DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 285 TM 012 041

AUTHOR Rothfarb, Sylvia H.; Abella, Rodolfo
TITLE Evaluation of the ATTLAS Program (Augmenting Thinking through Language Acquisition Skills).
INSTITUTION Dade County Public Schools, Miami, FL. Office of Educational Accountability.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 61p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Processes; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *English (Second Language); *Evaluative Thinking; *Language Acquisition; *Limited English Speaking; Minority Groups; Principals; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *ATTLAS Program; *Dade County Public Schools FL

ABSTRACT

The Augmenting Thinking through Language Acquisition Skills (ATTLAS) program was designed to increase analytical thinking abilities and English language capabilities of limited English proficient (LEP) elementary school students. The program concentrates on first through third grades, although there are some pull-out classes for grades 4-6; and teachers use the Behavior Training Series. The effect of ATTLAS on the acquisition of English was evaluated, and the performance of 672 students who had and 213 students who had not participated in the ATTLAS program was compared. The program's effectiveness was evaluated via observations of students' performance during the 1986-87 academic year and assessing reactions of school personnel to the program. Survey data were analyzed for 38 teachers and 20 principals in the ATTLAS program (a response rate of 93% and 100% respectively). Results indicate that: (1) ATTLAS exerted a slight, positive effect on language acquisition; (2) no differences were seen in the effectiveness of different delivery modes for English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) instruction on language acquisition; and (3) school personnel reacted favorably to the program, but wanted more appropriate materials for younger grades. LEP students are not advancing through the school program as quickly as expected, but ATTLAS students are more likely to advance. Eight tables contain student and teacher data, and the survey instruments are appended. (SLD)

Dade County Public Schools
Office of Educational Accountability
1450 Northeast Second Avenue
Miami, Florida 33132

EVALUATION OF THE ATTLAS PROGRAM
(Augmenting Thinking Through Language Acquisition Skills)

August 1987

Principal Evaluators/Authors:

Sylvia H. Rothfarb, Ph.D.
Rodolfo Abella, Ph.D
Program Evaluation Department

THE SCHOOL BOARD OF DADE COUNTY, FLORIDA

Mr. Paul L. Cejas, Chairman
Dr. Michael Krop, Vice-Chairman
Mr. G. Holmes Braddock
Dr. Rosa Castro-Feinberg
Ms. Janet R. McAliley
Mr. Robert Renick
Mr. William H. Turner

Dr. Joseph A. Fernandez
Superintendent of Schools

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ATTLAS (Augmenting Thinking Through Language Acquisition Skills) is a program designed to increase the analytical thinking abilities and English language capabilities of limited English proficient (LEP) students in elementary schools. The program was initiated in September, 1986, by the Department of Advanced Academic Programs, in cooperation with the Department of Bilingual/Foreign Language Education. During 1986-87, ATTLAS was operational in 20 elementary schools. ATTLAS involved 42 teachers and 860 students in grades one through six. The students received ATTLAS through one of three delivery modes: CCHL (Curriculum Content in the Home Language); ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) in self-contained classes; or ESOL in pull-out classes. In this report, the evaluation of the effect of ATTLAS on students' English acquisition is presented.

At the end of the year, the performance of ATTLAS students in English was compared with that of similar students who had not received ATTLAS. The criterion measure used was the student's ESOL level standing. The ESOL level is a standard measure of progress within the ESOL curriculum, used to classify students (Levels I through V). The student's ESOL level is established through a county-approved test in conjunction with teacher judgments. ESOL levels act as indicators of English proficiency, and are thus the criterion for assigning students to different delivery modes, for advancing through ESOL, and for exiting the program. In addition to assessing the language performance of the students, the reactions of school personnel toward the ATTLAS Program were measured.

The evaluation addressed the following questions:

1. Do ATTLAS students advance through the program (i.e., acquire English) at a faster rate than non-ATTLAS students?

2. Do ATTLAS students in ESOL self-contained classes acquire English at a faster rate than ATTLAS students in ESOL pull-out classes?

