DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 199 FL 016 511

AUTHOR Mei, Dolores M.; And Others
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
TITLE English as a Second Language, 1984-85 Final Report. OEA Evaluation Report.
PUB DATE [87]
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Course Objectives; *English (Second Language); High Schools; High School Students; Inservice Teacher Education; *Language Skills; Limited English Speaking; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; Structural Analysis (Linguistics); Syntax; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Content Area Teaching

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the New York City high schools' program in English as a second language (ESL) for limited English-proficient students focuses on the effectiveness of the program's beginning, intermediate, advanced, and transitional classes. It evaluates one program aspect, ESL content area classes, and focuses on two principal program objectives: improvement of listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills necessary for mainstreaming, and mastery of English syntax objectives as measured by the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test. Overall, the program was found to have met its English language objectives, but that success did not translate into improved achievement in content area learning. Recommendations include: on-site and, if possible, centralized group training sessions for ESL content-area teachers; and ESL training for all ESL content-area teachers with large classes. (MSE)

OEA Evaluation Report

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
1984-85
FINAL REPORT

Evaluation Section Report
Robert Tobias, Administrator
John E. Schoener, Senior Manager

Project Numbers: 5001-56-51626
5001-56-54124
5001-56-51629

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE
1984-85
FINAL REPORT

Leonard Moriber
Director
Office of High
School Projects

Eli Plotkin
Program Manager

Prepared By The
High School
Evaluation Unit:

Dolores M. Mei
Evaluation Manager

Warren Cohen
James Langlois
Evaluation
Associates

Elly Bulkin
Basima Ahed
Evaluation
Consultants

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director

SUMMARY

The English as a Second Language Program (E.S.L.) is funded by Chapter I and by Pupils with Special Educational Needs (P.S.E.N.). It is a basic skills program for students of limited English proficiency (LEP). During the 1984-85 school year, it provided beginning, intermediate, advanced, and transitional classes for students in 55 New York City High Schools.

This report focuses on two program objectives:

-To provide an instructional program which will improve the listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English necessary for success in the mainstream.

-To have 70 percent of program participants master one English syntax objective for every 20 days of instruction as measured by the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test (CREST).

This report evaluates one aspect of the instructional program: the implementation of E.S.L. content area classes. In fall, 1984, the Division of High Schools provided resources for the establishment of E.S.L. content area classes. Tax-levy funds supported these classes for E.S.L. students whose English skills were not yet sufficiently developed for them to function effectively in mainstream classes. The purpose of these classes was to develop skills in both the content area and the English language. Teachers incorporated E.S.L. methodology into their mathematics, science, social studies, business education, and other classes. Twenty-eight schools offered a total of 250 E.S.L. content area classes in fall, 1984, and 27 schools offered 225 such classes in spring, 1985. Individual schools offered from one to 67 E.S.L. content area classes. Most schools, however, offered fewer than 10 such classes.

The potential value to students of E.S.L. content area classes remains to be realized. Few teachers of these classes had previous training in E.S.L. methodology. The E.S.L. program's staff development specialists (S.D.S.s) worked with these teachers in adapting their classroom techniques and curriculum to the needs of LEP students. S.D.S.s did most of their training on a one-to-one basis. These teachers were not part of their school's regular E.S.L. program. They were, therefore, not mandated to meet together. As a result, S.D.S.s could not set up group training sessions for them.

Teachers had almost no content area materials appropriate for LEP students. In almost all of the classes observed by the evaluation team, students used either a standard textbook or handouts from a textbook. The texts were

written for mainstream, rather than LEP, students. In a few instances, teachers used different supplementary materials appropriate to their students' English skills levels. During the 1984-85 school year, the E.S.L. program staff developed the draft of a manual on teaching E.S.L. in the content area. They will complete and distribute the manual during the 1985-86 school year.

Students in E.S.L. content area classes had to master subject matter required for graduation at the same time as they learned English syntax and vocabulary. Dealing with both subject matter and language skills was particularly difficult for beginning E.S.L. students. For the most part, E.S.L. content area teachers were more likely to explain unfamiliar vocabulary than to address students' problems with syntax. At one school, staff placed students in E.S.L. content area classes because the school did not have sufficient bilingual teachers to offer bilingual content area classes.

