify it where needed.

For additional information regarding the provision of equal education opportunity to ELs, see additional resources or contact the [Office for Civil Rights](http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/index.html) enforcement office at:

Phone: (800) 421-3481  
Email: [ocr@ed.gov](mailto:ocr@ed.gov)  
URL: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/index.html>

# Private School Participation

Districts must annually consult with private schools. This consultation must include a discussion on the needs of the enrolled private school ELs and funding to ensure that equitable services under the law are provided. The ODE has provided a form that documents the required consultation with private schools. The form can be found on the [TransACT Website](https://www.transact.com/). All school districts should store this completed form for monitoring review and complete the required private schools sections on their budget narrative. **This form must be returned to the state ombudsman. If a district chooses not to participate, the district needs to return the form, which states the private school will not be participating.**

To ensure timely and meaningful consultation, the LEA must consult with appropriate private school officials during the design and development of the Title III program on issues such as:

* How the EL needs to be identified.
* What services will be offered.
* How, when, and by whom the services will be provided.
* How the services will be assessed and how the results of the assessment will be used to improve those services.
* What the size and scope of the services to be provided to the private school children and educational personnel.
* What amount of funds will be available for those services?
* How and when the LEA will make decisions about the delivery of services, including a thorough consideration of the views of the private school officials on the provision of contract services through potential third-party providers.
* Title III services provided to children and educational personnel in private schools must be equitable and timely and address their educational needs.
* Funds provided for educational services for private school children and educational personnel must be equal, taking into account the number and educational needs of those children, to the funds provided for participating public school children.
* Title III services provided to private school children and educational personnel must be secular, neutral, and non-ideological.
* LEAs may serve private school EL children and educational personnel either directly or through contracts with public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions.
* The control of funds used to provide services and the title to materials and equipment purchased with those funds must be retained by the LEA.
* Services for private school children and educational personnel must be provided by employees of the LEA or through a contract made by the LEA with a third party.
* Providers of services to private school children and educational personnel must be independent of the private school and of any religious organization, and the providers' employment or contract must be under the control and supervision of the LEA.
* Funds used to provide services to private school children and educational personnel must not be commingled with non-federal funds.

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the LEA and private school should be developed as a result of initial consultation and address the items listed above. **This form is available on the** [TransACT Website](http://www.transact.com/). Subsequent meetings may be necessary between the LEA and private school to assess services and determine areas and plans for improvement. Documentation of timely and meaningful consultation with private schools should be included in the service delivery plan, and is a requirement on the budget narrative submission for release of Title III funds.

Once a private school student is identified as EL, the private school may request the student continue to receive Title III services in subsequent school years until the student attains English proficiency.

It is possible that more than one consultation a year may be necessary:

* Spring consultation for participation the following school year.
* Fall consultation regarding possible ELs.
* Fall consultation regarding needs and funding limits for regular Title III allocations.
* Consultation regarding potential immigrant (recent arrivers) and funding support for immigrant (recent arrivers) enrolled in private schools, when the district is the recipient of the Title III – Immigrant sub-grant.

## Private Schools and Title III Consortium Members

All districts are required to consult with private schools within district boundaries. Districts that are members of a Title III Consortium must inform their consortium lead if a private school has agreed to participate in Title III. The consortium lead, member district, and private school will need to consult on the services to be provided and the funding available for the identified ELs enrolled in the private school.

* [ODE's Private School Participation under ESEA web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/Pages/Private-Schools.aspx)
* [U.S. Department of Education Private School Participation, Sec. 9501 web page](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg111.html)
* [Non-Regulatory Guidance for ESEA 9501 document](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/psguidance.doc)

# English Language Proficiency Standards

In October 2013, the Oregon State Board of Education adopted new ELP standards that correspond to the Common Core. These standards will be assessed on the ELPA21, new language proficiency assessment currently in development. Please [visit the English Language Proficiency Standards web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/equity/EngLearners/Pages/EnglishLanguageProficiencyStandards.aspx).

Definition: Academic language is different from everyday speech and informal writing. It is the language of texts, of academic discussion, and formal writing. Without academic language proficiency, students will not achieve long-term success in school. ELs at the intermediate and advanced levels of ELD, who receive no formal language instruction, demonstrate oral fluency, but generally show critical gaps in language knowledge and vocabulary. Academic language must be continuously developed and explicitly taught across all subject areas.

**Oregon has been working nationally on the development of Alt-ELP Standards for ELs with significant cognitive disabilities. ODE staff will be proiding training on the Alt-ELP Standards during the Fall of 19-20. These standards are the same for both ELs and ELs with significant cognitive disabilities. There are differences in the proficiency levels between the ELs and the ELs with significant cognitive disabilities.**

# Assessment of English Learners

## English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21)

All students who qualify for EL services are required to participate annually in English language proficiency (ELP) testing. ELPA is a single test that contains a reading, writing, and listening segment, and a speaking segment. While both segments are part of the same test, students will require Test Administrator (TA) approval to begin each segment.

The reading, writing, and listening section is the first segment presented to students. Students should review their answers upon completing all questions in this segment, as they will not be able to return to this portion of the test after continuing to the speaking segment. After reviewing his or her responses for the first segment, the student will need TA approval to start the speaking segment.

A student’s IEP or 504 Plan might exempt the student from responding to a particular domain of the ELPA (reading, writing, speaking, or listening). **Exemptions from a domain in ELPA summative must be limited to only students who cannot participate in the domain with any accessibility support. There should be very few domain exemptions.**

Please review the final version of the Test Administration Manual (TAM) for information on domain exemption policies for ELPA, and the Oregon Accessibility Manual (OAM) for information regarding: Universal supports, designated supports and accommodations for ELPA. TAs who need to administer the ELPA must be officially trained for that assessment. Please see the TAM for details.

## State Content Assessments

The Oregon Statewide Assessment System (OSAS) comprises state Mathematics, English Language Arts (ELA), Science, and Social Sciences content area assessments.

* [ODE's Test Administration web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/assessment/Pages/Assessment-Administration.aspx) contains links to the Test Administration Manual and the Oregon Accessibility Manual.
* Additional resources for the ELPA can be found on [ODE's English Language Proficiency Assessment web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/assessment/Pages/English-Language-Proficiency.aspx).

## English Learner Students with Disabilities (ELSWD)

Please [visit the English Learner Students with Disabilities (ELSWD) web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/ELSWD.aspx) for additional guidance and support.

If you suspect that an EL has a disability, referral and evaluation should happen in a timely manner, as it does for all students.

Designated staff in each school/district should lead this process (whether IDEA or 504) as there are very specific guidelines to be followed. Educators who are knowledgeable about and familiar with the student’s language acquisition must be involved at every step throughout the process.

All notices and consents are required to be provided in the parents’ native language, unless the language is not written or it is clearly not feasible to do so. Qualified interpreters should be utilized to translate all other information.