3. What are the reactions and opinions of school personnel to the program?

Results and Conclusions

1. ATTLAS appears to have exerted a slight positive effect on language acquisition. This conclusion is most clearly supported by results which indicate that ATTLAS students are more likely than non-ATTLAS students to advance at least one ESOL level during the course of the school year. However, Level I LEP students in general are not advancing through the program in accordance with district standards.

2. The different ESOL delivery modes used to introduce ATTLAS (pull-out, self-contained) were contrasted. No differences were observed concerning the effect of ESOL delivery mode on language acquisition.

3. School personnel were asked to respond to a questionnaire that inquired about their reactions to the ATTLAS program. An analysis of their responses indicated that school personnel believed: (a) that students had enjoyed ATTLAS, (b) that the program should be continued, (c) that the instruction time was inadequate, (d) that more appropriate materials

are needed for first and second grade ATTLAS students, and (e) that ATTLAS training enhanced the teacher's questioning strategies, but not their higher-order questioning.

INTRODUCTION

One of the recent changes in the curriculum brought about by the educational reform movement of the eighties has been a renewed interest in the teaching of critical thinking. According to critical thinking experts, "To think critically is to be adept at gathering, analyzing, synthesizing and assessing information, as well as identifying misinformation, prejudice and one-sidedness. A student with such skills will have the tools of life-long learning" (Paul, 1987). The Dade County Public School (DCPS) system has already introduced the teaching of critical thinking into programs such as Elementary Gifted Centers and Home-School Programs, and the Elementary Academic Excellence Program. Presently, DCPS is exploring approaches to foster the development of critical thinking skills in limited English proficient (LEP) students.

During 1986-87, there were 25,716 LEP students in DCPS; 20,854 were enrolled in elementary schools. Special classes are provided for LEP students, so that they can master English as quickly as possible, and continue learning academic subjects while learning English. Such classes include English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and Curriculum Content in the Home Language (CCHL). However, these classes typically do not include the systematic development of analytical or higher order thinking skills, which may enhance, and possibly accelerate, the student's proficiency in English. In an effort to address this problem, the Department of Advanced Academic Programs, in cooperation with the Department of Bilingual/Foreign Language Education, initiated the ATTLAS Program (Augmenting Thinking Through Language Acquisition Skills).

Through ATTLAS, instruction in higher order thinking skills is fused with instruction provided for LEP students in ESOL or CCHL classes. The 1986-87 school year was the first year of the program. The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the impact of ATTLAS on the student's acquisition of English.

Description of the Program

ATTLAS is a program designed to increase the analytical thinking abilities and English language proficiency of LEP students in elementary schools. The program goals are 1) to accelerate the rate in which LEP students learn English and 2) to increase the depth of English learned. An ultimate goal is to augment the number of LEP students enrolled in Gifted and Academic Excellence Programs.

The program was initiated in September, 1986, in 20 elementary schools. The schools were selected based on interest, staff capability and recommendations of bilingual teachers on special assignment in the area. In 1986-87, there were 42 teachers in ATTLAS, and approximately 860 students. The program is concentrated in first through third grades, although there are some pull-out classes of fourth, fifth and sixth grade combinations.

Teachers use the Behavior Training Series (Primary Thinking Skills, Building Thinking Skills, 1984). They receive training in the use of the materials and related strategies, and are provided assistance through two resource teachers. There are three types of program delivery, as described below.

1. ESOL in Self-Contained Classes (ESOL SC), is the delivery used for students classified as ESOL Levels III-IV (Intermediate B-Advanced). The students

are grouped together in a self-contained class. ATTLAS is taught by the classroom teacher through ESOL. The teacher has the option of working ATTLAS into other parts of the daily schedule, such as during mathematics or social studies.

2. ESOL in Pull-Out Classes (ESOL PO), is also delivered to ESOL Levels III-IV students, on a pull-out basis. It is taught by the special ESOL teacher, who fuses ATTLAS with the regular ESOL curriculum.