Overall, the program met its objective. Slightly over 80 percent of beginning students and 79 percent of intermediate students mastered at least one CREST objective per 20 sessions in both terms. At the advanced level, 54.8 percent of fall students and 59.1 percent of spring students met the evaluation objective. Students at the advanced level have fewer and more difficult skills to master than students at the lower levels. This fact largely explains differences in achievement between advanced students and those at the beginning and intermediate levels. However, success in meeting the evaluation objective did not necessarily translate into success in content area classes: beginning E.S.L. students, for example, who met the evaluation objective on the CREST might lack the vocabulary, syntax, and other English skills to pass E.S.L. content area classes in science or social studies. Accordingly, more study of student performance in these classes is needed.

Based on the evaluation findings, it is recommended that:

- -E.S.L. content area teachers should participate in on-site group training sessions and, if possible, in centrally-held, all-day training sessions.
- -All E.S.L. content area teachers whose classes contain large numbers of beginning E.S.L. students should receive E.S.L. training.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The English as a Second Language Program (E.S.L.) has provided services for New York City high school students for more than 15 years. Its goal is to help students of limited English proficiency (LEP) attain communicative and linguistic competency in English in the time allotted for a secondary school program. To be classified as LEP, students had to score below the twenty-first percentile on the Language Assessment Battery (LAB). The LAB is a norm-referenced test[1] used to measure the basic English skills of students whose native language is not English.

E.S.L. is a basic skills program which provides listening, speaking, reading, and writing instruction in the English language to students with over 30 different native languages. Many E.S.L. students are also in tax-levy or federally-funded Title VII bilingual programs. E.S.L. staff group students homogeneously on the basis of English proficiency. They assign each student to one of three levels of instruction: beginning, intermediate, and advanced. Some students also take a transitional class prior to mainstreaming. Students in 55 New York City high schools took

[1]Norm-referenced tests (N.R.T.s) are based on national norms. N.R.T. scores indicate a student's standing relative to other students in the nation.

E.S.L. classes during the 1984-85 school year. Nearly 11,000 students participated in the E.S.L. program each term. E.S.L. is funded by Chapter 1 and by Pupils with Special Educational Needs (P.S.E.N.). A school is eligible for federal Chapter 1 funds if a specified proportion of its student body either qualifies for the free lunch program or is a member of a family that qualifies for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (A.F.D.C.); it is eligible for New York State P.S.E.N. funds if its student body fails to meet certain academic standards.

Funding provides for teachers, educational assistants, and coordinators, as well as for central administrative staff and staff development specialists (S.D.S.s). The program is centrally administered. S.D.S.s visit participating schools at least twice a month to train and assist teachers, distribute curriculum materials, and collect data.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The E.S.L. program has identified a number of program objectives. This evaluation focused on the following two:

-To provide an instructional program which will improve the listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills in English necessary for success in the mainstream.

-To have 70 percent of program participants master one English syntax objective for every 20 days of instruction as measured by the Criterion Referenced English Syntax Test (CREST).*

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation includes two kinds of data: information about E.S.L. content area classes and student outcome data. The narrative portion of this report focuses on the implementation of E.S.L. content area instruction in classes established by the Division of High Schools in fall, 1984. Tax-levy funds supported these classes for E.S.L. students whose English skills were not yet sufficiently developed for them to function effectively in mainstream classes. Teachers incorporated E.S.L. methodology into instruction in science, mathematics, social studies, business education, and other subjects. Few teachers of E.S.L. content area classes had previous training in E.S.L. methodology. The E.S.L. program's S.D.S.s worked with these teachers in adapting classroom techniques and curriculum to the needs of LEP students. Twenty-eight high schools offered E.S.L. content area classes in fall, 1984; 27 offered them during

---

*The CREST measures the English skills of non-native speakers of English. It is a criterion-referenced test (C.R.T.). C.R.T. scores indicate the level of skill a student has achieved in a particualr subject area.

the spring term. Two of these schools were alternative high schools; the rest were academic-comprehensive high schools. In most instances, individual subject-area departments, rather than E.S.L. programs, offered these classes.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The Office of Educational Assessment/High School Evaluation Unit (O.E.A./H.S.E.U.) used a number of qualitative and quantitative methods to evaluate the 1984-85 Chapter 1/P.S.E.N. E.S.L. program. These tools and techniques included:

- Site visits to seven schools with E.S.L. content area classes, including a visit to one of the two participating alternative high schools.
- Interviews with teachers; the program manager; the staff development/instructional services coordinator; and five of the program's S.D.S.s.
- Examination of curriculum materials developed specifically in connection with E.S.L. content area classes.
- Analysis of student outcome data, including attendance and number of C.R.T. skills mastered.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

The O.E.A./N.S.E.U. report of the 1984-85 E.S.L. evaluation consists of two volumes. This volume contains four chapters. Chapter I includes program background, scope of the evaluation, and evaluation procedures. Chapter II is a description of the E.S.L. content area classes. Chapter III summarizes the analyses of student outcomes for the E.S.L. program as a whole. Chapter IV contains conclusions and recommendations. The second volume will describe student outcome data by school and by proficiency level (beginning, intermediate, advanced).