Evaluations must be conducted by professionals who are able to select and administer procedures so that results are not biased by the child’s culture or language. Both the [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) web page](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/) and the [Section 504 – Protecting Students With Disabilities web page](https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/504faq.html) provide specific information, and answer common questions in order to assist school and district personnel to best serve students with special academic needs.

IDEA requires that when an EL has a disability, planning for the child’s language needs and the effect of language development on the overall educational program be considered by the IEP team, which must include someone who is knowledgeable about the child’s second language acquisition and level of functioning.

Once an EL has been identified as eligible for special education, the IEP team, with appropriate representation from those knowledgeable about the child’s background, culture, and language acquisition, should make the decisions about the relationship between the child’s disability, language needs, participation in required assessments, and educational program.

For a 504 plan implementation, the team should include a professional who is knowledgeable about the child, and someone who understands the child’s language development.

It is important to maintain the perspective that if the child’s disability affects his or her functioning in any academic area, it is likely it will affect their progress in learning English. As such, it is not appropriate to withdraw language instruction from a child based on limited performance consistent with their disability.

## Special Education

The disproportionate representation of ethnically and linguistically diverse students in high incidence special education programs, intellectual disabilities, learning disabilities, and emotional disturbance) has been a concern for over three decades ([Artiles, Trent, & Palmer, 2004; Donovan & Cross, 2002; Dunn, 1968](http://www.ode.state.or.us/teachlearn/testing/admin/alt/ea/ed_policy_analysis_archives-disproreparticle_2.pdf)).

The importance of this issue is evident in the fact it has been studied twice by a National Research Council (NRC; Donovan & Cross, 2002; Heller, Holtzman, & Messick, 1982). Yet two NRC reports, resolutions, statements, and actions from major professional organizations, such as the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) (CEC, 1997, 2002), litigation (e.g., court cases such as Larry P. vs. Riles and Diana vs. the California State Board of Education), policy and advocacy efforts (e.g., new IDEA amendments, CEC Institutes on Disproportionality), pressure from parent groups, and efforts from a relatively small group of researchers have not been sufficient to significantly reduce this problem. The recent NRC report concluded, “twenty years later, disproportion in special education persists” (Donovan & Cross, 2002, p. 1). The phenomenon of disproportionate representation becomes particularly problematic when one considers our nation’s school-aged population is becoming culturally and linguistically diverse at an unprecedented rate (Smith, 2003; U.S. Department of Commerce, 2000).

[Blatchley and Lau report in the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) Communique May 2010](https://www.questia.com/magazine/1P3-2038869681/culturally-competent-assessment-of-english-language), students who are learning English as a second or third language often lag behind native English speakers in academic skills, and may display differences in behavior or social skills compared to their native English speaking peers. These ELs are, therefore, at risk for referral for special services including special education.

Educators are encouraged to use appropriate, nonbiased approaches to screen ELs to determine their need for support within the general education program and to implement culturally competent instructional strategies prior to considering referral to special education (e.g., see Lau & Blatchley, 2009). However, when ELs make little or no progress despite additional supports and special education services are considered, school personnel are urged to take a broad, ecological perspective, collecting data through a multi-dimensional, multi-task approach, and interpreting results within the context of the students’ unique cultural, linguistic, and experiential backgrounds (Lau & Blatchley, 2010).

Using nationally standardized, norm-referenced test (NRT) scores to determine eligibility for special education requires considerable caution with ELs. As ELs present a continuum of English proficiency and acculturation, the appropriateness of NRTs for a given student depends on the similarity of that student’s experience to that of the test’s standardization population.

Tasks from standardized tests may be administered to find out what skills the learner does and does not have. However, if the learner’s background experience is significantly different from the group on which the test was normed, it is inappropriate to use the normative scores to draw conclusions regarding student needs and special education eligibility. The use of native language interpreters does not negate this principle, and in fact introduces other complicating factors. For instance, current standardized tests do not involve the use of interpreters as part of their standardization procedure. Moreover, some test items just cannot be translated from English to another language without seriously distorting their original meaning or without suggesting the correct or expected response. These extraneous factors could seriously compromise the validity and utility of the assessment.

**Impact of second language acquisition**

A major complication of academic assessment of ELs is their varying stages of second language acquisition and academic experience. Understanding the specifics of their current and previous instructional programs is essential to accurate interpretation of ELs’ academic performance. If a student has previously and recently received instruction in his or her native language, it will be important to assess those skills using appropriately trained bilingual staff to ensure these competencies are not overlooked when all current instruction is in English; however, if a student has only received instruction in English, it is not useful to evaluate academic skills in the native language, unless he or she has been exposed to these skills at home or in community settings.

**Using norm referenced achievement tests**

The focus in academic assessment is generally on the skill areas of reading, writing, and mathematics, and to a lesser extent, the content areas (such as science and social studies). The more unique an individual’s educational experience and background, the more educators must individually tailor the assessment. Norm-referenced achievement tests are often not very useful in assessing ELs because the norms do not adequately represent EL populations. Further, test content does not adequately reflect ELs’ instructional experience and test formats are often unfamiliar and confusing to the student.

To ensure ELs are appropriately identified with disabilities requiring special education services, student study teams, pre-referral teams, and RTI teams must be knowledgeable about:

* Second language acquisition;
* Culturally responsive instructional practices;
* Appropriate multicultural assessment practices;
* Linguistic and cultural challenges in using standardized test measures;
* Challenges faced by children whose L1 is not English;
* Effective instructional strategies for ELs; and
* Working with interpreters (oral communication) and translators (written communication).

ELs can be misidentified with disabilities for a huge variety of reasons. Some students with limited English exposure and knowledge have not received appropriate instruction, while others have experienced academic difficulties not related to disabilities such as:

* Interrupted schooling
* Limited formal education
* Medical problems
* Attendance problems due to family mobility
* Acculturation challenges

A resource guide is available on the ODE website to assist school district staff in managing the challenges of appropriately evaluating ELs who may have disabilities that require specialized instruction via an IEP (Special Education). The goal of the **Special Education Assessment Process for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students 2007 Revision** is to provide content, relevant to the challenge of deciding when academic learning difficulties are influenced by second language acquisition, the acculturation process, inappropriate instruction, or a disabling condition, as well as providing culturally responsive instructional and assessment considerations. Included in this 2007 Revision is a discussion on emerging practices on Response to Intervention (RTI), which has promising utility for CLD learners.

The following are a series of issues and requirements that student study teams should consider as they work with ELs:

* Informed parental consent for the evaluation.
* Legal timelines to develop assessment plan.
* Timeline for holding IEP team meeting.
* How much exposure to English has this child experienced?

Where is this child and his/her family in the acculturation process?