3. CCHL in Pull-Out Classes (CCHL), is the delivery used for ESOL Levels I-II students (Non-Independent-Intermediate A). It is taught by the CCHL teacher in the home language, through content subjects such as mathematics.

Start-up and initial cost of the program during 1986-87, including support services, was $88,864.

Evaluation Plan

The initial evaluation of the ATTLAS program focused on assessing the program's effect on students' acquisition of the English language. The question of the program's effectiveness was addressed in two basic ways: a) by observing the students' performance during the academic year, and b) by assessing the reactions of school personnel to the program. The specific questions examined are described below.

1. Progression Through the ESOL program. The effect of ATTLAS curriculum on students' progression through the system was observed. In order to comprehensively address this question, the following criterion measures were used to represent progression through the system: (a) Esol-level retention rate--the percentage of students not advancing one ESOL level, and (b) mean changes in ESOL level--the average number of ESOL levels advanced by students as a group. The following questions were addressed:

(a). ESOL Level Retention Rate: Do ATTLAS students advance through the program at a faster rate than non-ATTLAS students? Three questions focus solely on the relative proportions (percentages) of students who advance, or fail to advance, at least one or more ESOL levels. Consequently, the answers to these questions will be dichotomous in nature, inquiring into whether students advance or not. These specific questions will be asked:

i. For the school year 1986-87, and considering students from all ESOL levels jointly, were students exposed to ATTLAS more likely to advance at least one ESOL level during the school year (1986-87) than non-ATTLAS students?

ii. Were non-independent (i.e., Level I) students exposed to ATTLAS curriculum during the past year (1986-87) more likely to advance to intermediate Levels (II and III) than non-ATTLAS students who were non-independent (Level I) at the start of one of the previous three years (1984-85, 1985-86, 1986-87)?

iii. Did non-independent (Level I) students exposed to ATTLAS (1986-87) and Level I students from previous years (1984-85, 1985-86, 1986-87) meet district standards for progression through the ESOL program?

[Note: District standards state that, "within one year of continuous exposure to the program of English for speakers of other languages 85% of students who entered as non-independent will achieve the classification of intermediate." (Dade County Public Schools, 1986)].

(b) Mean Changes in ESOL Levels, ATTLAS vs. Comparison Groups: Did students exposed to ATTLAS during the past year advance a greater number of ESOL levels overall? This question will look at the average ESOL level increase of ATTLAS and comparison groups. In other words, this question will attempt to detect differences between ATTLAS and non-ATTLAS groups in the average number of ESOL levels advanced.

2. Comparison of Students in ATTLAS SC vs. ATTLAS PO: Among students exposed to the ATTLAS curriculum this past year, did students in ESOL self-contained classes acquire English at a faster rate than students in ESOL pull-out classes? Again, mean ESOL level changes will be considered in order to explore differences in performance due to delivery mode.

3. Views of School and Program Resource Personnel Toward Efficacy of the Program: The views and opinions of school personnel were addressed. The reactions of teachers, principals, and other personnel were assessed via questionnaires.

The final sample for the present study consisted of a total of (885) students. The treatment condition consisted of (672) students exposed to Attlas curriculum for a period longer than six months during the 1986-87 academic year. Another (213) LEP students, who were not exposed to ATTLAS, served as a comparison group.

The treatment (ATTLAS) group included all students who participated in the ATTLAS program during the year (n = 880). Students withdrawing early or entering the program late were excluded from the final sample. ATTLAS students represented different grade levels (1 through 6) and delivery modes (ESOL self-contained, ESOL pull-out, CCHL).

The comparison group (non-ATTLAS) was selected after consulting with area and central office personnel. In selecting the classes and schools that comprise the comparison group, an attempt was made to match the ATTLAS sample with regard to school area, ethnic composition, proportion of LEP students per school, school size, and percentage of free/reduced lunches.

A constant and standard measure of progress within the ESOL curriculum is the ESOL level used to classify students (I through V). ESOL levels act as indicators of English proficiency and are thus the criterion for assigning students to different delivery modes and for exiting the program. Consequently, changes in ESOL level during the academic year represent the basic measure of interest in the present study.