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

E.S.L. content area classes fostered the development of English skills for LEP students and introduced them to content area material which they must master in order to graduate. Unlike those in basic E.S.L. courses, which are supplementary, students received credit for passing E.S.L. content area classes. Many LEP students in bilingual programs took bilingual content area classes which were credit-bearing and taught in their native language. In schools which did not offer bilingual content area classes in the student's native language, the student could only take mainstream content area classes which were taught entirely in English. E.S.L. content area classes provided an alternative for these students: in these classes, students could receive content area instruction along with attention to their special language needs.

A few schools with E.S.L. programs had previously offered E.S.L. content area classes. Funded program staff had urged school administrators to increase the number of such classes. Subsequently, a number of administrators committed additional 1984-85 tax-levy monies to these classes. The result was a dramatic expansion of the program.

Twenty-eight schools offered a total of 250 E.S.L. content area classes in fall, 1984 and 27 school offered 225 such classes in spring, 1985. Of these, 44 percent were social studies classes, 24 percent were science classes, 16 percent were mathematics classes, 11 percent were business education classes, and five percent were in other subjects (i.e., music, art, health). Individual schools offered from one to 67 E.S.L. content area classes. Most schools, however, offered a relatively small number of these classes: over 40 percent gave one to three classes; over 70 percent gave one to nine classes.

STAFFING AND STAFF TRAINING

Most teachers of E.S.L. content area classes did not have E.S.L. licenses. Only one licensed E.S.L. teacher was among the 128 teachers of fall, 1984 classes. Five licensed E.S.L. teachers were among the 113 teachers of spring, 1985 classes; four of these teachers were from a single school which had offered E.S.L. content area classes in previous years. No license exists for E.S.L. content area teachers; most were licensed in their subject areas.

The predominance of teachers without E.S.L. licenses made training in E.S.L. methodology particularly important.

The S.D.S.s contacted supervisors of E.S.L. content area courses to indicate their availablity for staff development services. For the most part, S.D.S.s did training on a one-to-one rather than on a group basis. Individual meetings between an E.S.L. content area teacher and an S.D.S. were more feasible than group meetings. These teachers were not part of their school's E.S.L. program. Therefore, S.D.S.s could not set up group training sessions, as they did for E.S.L. teachers, during times when these teachers were mandated to meet together.

The S.D.S.s indicated that, for the most part, they had limited contact with teachers of these classes. In some cases, teachers were not interested in establishing an ongoing relationship with the S.D.S. because they did not expect to teach E.S.L. content classes the following term. The S.D.S.s did, however, do some demonstration lessons and share curriculum. One S.D.S. had more teacher contact at Martin Luther King, which has offered such classes before, than at other schools with teachers less experienced with E.S.L. content area courses. Another S.D.S. had a lot of contact based on individual need. The S.D.S. at Seward Park, a school with 11 E.S.L. teachers and seven E.S.L. educational assistants, observed that its huge E.S.L. program necessarily had to be a priority. This primary responsibility left her with little time to work with the teachers from different

departments who taught over 50 E.S.L. content area classes per term.

CURRICULUM

During the 1984-85 school year, teachers had almost no material available which addressed both content area subject matter and the language difficulties of LEP students. Students in almost all of the 23 classes observed by the evaluation team used either a standard textbook or handouts from a textbook. The content of these texts was consistent with the material covered in mainstream courses. They did not, however, address deficiencies in basic English skills.

In a few instances, teachers used a variety of supplementary, alternative curricular materials appropriate to their students' English skills level. Flushing E.S.L. content area teachers, for example, used a two-term curriculum manual developed in 1982 by its Title VII trilingual program staff, Civics for New Americans (Language Arts Approach). It is designed first to explain to new immigrants such survival skills as shopping, reading street signs, and traveling to the subway, and then to teach these students about their neighborhood, their city, and their country. The manual is entirely in English and supplements

standard English-language textbooks which do not contain vocabulary questions, cloze paragraphs, and other English-language building exercises. The funded E.S.L. office has agreed to reproduce and distribute Civics for New Americans; it has already distributed a dozen of these manuals to social studies programs which offer E.S.L. content area classes.