* Immigrant or refugee status.
* The type of instruction has the student had: model of ELD or bilingual, if any.
* History of access to core curriculum.
* The student’s language proficiency in the four skill areas in: L1, L2.
* How the student compares with his/her peers.
* How the student interacts with others in the home environment.

[Visit the Macome Intermediate School District - Alfredo J. Artiles and Alba A. Ortiz (2002) Web page](http://www.misd.net/Bilingual/ellsandspedcal.pdf) for more information.

The [National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (NJCLD)](http://www.ldonline.org/about/partners/njcld) strongly supports comprehensive assessment and evaluation of students with possible learning disabilities by a multidisciplinary team for the identification and diagnosis of students with learning disabilities. Comprehensive assessment of individual students requires the use of multiple data sources. These sources may include standardized tests, informal measures, observations, student self-reports, parent reports, and progress monitoring data from RTI approaches (NJCLD, 2005). Reliance on any single criterion for assessment or evaluation is not administered the student’s native language, nor is a group assessment, such as universal screening or statewide academic assessment tests, sufficient for comprehensive assessment or evaluation.

*Assessment* is used to refer to the collection of data through the use of multiple measures, including standardized and informal instruments and procedures. These measures yield comprehensive quantitative and qualitative data about an individual student. The results of continuous progress monitoring also may be used as part of individual and classroom assessments. Information from many of these sources of assessment data can and should be used to help ensure that the comprehensive assessment and evaluation accurately reflects how an individual student is performing.

*Evaluation* follows assessment and incorporates information from all data sources. *Evaluation* refers to the process of integrating, interpreting, and summarizing the comprehensive assessment data, including indirect and preexisting sources. The major goal of assessment and evaluation is to enable team members to use data to create a profile of a student’s strengths and needs. The student profile informs decisions about identification, eligibility, services, and instruction. Comprehensive assessment and evaluation procedures are both critical for making an accurate diagnosis of students with learning disabilities. Procedures that are not comprehensive can result in identification of some individuals as having learning disabilities when they do not, and conversely, exclude some individuals who do have specific learning disabilities.

**IEP Team**

* Group described in [SEC 34 CFR 300.306.](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2010-title34-vol2/pdf/CFR-2010-title34-vol2-sec300-306.pdf)
* The IEP team considers whether the student’s lack of progress is consistent with the second language acquisition process or a possible manifestation of a disability.
* The team must include a representative with knowledge of second language acquisition and ELD programs/services.
* The team also includes parents/guardians, and student when appropriate.
* The team considers the results of the assessment and whether instruments used are valid and reliable for ELs.
* IEP teams must review ELPA results to determine the student’s level of English proficiency.

IEP Development for ELs - Must include:

* Current levels of performance (based on assessment results; include strengths and weaknesses).
* Assessment and classroom accommodations, program supports and modifications (including the ELPA21).
* Goals should be linguistically appropriate and standards based.
* The need for special education services and ELD services; instruction could be provided by both programs.
* ELD standards when appropriate.
* Language of instruction (can be different for different subjects).
* Materials and instructional programs appropriate for ELs.
* The ELPA21 is the primary criterion to determine the student’s level of English proficiency, unless the IEP Team decides that the student needs an alternate English proficiency test.
* Should ELPA21 be given with or without accommodations.
* What universal or designated supports will the student have.
* The need to use alternate assessment in one or more required domain.

**In the IEP**

* Instruction needs to address both their linguistic and cultural characteristics and their disabilities.
  + May include:
    - Sheltered academic instruction
    - Mediating scaffolds – peer support
* Task scaffolds – reduce the information students must generate independently.
* Material scaffolds – learning prompts.
* Comprehensible input – language appropriate to the student’s ELP.

## 504 Accommodation Plans

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504) is a federal civil rights statute, which provides:

*“No otherwise qualified individual with disabilities in the United States…shall solely by reason of his/her disability, be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.”*

Although Section 504 protects all individuals with disabilities – students, staff, parents, and the public – this publication addresses Section 504 as it affects students in public schools. Since all public school districts receive federal funds, all public school districts (and public charter schools) must comply with Section 504. Additionally, public school districts are government entities covered by Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), a federal law. This publication is designed to assist Oregon school districts to comply with these nondiscrimination laws. Section 504 is an evolving area of law, and readers should always supplement their understanding of Section 504 with current information.

To be in compliance with Section 504 and state nondiscrimination requirements for schools, school districts with more than 15 employees must do the following:

1. Designate an employee to coordinate compliance with Section 504.
2. Adopt and implement procedures to ensure interested persons can obtain information regarding the existence and location of services, activities, and facilities accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities.
3. Provide grievance procedures that have appropriate due process standards, and provide for the prompt and equitable resolution of complaints of discrimination.
4. Provide notices that the district does not discriminate in violation of Section 504. The notification must state, where appropriate, the recipient does not discriminate in admission or access to, or treatment or employment in, its program or activity.
5. Provide notice of the designated employee, how to obtain information about access, the grievance procedures, and the district’s statement of nondiscrimination to students, parents, employees, unions, and professional organizations. These notices should be included in student/parent handbooks and on the district’s website.

Taken from: [Student Access – Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973](https://www.google.com/url?q=https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/childnutrition/Documents/sec504info.doc&sa=U&ved=0ahUKEwjyy_rMjbfhAhVpT98KHUkrA7UQFggGMAE&client=internal-uds-cse&cx=017270664345420165392:sia_fbfaeds&usg=AOvVaw3L5Z6NNo2xaTfmpMlkcI02)

## Talented and Gifted (TAG) Identification

In considering the pool of candidates for identification as TAG learners, it is important to note gifted students exist in all cultures, all races, all ethnicities, and all socio-economic groups. According to the [Belin-Blank International Center for Gifted and Talented Education (2008)](http://aea11gt.pbworks.com/f/IdentifyGiftedTalentedELL.pdf) there is minimal research about the characteristics of gifted ELs. Characteristics appear in varying degrees in ELs who are identified as gifted. The following list was compiled by the Iowa Department of Education as possible giftedness indicators:

* Acquires a second language rapidly;
* Displays a mature sense of diverse cultures and languages;
* Code switches easily (think in both languages);
* Demonstrates an advanced awareness of American expressions;
* Translates at an advanced level;
* Navigates appropriate behaviors successfully within both cultures (Belin-Blank, pg 12).

Identifying ELs for gifted programming begins with collaboration among classroom teachers, gifted/talented educators, and EL educators, and is supported by ORS and OAR: please [visit ODE’s Talented and Gifted (TAG) Education web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/learning-options/TAG/Pages/default.aspx). In identifying ELs for TAG identification, educators need to be especially sensitive to cultural bias in testing instruments and in the TAG nomination processes for students who are essentially caught between two languages. (Belin-Blank, pgs 16–17)

[Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 343.395 (4)](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/343.395) define Talented and Gifted Children as:

* Those children who require special educational programs or services, or both, beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society and who demonstrate outstanding ability or potential in one or more of the following areas:
  + General intellectual ability as commonly measured by measures of intelligence and aptitude.
  + Unusual academic ability in one or more academic areas.
* Districts may also identify students in the follow areas:
* Creative ability in using original or nontraditional methods in thinking and producing.
* Leadership ability in motivating the performance of others either in educational or non-educational settings.
* Ability in the visual or performing arts, such as dance, music, or art.

Oregon Administrative Rule ([OAR) 581-022-1310 (2)(a)](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_022.html) requires districts to “use research based best practices to identify student from under-represented populations including: ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, students who are culturally and/or linguistically diverse, or economically disadvantaged”

Further, this rule indicates “despite a student’s failure to qualify” under the traditional methods of identification that “districts, by local policies and procedures, shall identify students who demonstrate the potential to perform at the 97th percentile”. Once identified, OARs described under [OAR 581-022-1330 (4)](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_022.html) requires “the instruction provided to identify students shall be designed to accommodate their assessed levels of learning and accelerated rates of learning”.

Further considerations: The Oregon process for any student to be identified as TAG requires the nomination process include a “body of evidence” which should include the results of at least one nationally normed test and should also include convergent testing data, evidence of classroom performance, parent and teacher recommendations, work portfolios, and classroom observations. It is important to note the parent survey should be in the parents’ native language, if possible. No single measurement, nor the results of one test, can be used as the sole criterion for TAG education identification in Oregon. It is important to note that even if the nationally normed score is not in the 97th percentile or higher, the student may still be eligible under Potential to Perform.

Once the student is identified, she or he should receive services in the area of identification. The testing instrument used for identification defines the student’s area of identified giftedness. It is important for parents and teachers to know the student’s area(s) of gifted identification so the services are accurately provided.

There are complicating factors in identifying a student who are also receiving EL services. Here are some considerations:

* For example, if the student scored at the 97th percentile on a non-verbal instrument, he or she may still be struggling with the nuances of second language acquisition. In an attempt to improve this situation, many educators assume that testing the student in his/her native language for gifted education might be the answer. An example of this would be testing a native Spanish speaker for TAG on a test that is written in Spanish. At this point, it would be extremely important to know if the student speaks and reads Spanish. This may not be the case; the student may not read or write Spanish, and may have verbal skills which only encompass “speaking Spanish”.
* For some cultures, parents do not seek recognition for their child. Cultural values should be considered for TAG identification. Although TAG is a needs-based program, it may not align to the family’s cultural values to extol the abilities of one child and not all of the children in the family.
* Another consideration is the “element of expectation” once a student is identified to receive TAG education services. It is most likely important for the student to continue to receive EL services. In addition, gifted education identification can set an extraordinary learning path for a student. However, when a student is identified as gifted, both the teacher’s and the family’s expectations rise. In a outcome manner, the student’s self-expectation also rises. While a student is still acquiring English language skills, he or she should be afforded opportunities to check-in with teachers on appropriate levels of expectation both from the student’s and parent’s points of view and from the teacher’s point of view. This collaboration of expectations serves the newly identified EL/TAG student in the best possible way.

Below are some resources to assist parents and teachers to further understand the needs of high ability TAG students who may be culturally and linguistically diverse.

* [National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) position paper on Identifying Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners](http://www.nagc.org/sites/default/files/Position%20Statement/Identifying%20and%20Serving%20Culturally%20and%20Linguistically.pdf)

Recommended Reading:

* *Cultural Competence, A Primer for Educators* by Jerry V. Diller and Jean Moule, 2005, Wadsworth, Thomson Learning, Inc.
* *Special Populations in Gifted Education: Understanding Our Most Able Students from Diverse Backgrounds* by Jaime Castellano

Recommended Resource: [*Identifying Gifted and Talented English Language Learners, Grades K-12, the Iowa Department of Education*](https://www.educateiowa.gov/sites/files/ed/documents/IdentifyGiftedTalentedELL.pdf) published by the Belin-Blank International Center for Gifted Education and Talent Development (2008). Please refer to the embedded link under “Gifted & Talented Connections”.

## Foster Care

Some students in foster care are also English learners (ELs) - students identified as needing additional support with their English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, or writing English through EL identification procedures required by ESSA and OAR. Title VI (Civil Rights) and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 (EEOA) require public schools to ensure that all EL students, including EL students in foster care, can participate meaningfully and equally in educational programs. In order to meet their obligations under Title VI and the EEOA, LEAs must:

* Identify and assess all potential EL students in a timely, valid, and reliable manner;
* Provide EL students with a language assistance program that is educationally sound and proven successful;
* Sufficiently staff and support the language assistance programs for EL students;
* Ensure that EL students have equal opportunities to meaningfully participate in all curricular and extracurricular activities;
* Avoid unnecessary segregation of EL students;
* Ensure that EL students with disabilities are evaluated in a timely and appropriate manner for special education and disability-related services and that their language needs are considered in these evaluations and delivery of services;
* Meet the needs of EL students who opt out of language assistance programs;
* Monitor and evaluate EL students in language assistance programs to ensure their progress with respect to acquiring English proficiency and grade level core content, exit EL students from language assistance programs when they are proficient in English, and monitor exited students to ensure they were not prematurely exited and that any academic deficits incurred in the language assistance program have been remedied;
* Evaluate the effectiveness of a school district’s language assistance program(s) to ensure that EL students in each program acquire English proficiency and that each program was reasonably calculated to allow EL students to attain parity of participation in the standard instructional program within a reasonable period of time; and
* Ensure meaningful communication with limited English proficient (LEP) parents.

Please [visit the ODE Foster Care web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/fosteringconnections/Pages/default.aspx) for more information.

## Charter Schools

Charter schools are required to have an EL Plan; this plan could be included in the sponsoring district’s EL Plan or submitted as a separate plan. This plan addresses the federal requirements on services for ELs (Title VI), as well as Oregon’s ELL weighted funding requirements. Charter schools not meeting AMAOs for 2 or more years will be required to write a Title III Improvement Plan.

Although public charter schools are exempt from [ORS 336.079](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/336.079), applicable state and federal anti-discrimination laws require public charter schools to identify ELs and provide them with appropriate programs to overcome their language barriers. Whether a particular program is appropriate under federal law depends on whether it: (1) is based on a **sound educational theory or legitimate experimental strategy**; (2) implemented effectively; and (3) produces results that demonstrate that language barriers are being overcome. Oregon requirements are substantially the same as federal requirements.