At Seward Park, the general science teacher used a bilingual textbook, Chinese Supplementary Textbook for Biology A, which the school's Title VII Chinese bilingual program staff had developed. The difficulty for beginning-level E.S.L. students of the English textbook's vocabulary and syntax was a significant obstacle to their grasping the course's science content. Although use of the Chinese supplemental textbook enabled students to learn course content, it did not teach and reinforce their English reading and comprehension skills.

During the 1984-85 school year, the staff development/instructional services coordinator, with input from S.D.S.s and teachers, developed the draft of a manual on teaching E.S.L. in the content areas. This manual addresses an important program need. It contains a detailed explanation of how content area teachers can help students develop English skills. It includes lessons on social studies, mathematics, and science. The lessons begin with a statement

of both content area and E.S.L. aims. Pupil worksheets are integral to many of the lessons. A few lessons illustrate how E.S.L. social studies teachers can present global studies and American studies material to beginning-level E.S.L. students. These teacher-developed lessons contain reading passages followed by vocabulary and verb study lists, as well as comprehension and review exercises. During the 1985-86 school year, High School Bilingual/E.S.L. Staff will complete and distribute this manual.

CLASSROOM IMPLEMENTATION

The student composition of different E.S.L. content area classes affected classroom implementation. Although these classes followed the same curriculum as mainstream classes, teachers usually had to adjust the speed with which they presented each topic, especially in classes with beginning E.S.L. students. Seward Park was unique in giving E.S.L. biology in three terms, rather than in the usual two. This adjustment reflected the school administrators' awareness that their beginning E.S.L. students could not absorb the content in English in two terms. One S.D.S. noted that classes with newly-arrived students had to be scaled down. In these classes, teachers had to address not only

subject matter, syntax, and vocabulary, but student acculturation to a totally new environment.

At six of the seven schools visited, staff placed students in E.S.L. content area classes on the basis of the required curriculum. Interviews with S.D.S.s indicated that staff at other schools also assigned students primarily on the basis of their curriculum needs, rather than of their E.S.L. level. With few exceptions, beginning E.S.L. students clustered in required ninth-grade classes and intermediate E.S.L. students in required ninth- and tenth-grade classes. An eleventh-year class, such as John Bowne's economics class, contained only advanced E.S.L. students. At the same time that they had taken the lower levels of E.S.L., these students had taken the previous courses in the required social studies sequence. A wide range of students could, however, be found in Flushing's typing classes. Two of those observed contained students whose E.S.L levels ranged from beginning to advanced. The teacher reported that since some spoke English very well and others not at all, the students with better English-language skills translated for the others.

In rare instances, staff placed students on the basis of language background. At Theodore Roosevelt, for example, with a well-established E.S.L. content area program, beginning Indo-Chinese students were in separate classes

because, according to the S.D.S., they could not communicate without the presence of an Indo-Chinese educational assistant. The school's larger group of Spanish-speaking E.S.L. students, who were also kept together, was divided according to E.S.L. level.

At Seward Park, staff assigned Chinese- and Spanish-speaking students to separate E.S.L. content area classes. The Seward Park assistant principal for administration stated that these students should be in bilingual content area classes, but the school did not have sufficient bilingual staff to offer such classes. In bilingual content area classes, the students would learn subject matter taught in their native language. Educational assistants funded by Title VII or tax-levy funds worked in many of Seward Park's E.S.L. content area classes, especially at the lower levels. Two of the four Seward Park E.S.L. content area classes observed, both with beginning E.S.L. students, had educational assistants. In the mathematics class for Spanish-speaking students, the teacher taught in English with the educational assistant interjecting explanations in Spanish. In the mathematics class for Chinese-speaking students, the educational assistant followed each of the teacher's English-language verbal or written explanations with a Chinese translation; the teacher acknowledged that he "definitely needs the paraprofessional" and that the class is "much

harder when she is absent."

The use of educational assistants to translate was one method of addressing students' difficulties with English. Two schools used educational assistants only in specific E.S.L. content area classes: the Park West mathematics class with beginnning E.S.L. students and the Flushing Civics for New Americans class with Korean students who had no knowledge of English. The teacher of the Flushing civics class also divided students into groups of four, with one of the more proficient students interpreting for the others.