1. **Sound educational theory or legitimate experimental strategy -** Castañeda (see legal resources) requires districts to use educational theories that are recognized as sound by some experts in the field, or at least theories recognized as legitimate educational strategies. Some approaches falling under this category include transitional bilingual education, bilingual/bicultural education, structured immersion, developmental bilingual education, and ESL. A public charter school using any of these approaches has complied with the first requirement of Castaneda. If a district is using a different approach, it is in compliance with Castañeda if it can show that the approach is considered sound by some experts in the field or that it is considered a legitimate experimental strategy.
2. **Implemented effectively -** If a public charter school uses a program model such as ELD or bilingual education, the public charter school should have ascertained teachers who use those methods are effective in their implementation. This training can take the form of in-service training, formal college coursework, or a combination of the two. In addition, a public charter school should be able to show it has determined its teachers have mastered the skills necessary to teach effectively in a program for EL students. In making this determination, the public charter school should use validated evaluative instruments -- that is, tests that have been shown to accurately measure the skills in question. The public charter school should also have the teacher's classroom performance evaluated by someone familiar with the method being used.

If a public charter school has shown it has unsuccessfully tried to hire qualified teachers, it must provide adequate training to teachers already on staff to comply with the Title VI regulation. Such training must take place as soon as possible. For example, public charter schools sometimes require teachers to work toward obtaining a credential as a condition of employment in a program for EL students. This requirement is not, in itself, sufficient to meet the public charter school's obligations under the Title VI regulation. To ensure that EL students have access to the public charter school's programs while teachers are completing their formal training, the public charter school must ensure those teachers receive sufficient interim training to enable them to function adequately in the classroom, as well as any assistance that may be necessary to carry out the public charter school's interim program.

1. **Produces results that demonstrate language barriers are being overcome.** Programs of service for ELs are required to meet three state goals measured annually by the state assessment system:

[OAR 581-021-0046(8)](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_021.html) requires public charter schools to (1) develop and implement a plan for identifying students whose primary language is other than English, and (2) provide those students with "appropriate programs" until they are able to effectively participate in regular classroom instruction. OAR 581-021-0046(8) does not set out the requirements for "appropriate programs'" nor have Oregon courts addressed that issue. Oregon courts would likely construe the requirements of "appropriate programs" similarly to how federal courts construe requirements for taking "appropriate action" under federal anti-discrimination laws.

If a district is using a different approach, it is in compliance with Castaneda if it can show the approach is considered sound by some experts in the field or it is at least, deemed a legitimate experimental strategy.

Also, the USDOE OCR in [The Provision of an Equal Education Opportunity to Limited-English Proficient Students (2000)](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/eeolep/index.html) has provided non-formal general guidelines for districts to ensure that they meet the needs of EL's.

## Oregon Diploma Requirements

[Please feel free to visit the Oregon Diploma web page for more information.](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/OregonDiploma/Pages/default.aspx)

# Biliteracy Seal

## Background and Purpose

Twenty-three districts, plus the District of Columbia, have adopted State Seals of Biliteracy. The Oregon State Seal of Biliteracy is designed to provide a rigorous, proficiency-based recognition of the linguistic assets and academic skills of Biliterate graduates. The Seal creates multiple pathways for students to demonstrate their proficiency in the partner language. With the Seal in hand, students will have a standardized measure of Biliteracy that demonstrates their advanced skills to colleges and employers. Although Biliteracy is not a requirement for the Oregon Diploma, the Seal of Biliteracy recognizes and values Biliteracy by honoring student achievement in more than one language.

## Criteria for the Biliteracy Seal:

* Students must be on track to graduate with all requirements satisfied.
* Students must meet benchmarks in Essential Skills Reading and Writing in English.
* Students must earn an acceptable score on a Partner Language Assessment:
  + AP & IB – score a 4 or above;
  + AP Literature – score a 3 or above, plus a listening/speaking assessment;
  + AAPPL – ACTFL rubric;
  + Assessments under the ACTFL rubric (assesses all four domains; scores 6 or above in all domains):
    - OPI – Oral Proficiency Interview
    - CLEP
    - SLIP
    - STAMP 4s
  + Portfolio of evidence – local assessment of all four domains;
  + Willamette Promise – available in Spanish only at this time.

Districts submits students’ data in late April/early May, or by September 30 in the fall, each by electronic data collection. ODE will mail certificates and seal to districts by mid-May or mid-October. Seal may be affixed to diplomas. (Please [visit the Biliteracy Initiatives web page](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/equity/EngLearners/Pages/BiliteracyInitiatives.aspx) for more information)

# Essential Skills

In January 2007, the State Board adopted Essential Skills as a requirement for graduation. After public review and input, the Essential Skill definitions were adopted by the State Board of Education in March 2008. Students enrolled in grade 9 in 2010-11 and beyond are required to demonstrate proficiency in the following Essential Skills in order to receive a Regular or Modified Diploma.

**Essential Skills include:**

1. Read and comprehend a variety of text.

2. Write clearly and accurately.

3. Apply mathematics in a variety of settings.

The Essential Skills are process skills occurring across academic disciplines and are embedded in the content standards. The skills are not content specific and can be applied in a variety of courses, subjects, and settings.

In support of the Essential Skills graduation requirement, many districts will offer Work Samples as an assessment option for their students. As districts build their local assessment systems, they will need to develop or acquire Work Sample resources such as prompts and scoring. ODE has partnered with Willamette ESD to build an online bank for sharing Work Samples.

For comprehensive information about the Essential Skills the web page:

<https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/essentialskills/Pages/default.aspx>

*The following Essential Skills are not currently graduation requirements, but may be phased in for students enrolled in grade 9 in 2017-18 or later:*

4. Listen actively and speak clearly and coherently.

5. Think critically and analytically.

6. Use technology to learn, live, and work.

7. Demonstrate civic and community engagement.

8. Demonstrate global literacy.

9. Demonstrate personal management and teamwork skills.

Please [visit the Essential Skills Graduation Requirement web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/educator-resources/essentialskills/Pages/default.aspx) for additional information.

# Additional Resources

Please feel free to visit the following resource links:

* **[Oregon’s Office of Civil Rights web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/equity/civilrights/Pages/default.aspx)**

* **[Title III English Learners and Immigrant Youth web page](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/default.aspx)**
* **Title III Directors Meetings and Events for Title III web page to** [**view the Title III District Contact List**](https://www.oregon.gov/ode/schools-and-districts/grants/ESEA/EL/Pages/Directors.aspx)

# Statues, Rules, and Memorandums: Services for English Learners

## Federal Law

Each LEA receiving Title III funds is required by federal law to meet minimum program requirements. Federal laws relating to the distribution and use of Title III funds are found in the current ESEA document on the [U.S. Department of Education’s Title III – Language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant Students web page](https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg39.html).

Please feel free to [visit the ESEA as amended by ESSA Law](http://legcounsel.house.gov/Comps/Elementary%20And%20Secondary%20Education%20Act%20Of%201965.pdf) First year of implementation 2017-2018.

# Legal References

There are both Federal and State Laws governing the implementation of EL programs. In addition, there is a requirement for all public schools to follow the guidelines 1) 1868 - Fourteenth Amendment - "No state shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

3) [Bilingual Education Act (Amended in 1974 and 1978)](http://www.ncela.us/files/rcd/BE017100/Fall88_7.pdf) - "The Congress declared it to be the policy of the United States, in order to establish equal educational opportunity for all children, (a) to encourage the establishment and operation, where appropriate, of educational programs using bilingual educational practices, techniques, and methods; and (b) for that purpose, to provide financial assistance to local education agencies, and to State education agencies for certain purposes, in order to enable such local educational agencies to develop and carry out such programs in elementary and secondary schools, including activities at the pre-school level, which are designed to meet the educational needs of such children; and to demonstrate effective ways of providing, for children of limited English speaking ability, instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in the English language."

Please feel free to [visit the United States Office of Civil Rights (OCR) Website.](https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/index.html)

## Overview of the Agency

*The mission of the Office for Civil Rights is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation through vigorous enforcement of civil rights.*

We serve student populations facing discrimination and the advocates and institutions promoting systemic solutions to civil rights problems. An important responsibility is resolving complaints of discrimination. Agency-initiated cases, typically called compliance reviews, permit OCR to target resources on compliance problems that appear particularly acute. OCR also provides technical assistance to help institutions achieve voluntary compliance with the civil rights laws that OCR enforces. An important part of OCR's technical assistance is partnerships designed to develop creative approaches to preventing and addressing discrimination.

Step 1: Determine the planned Educational Approach.

Step 2: Have a system for identification.

Step 3: Have a planned assessment to determine students who have identified a primary language other than English on the HLS for English proficiency.

Step 4: Develop a system for placement and services.

Step 5: Provide adequate staffing and resources.

* Ensure instructional staff are appropriate to implement services, have the educational expertise, and are qualified to implement services.
* Recruit and hire qualified staff, and establish a timetable to have them in place.
* Identify and meet training needs.
* Identify and obtain resources needed to implement the EL program.

Step 6: Develop and communicate a consistent system for transition/exiting students.

Step 7: Monitoring.

* Monitor the success of former ELs for two years after exiting bilingual/ESL program.
* Determine how often students will be monitored and what information will be reviewed to measure success.
* If a student is not successful, determine whether the causes are language, academics, or other reasons.
* Have procedures in place to assist students.
* Inform parents of service options.

Step 8: Program Evaluation.

In order to meet state regulatory requirements, LEAs should have a system of evaluating their programs in place. It will likely include:

* Description of programs and activities;
* ELs’ progress in English and academic achievement;
* Determine effectiveness of programs and activities;
* Determine whether to continue funding for specific programs or activities.

State Educational Agency (SEA) Responsibilities:

* Allocate sub-grants and provide technical assistance to LEAs, creating systems to complying with federal and state program requirements.
* Participate in monitoring of LEAs.
* Establish and calculate AMAOs.
* Provide technical assistance.
* Collect and synthesize data on effectiveness of services and activities.
* Report to the USDOE on the effectiveness of services in improving the education of ELs.

## Oregon State Laws

Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) and Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) for Education related to ELs are listed on page 67 in the Appendix section of this guide. The Appendix lists the sections in [OAR](https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayChapterRules.action?selectedChapter=137) and [ORS](https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/ORS.aspx) that pertain to ELs, with hyperlinks to specific sections for viewing of complete text.

The following OAR and ORS are a few, but not all, of those relating to ELs.

**HB 3499** came into law in 2015 – this is a state initiative to improve outcomes for ELs. This language can be found in the [Oregon Laws 2015 – Chapter 604 document](https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/lawsstatutes/2015orLaw0604.pdf).

[**ORS 336.079 Special English Courses for Certain Children**](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/336.079) Specific courses to teach speaking, reading, and writing of the English language shall be provided at kindergarten and each grade level to those children who are unable to benefit from classes taught in English. Such courses shall be taught to such a level in school as may be required until children are able to profit from classes conducted in English. [1971 c.326 §3; 1993 c.45 §77]

[**ORS 659.850 Discrimination in education prohibited; rules.**](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/659.850)

(1) As used in this section, “discrimination” means any act that unreasonably differentiates treatment, intended or unintended, or any act that is fair in form but discriminatory in operation, either of which is based on race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, marital status, age or disability. “Discrimination” does not include enforcement of an otherwise valid dress code or policy, as long as the code or policy provides, on a case-by-case basis, for reasonable accommodation of an individual based on the health and safety needs of the individual.

(2) A person may not be subjected to discrimination in any public elementary, secondary or community college education program or service, school or interschool activity or in any higher education program or service, school or interschool activity where the program, service, school or activity is financed in whole or in part by moneys appropriated by the Legislative Assembly.

(3) The State Board of Education and the State Board of Higher Education shall establish rules necessary to ensure compliance with subsection (2) of this section in the manner required by ORS chapter 183. [Formerly 659.150; 2007 c.100 §29]

[**OAR 581-021-0046(8)** **Bilingual or Linguistically Different Students**](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_021.html). Districts shall develop and implement a plan for identifying students whose primary language is other than English and shall provide such students with appropriate programs until they are able to use the English language in a manner that allows effective and relevant participation in regular classroom instruction and other educational activities.

The following OAR is under review for updated language, this OAR is subject to change during the 2017-18 school year due in part to ESSA requirements.

[**OAR 581-023-0100 (4)**](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_023.html)

(4) Pursuant to ORS 327.013(7)(a)(B), the resident school districts shall receive an additional .5 times the ADM of all eligible students enrolled in an English as a Second Language program. To be eligible, a student must be in the ADM of the school district in grades K through 12 and be a language minority student attending English as a Second Language (ESL) classes in a program which meets basic U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights guidelines. These guidelines provide for:

(a) A systematic procedure for identifying students who may need ESL classes, and for assessing their language acquisition and academic needs;

(b) A planned program for ESL and academic development, using instructional methodologies recognized as effective with language minority students;

(c) Instruction by credentialed staff and trained in instructional strategies that are effective with second language learners and language minority students, or by tutors supervised by credentialed staff trained in instructional strategies that are effective with second language learners and language minority students;

(d) Adequate equipment and instructional materials;

(e) Evaluation of program effectiveness in preparing ESL students for academic success in the mainstream curriculum.

(f) Evaluation of program effectiveness in preparing ESL students for academic success in the mainstream curriculum.

(g) Process for transition from ELL Services that include procedures and criteria for determining when students no longer need those services. The criteria shall include:

(A) Achieving at the advanced level on the State’s English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA).

(B) The advanced level is a culmination of progress demonstrated on the same state proficiency measure over a legitimate period of time.