Teachers in the classses observed were far more likely to define vocabulary words than to address issues of syntax or pronunciation. The observations of the evaluation team and the S.D.S.s indicated that E.S.L. content area teachers left syntactical explanations to their students' E.S.L. teachers.

III. STUDENT OUTCOME DATA

Student outcome data for E.S.L. students are reported by term because of the great mobility of this largely immigrant group, whose members enter and leave the program throughout the school year. Data are reported for 10,739 students in the fall, 1984 term and for 10,804 students in the spring, 1985 term. Table 1 summarizes the number of schools and students reported in the E.S.L. program during the 1984-85 school year. Students were distributed fairly evenly among the three levels of E.S.L.; the greatest number was reported at the beginning level and the smallest at the advanced level. Approximately 75 percent of the students were in the ninth and tenth grades.

Table 2 contains data for E.S.L. students during fall, 1984 and Table 3 contains data for spring, 1985. About 80 percent of students in both terms had complete test results consisting of both pretest and posttest CREST scores. The E.S.L. evaluation objective was that 70 percent of program participants would master one English syntax objective for every 20 days of instruction as measured by the CREST. Classes were held for 63 days in the fall term and 61 days in the spring term. On the average, students attended 92 percent of program classes. The number of skills each student needed to master was calculated on the basis of individual

TABLE 1

Statistical Summary of Schools and Students Reported in the English as a Second Language Program According to Level

	Beginning Level	Intermediate Level	Advanced Level	Combined Total
Schools Reported (Fall, 1984):	46	47	41	50
Students Reported (Fall, 1984)*				
Ninth Grade:	2,797	1,045	254	4,100
Tenth Grade:	1,349	1,625	935	3,906
Eleventh Grade:	493	735	859	2,090
Twelfth Grade:	83	179	381	643
Total	4,713	3,583	2,429	10,739
Schools Reported (Spring, 1985):	53	52	47	54
Students Reported (Spring, 1985)				
Ninth Grade:	2,505	1,299	409	4,213
Tenth Grade:	1,112	1,647	1,243	4,002
Eleventh Grade:	383	668	999	2,050
Twelfth Grade:	40	118	381	539
Total:	4,040	3,732	3,032	10,804

*Fall, 1984 data is missing for 28 students.

aThe number of E.S.L. students decreased from the beginning to the intermediate levels, especially in the fall term.

TABLE 2

Statistical Summary of the English as a Second Language Program According to Level: Fall, 1984

	Beginning Level	Intermediate Level	Advanced Level	Combined Total
Proportion of Students Who Met the Evaluation Objective:	80.5	79.0	54.8	74.1
Average Number of Skills Mastered:	5.3 (of 25)	4.8 (of 25)	2.6 (of 15)	4.5
Average Number of Days Attended (of 63 Days):	56.5	57.1	58.1	57.1
Percentage Attendance:	92.4	91.4	93.0	92.2
Students with Complete Results as a Percentage of Students Reported:	81.0	82.3	82.7	81.9

- A higher percentage of students at the beginning and intermediate levels met the evaluation objective than students at the advanced level.
- Students at all levels had comparable rates of attendance.

TABLE 3

Statistical Summary of the English as a Second Language Program According to Level: Spring, 1985

	Beginning Level	Intermediate Level	Advanced Level	Combined Total
Proportion of Students Who Met the Evaluation Objective:	81.7	79.1	59.1	74.4
Average Number of Skills Mastered:	5.0 (of 25)	4.6 (of 25)	2.7 (of 15)	4.2
Average Number of Days Attended (of 61 Days):	54.5	55.5	55.6	55.2
Percentage Attendance:	92.0	91.6	91.8	91.8
Students with Complete Results as a Percentage of Students Reported:	77.9	81.7	80.5	80.0

aSeventy-four percent of students with complete results met the evaluation objective.

attendance. About 74 percent of the students met the evaluation objective in both terms. Students mastered an average of 4.5 skills (S.D.=3.6) in the fall term and 4.2 skills (S.D.=3.4) in the spring term.

The percentage of students meeting the evaluation objective during the 1984-85 school year is higher than it was during the 1983-84 school year. About 66 percent met the objective in fall, 1983 and 59 percent met it in spring, 1984. The number of skills mastered, however, has remained fairly constant from the 1983-84 to the 1984-85 school year.* The proportion of students who met the evaluation objective during the 1984-85 school year decreased from the beginning and intermediate levels to the advanced level. During the fall, 1984 term, for example, 81 percent of the beginning students and 79 percent of the intermediate students met the evaluation objective, but only 55 percent of the advanced students met it. During the fall, 1984 term,

---

*The change in the percentage of students who met the evaluation objective reflects a change in O.E.A./M.S.E.U. methodology. The subsequent methodological revision more accurately reflects student achievement. A review of previously-used methods of data analysis revealed that they understated the number of students who met the evaluation objective, because they assumed students would meet an objective in fewer than 20 days. For example, in a 67-day term students would be expected to master three objectives under the new system, but four objectives under the old system. Since the evaluation objective states that students should master one skill for every 20 days of instruction and a 67-day term would allow students only seven days to master a fourth objective, the corrected methodology requires that the full instructional period (20 days) be allowed for students to master each additional skill.

beginning students mastered 5.3 skills (S.D.=4.0) and intermediate students mastered 4.8 skills (S.D.=3.5), but advanced students mastered only 2.6 skills (S.D.=2.1). These student achievement data showed little change from the fall to the spring term. The differences are largely attributable to the number of skills tested at each level. The beginning and intermediate levels tests contain 25 skills; the advanced level test contains 15 skills. Students at the advanced level have fewer and more difficult skills to master than students at the lower levels, because the skills are arranged in order of increasing difficulty.

Success in meeting the evaluation objective does not necessarily translate into success in content area classes. A beginning E.S.L. student, for example, who meets the evaluation objective on the CREST does not necessarily have sufficiently-developed English skills to pass an E.S.L. content area class in science or social studies.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The widespread availability of E.S.L. content area classes provided LEP students with a valuable transition between E.S.L classes and mainstream subject area classes. The concrete support which funded E.S.L./Bilingual Program staff gave to tax-levy E.S.L. content area teachers represented an important coordinated effort.

Nevertheless, the full value to students of E.S.L. content area classes remains to be realized. Few teachers of these classes had training in E.S.L. methodology. They were far more likely to explain unfamiliar vocabulary words than to deal with the syntax or irregular verbs which LEP students might find particularly confusing. The further development and distribution of model curriculum by funded E.S.L. program staff should, however, be of considerable value to E.S.L. content area teachers, especially to those with less experience integrating subject matter with language skills.

S.D.S.s faced several constraints. Providing training to tax-levy E.S.L. content area teachers added to the S.D.S.s' workload. The dispersal of E.S.L. content area teachers among their various subject-area departments also meant that S.D.S.s could not readily schedule group training meetings. One-on-one training sessions, while effective, were more time-consuming than group sessions and constituted an

additional drain on the S.D.S.s' limited time.

Students needed to take content area classes required for graduation. As a result, staff at almost all of the schools visited placed E.S.L. students in content area classes on the basis of their curriculum needs, not on the basis of their E.S.L. level. Beginning E.S.L. students had to grasp subject matter they would probably have found challenging in their native language at the same time that they found themselves confronted with unfamiliar English syntax and vocabulary. In some classes, these students received valuable help from experienced E.S.L. content area teachers, from educational assistants, from other, more English-fluent students, and from curriculum designed specifically for the new immigrant. Some of the E.S.L. students, however, had English skills too limited for them to absorb the same material presented to mainstream and English-dominant students. In one of the schools visited, students who should have been placed in bilingual content area classes were placed in E.S.L. content area classes because of a shortage of bilingual teachers.

The E.S.L. program was generally successful in meeting its performance objective: to have 70 percent of program participants master one English syntax objective for every 20 days of instruction. Slightly over 80 percent of beginning E.S.L. students and 79 percent of intermediate students met

the performance objective both terms. However, success in meeting the evaluation objective does not necessarily translate into success in content area classes. A beginning E.S.L. student who masters elementary skills might lack the vocabulary and syntax to comprehend content area material.

Based on the evaluation findings, it is recommended that:

- E.S.L. content area teachers participate in on-site group training sessions and, if possible, in centrally-held training sessions.
- All E.S.L. content area teachers whose classes contain large numbers of beginning E.S.L. students receive E.S.L. training.
- Project administrators encourage coordination between a school's E.S.L. program and its E.S.L. content area teachers and between the E.S.L. program and the chairpeople of departments which offer E.S.L. content area classes.