## Case Law and Related Statutes

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its regulations at [34 CFR Part 100 2](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/rights/reg/ocr/edlite-34cfr100.html) - "No person in the U.S. shall, on the ground of race, color, national origin be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

[May 25, 1970, Memorandum, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/lau1970.html) - This memorandum interpreted the Civil Rights Act. It delineates the responsibility of school districts in providing equal education opportunity to national origin minority group students whose English language proficiency is limited. The following quotes discuss some major areas of concern with respect to compliance with Title VI and have the force of Law:

*"Where inability to speak and understand the English language exclude 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."*

*"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."*

*"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 preparation courses on a basis directly related to the failure of the school system to inculcate English language skills."*

5) 1974 - Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) - *"No state shall deny equal educational opportunity to an individual on account of his or her race, color, sex or nation origin, by the failure of an educational agency to take appropriate action to overcome language barriers that impede equal participation by its students in its instructional programs."*

Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 USC 12131-12161

Individuals with Disabilities Educational Improvement Act (IDEIA) of 2004

[Lau v Nichols (1974) Ruling](http://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-supreme-court/414/563.html) - The decision stated that providing students the same desks, books, teachers and curriculum did not ensure that they had equal educational opportunity, particularly if the students did not speak English. If English is the mainstream language of instruction, then measures have to be taken to ensure that instruction is adapted to address those children's linguistic characteristics (Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563, 94 S. Ct. 786, 1974).

[*Castaneda v Pickard, 648* F2d 989(5th Cir 1981) Ruling](http://web.stanford.edu/~hakuta/www/LAU/IAPolicy/IA1bCastanedaFullText.htm), the5th Circuit set out a widely adopted three-part test to determine whether districts have taken “appropriate action” to remedy the language deficiencies of their ELs: (1) is the school “pursuing a program informed by an educational theory recognized as sound by some experts in the field, or at least, deemed a legitimate experimental strategy”; (2) are the programs and practices actually used by the school “reasonably calculated to implement effectively the educational theory adopted by the school”; and (3) does the program “produce results indicating that the language barriers confronting students are actually being overcome”. Congress intended that schools make a “genuine and good faith effort, consistent with local circumstances and resources, to remedy the language deficiencies of their students”.

## State Archiving (Retention) Requirements

[Visit the OAR for Educational Service Districts, School Districts, and Individual School Records, Division 400](https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayChapterRules.action?selectedChapter=175) for more information.

## Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) and Oregon Revised Statues (ORS)

Visit the [OAR Website](https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayChapterRules.action?selectedChapter=137) and [ORS Website](https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/bills_laws/Pages/ORS.aspx)

The following is a list of OAR and ORS that relate to ELs, with hyperlinks to the specific section.

Oregon 2015 passes new legislation this June, this bill has not been given it ORS number at the time of this posting. This is [HB 3499](https://olis.leg.state.or.us/liz/2015R1/Downloads/MeasureDocument/HB3499). Two workgroups are in process as outlined in this bill. Additional requirements will be forthcoming in the coming months, including additional OARs.

### Oregon Revised Statues and Oregon Administrative Rules

(Additional links will be added as they become available.)

| Type | Number | Title | Click on Link, then scroll down to specific number |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OAR | **581-021-0580 through 581-021-0584** | **Oregon State Seal of Biliteracy** | [OAR 581-021-0580](http://www.ode.state.or.us/superintendent/priorities/581-021.0580-582-584-final-4-18-16.docx) |
| OAR | **581-022-1310** | **Identification of Academically Talented and Intellectually Gifted Students** | [OAR 581-022-1310](http://www.ode.state.or.us/policy/state/rules/tagoar.pdf) |
| OAR | **581-022-0617** | **Essential Skills for English Language Learner Students (ELLs)** | OAR [581-022-0617](http://www.ode.state.or.us/superintendent/priorities/581-022-0617-final-3-1-16.doc) |
| OAR | **581-021-0030** | **Limitation on Administration and Utilization of Tests in Public Schools** | [OAR 581-021-0030](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_021.html) |
| OAR | **581-021-0045** | **Discrimination Prohibited** | [OAR 581-021-0045](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_021.html) |
| OAR | **581-021-0046** | **Program Compliance Standards** | [OAR 581-021-0046](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_021.html) |
| OAR | **581-021-0260** | **An Educational Agency or Institution's Annual Notification** | [OAR 581-021-0260](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_021.html) |
| OAR | **581-022-0610** | **Administration of State Assessments** | [OAR 581-22-0610](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_022.html) |
| OAR | **581-022-0615** | **Assessment of Essential Skills** | [OAR 581-22-0615](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_022.html) |
| OAR | **581-022-0617** | **Essential Skill Assessments for English Language Learners** | [OAR 581-22-0617](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_022.html) |
| OAR | **581-022-1140** | **Equal Educational Opportunities** | [OAR 581-22-1140](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_022.html) |
| OAR | **581-022-1363** | **Expanded Options -- Definitions** | [OAR 581-22-1363](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_022.html) |
| OAR | **581-023-0100** | **Eligibility Criteria for Student Weighting for Purposes of State School Fund Distribution** | [OAR 581-023-0100](http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/oars_500/oar_581/581_023.html) |
| ORS | **327.013** | **State School Fund distribution computations for school districts** | [ORS 327.013](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/327.013) |
| ORS | **327.345** | **Grants for training English as second language teachers; qualifications; use; rules** | [ORS 327.345](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/327.345) |
| ORS | **336.074** | **Teaching in English required; exceptions** | [ORS 336.074](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/336.074) |
| ORS | **336.079** | **Special English courses for certain children** | [ORS 336.079](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/336.079) |
| ORS | **336.081** | **Opportunity to qualify to assist non-English-speaking students** | [ORS 336.081](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/336.081) |
| ORS | **339.351** | **Definitions for ORS 339.351 to 339.364.** | [ORS 339.351](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/339.351) |
| ORS | **659.850** | **Discrimination in education prohibited; rules** | [ORS 659.850](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/659.850) |
| ORS | **659.855** | **Sanctions for noncompliance with discrimination prohibitions** | [ORS 659.855](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/659.855) |

### Executive Numbered Memoranda Pertaining to English Learners

| Numbered Memorandum | Pertaining to: | Link |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 004-2018-19 | Exiting EL Policy Change | [Exiting policy change](https://www.google.com/url?q=https://www.oregon.gov/ode/about-us/Documents/Executive%2520Numbered%2520Memo%2520004-2018-19%2520Exiting%2520ELs%2520as%2520Proficient.pdf&sa=U&ved=0ahUKEwjw9rzbt5PhAhVoITQIHWqWAV0QFggFMAA&client=internal-uds-cse&cx=017270664345420165392:sia_fbfaeds&usg=AOvVaw0QqPZLSNu4HoAC39Wlr8J2) |
| 005-2017-18 | Identification of English Learners (ELs) under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) | [Identification of English Learners (EL) under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/about-us/Pages/Executive-Numbered-Memos-2017-18.aspx) |
| 003-2017-18 | Update to Executive Numbered Memo 006-2016-17 Reclassification/Retention for English Learners | [Reclassification/Retention for English Learners (EL)](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/about-us/Pages/Executive-Numbered-Memos-2017-18.aspx) |
| 003-2016-17 | Identification of English Learners | [Executive Numbered Memo 003-2016-17 Identification of English Learners](http://www.oregon.gov/ode/about-us/Documents/Numbered%20Memo%20003-2016-17%20EL%20Identification.pdf) |
| 006-2015-16  (Revised/Out of date) | Reclassification of English Learners as Proficient | [Executive Numbered memorandum 006-2015-2016](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?id=13667) |
| 005-2015-16 | Protecting Personally Identifiable(PPI) Student Assessment Data | [Executive Numbered Memorandum 005-2015-16 Student PII Assessment Data](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?id=13320&typeid=4) |
| 001-2014-15 | English Learner Students with Disabilities | [Executive Numbered Memorandum 001-2014-15 English Learner Students with Disabilities](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=10106&TypeID=4http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=10106&TypeID=4) |
| 009-2013-14 | Proper Identification of Spanish-Speaking English Learners for the Kindergarten Assessment | [Executive Numbered Memorandum 009-2013-14 – Proper Identification of Spanish-Speaking English Learners for the Kindergarten Assessment](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=9831) |
| 007-2013-14  (Revised/Out of date) | Reclassification and Retention Procedures for English Learners (ELs) (Revision to Memo #002-2008-09) | [Executive Numbered Memo 007-2013-14 – Reclassification and Retention Procedures for English Learners](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?id=9770&typeid=4) |
| 011-2012-13 | Postponement of Materials for English Language Proficiency and Development (ELP/D) | [Executive Numbered Memo: 011-2012-13 – Postponement of Materials for English Language Proficiency and Development (ELP/D)](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=9019&TypeID=4) |
| 007-2011-12 | ELL participation in annual English Language Proficiency Assessment (Revision) | [MEMORANDUM NO. 007-2011-12 - ELL Participation in annual English Language Proficiency Assessment (Revision to MEMORANDUM NO. 006-2009-10)](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=8163&TypeID=4) |
| 007-2009-10  (Note: An updated OAR has been issued in the 2015-16 SY) | Assessment of Essential Skills Options for EL Students | [MEMORANDUM NO. 007-2009-10 – Assessment of Essential Skills Options for EL Students](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=5339&TypeID=4) |
| 006-2009-10 | ELL participation in annual English Language Proficiency Assessment (original) | [MEMORANDUM NO. 006-2009-10 – ELL Participation in annual English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA)](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=5318&TypeID=4) |
| 002-2008-09  (Revised/Out of date) | Promoting, Retaining, and Exiting English Language Learners from English Language Development Program | [Memo # 002-2008-09 Promoting, Retaining and Exiting English Language Learners from English Language Development Program](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=3994&TypeID=4) |
| 010-2006-07 | New federal regulations and assessment options for EL | [Memo # 010-2006-07 New federal regulations and assessment options for EL](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=2503&TypeID=4) |
| 024-2005-06 | Meeting State Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) | [Memo # 024-2005-06 Meeting State Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=1706&TypeID=4) |
| 005-2005-06 | Oregon’s New English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA)  **(Note: This memorandum is under review for archiving).** | [Memo # 005-2005-06 Oregon's New English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA)](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=1727&TypeID=4) |
| 029-2003-04  Revised 2017-18 | Assessing New EL students – state assessments | [Memo # 029-2003-04 Assessing New Limited English Proficient Students](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=1778&TypeID=4) |
| 001-2003-04 | English Language Proficiency Testing – identification | [Memo # 001-2003-04 English Language Proficiency Testing](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcement.aspx?ID=1806&TypeID=4) |

# EL Required Documents

The following is a list of documents that provide evidence of district compliance with Title I and III program requirements. Additional documents may be added as required by guidance from the U.S. Department of Education. Oregon Department of Education (ODE) staff may require districts to submit evidence of compliance as part of on-going required federal monitoring for Title I and/or III.

ODE has contracted with TransACT Communications, Inc. to provide translated templates for many compliance related forms. These forms, translated into several languages, are available on the [TransACT Website](http://www.transact.com/). Actual samples of these forms (or district forms created with the same information) are required to be maintained at the school and district level for compliance monitoring purposes. Failure to save original samples of these forms as evidence of program implementation, including signatures will result in program monitoring findings at both the local and state levels.

## Title III Documents

| Document | Description | Required by: | Timeline |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Initial Identification/ program placements – Parent Notification letter | Letter informing parent that their student has qualified as an EL and been placed in an appropriate level of service must contain all elements listed in (Sec. 1112) and must be signed by district personnel and include the specific date sent (mm/dd/yyyy). | Local Service Plan – Title VI  Title I – Sec. 1112 | Within the first 30 days of the school year, OR within 2 weeks of enrollment after the start of the school year. Original letter filed in student permanent file (cum). |
| Continuing Program Placement letter | Letter informing parents that their EL student is continuing in the district EL program must contain all elements listed in (Sec.1112) and must be signed by district personnel and include the specific date sent (mm/dd/yyyy). | Local Service Plan – Title VI  Title I – Sec. 1112 | Within the first 30 days of the school year, OR within 2 weeks of enrollment after the start of the school year. |
| Language Use Survey | Questionnaire assisting in identification of potential EL students; must be given to all students. | Local Service Plan – Title VI  Executive Numbered Memo | When any student enrolls in a district. Based on response, student is screened to determine if student is an EL. Original copy filed in student permanent file (cum). |
| Waiver | Signed documentation that a parent has been informed that their student has qualified for EL services and the parent has decided to waive/refuse services. | Title III | File original in student permanent file (cum). |
| Consultation with Private Schools | Signed documentation that the district has met with private schools within the district boundaries, addressing Title III services and identification EL students. Must be signed and dated by both private school and district personnel. | Title III & Title I | Annual consultations are conducted with private schools; all potential EL and Recent Arriver should be included in consultation. |
| EL Parent Meeting | Agendas and sign-in sheets available for monitoring. | Title III & Title I | As necessary |
| Recent Arrivers Student Count for Private Schools | Documentation of the number of Recent Arrivers enrolled in local private schools; all documents must be signed and dated. | Title III | Included in ODE Title III Grant Intent – submitted count each spring. |
| EL Exit Notification | Letter informing parents that their student has exited from the English Language Development Program; should be signed and dated. | Title III & OCR | Sent to parents when student has met the requirements for obtaining academic English proficiency. |
| Returning an monitoring EL back into EL program | Communication with EL parents regarding a decision to return a monitoring EL to the EL program. | Title III & OCR | As necessary |