A selected number of tests are used county-wide, in conjunction with teacher judgments, to establish ESOL levels for elementary students (a frequency distribution of the different tests administered to ATTLAS students in this evaluation is presented in Table I). Students are assigned ESOL levels at the beginning (pre-ESOL) and at the end of the academic year (post-ESOL).

Finally, questionnaires designed to measure the school personnel's reactions to the ATTLAS program were developed. The questionnaires were constructed on the basis of classroom observations (of ATTLAS), interviews with teachers and program-related personnel, and by reviewing the relevant literature. Separate questionnaires were constructed for teachers, principals, and resource teachers.

RESULTS

Impact of Program on Students' English Proficiency

Sample Characteristics

The ATTLAS (treatment) and comparison groups had similar characteristics. In both samples the majority of students were Hispanic (90% of ATTLAS and 94% of comparison) with the rest being mostly Haitian in origin. In addition, both groups had near equal numbers of males and females (see Table 2).

Most students were in grades 1 through 3 during the school year (93% of ATTLAS and 83% of comparison). Students in both samples were similarly distributed among the three delivery modes, with a majority assigned to the ESOL pull-out method. Finally, a majority of the students began the year either as an ESOL Level III or a IV (79% of treatment and 64% of comparison).

Progression Through the ESOL Program

Contrast of ATTLAS and comparison sample, across pre-ESOL levels, for the year 1986-87. The present analysis looks at the proportion of children, in both the ATTLAS and comparison groups, which advanced (or failed to advance) at least one ESOL level during the previous school year.

Table 3 gives the proportion of students, for the different starting ESOL levels, who did not advance during the school year (ESOL level retention rate). The ESOL level retention rate for all ATTLAS students was 21% compared with 28% of the comparison group. These proportions represent the percentage of students who did not increase their level of English proficiency during the school year.

The proportion of students who advanced was generally higher for the ATTLAS group, regardless of initial ESOL level. For example, among students starting at Level IV, it was more likely for an ATTLAS student to exit the program than for comparison group students. That is, 73% of Level IV students in ATTLAS exited the program, pull-out and self-contained combined, compared with 66% of comparison group students.

Comparison of ATTLAS sample with samples drawn from the previous three years. The present analysis compares the proportion of Level I students who advanced (or failed to) in samples drawn from 1984-85, 1985-86 and 1986-87 school years. All students in the present analysis are (or were) Level I students and new to the ESOL program at the beginning of the particular school year. The samples representing former years (1984-85, 1985-1986) are made up of students from the present ATTLAS sample who were Level I and new to the program one or two years ago. Their records were examined and their ESOL level changes during those years recorded. The sample for 1986-87 represent students, ATTLAS and comparison being considered both separately and together, who were Level I and

initiating the program at the start of this year. It should be noted that students in the 1984-85 and 1985-86 samples could not have been exposed to ATTLAS since the program was not in existence at the time.

As evident in Table 4, the percentage of ATTLAS students who failed to advance beyond Level I for the school year 1986-87 was 23%. In contrast, the ESOL level retention rate for non-ATTLAS students representative of the past three school years (including 1986-87) was in the range of 27% to 33%. Therefore, it appears that ATTLAS students were more likely to advance beyond Level I than non-ATTLAS students from previous school years.

Comparison of ATTLAS and non-ATTLAS samples with district standards. According to district standards the ESOL level retention rate of Level I students should be lower than 15% (i.e., 85% or more should advance). As Table 4 indicates, student performance the past three years has not approximated this standard. Overall, across the samples representing 1984-85 through 1986-87, 27% of students have failed to advance beyond Level I during the school year.

For the current school year, the ESOL level retention rate for ATTLAS Level I students was 23%, compared to 28% for the comparison group students. Thus, it appears that ATTLAS students were more likely to approximate the standard than non-ATTLAS students from the same year or from the two previous school years. Nevertheless, all of the groups failed to achieved the prescribed 15% standard.

Mean changes in ESOL levels: ATTLAS vs. comparison groups. The present analyses statistically compare the average increase in ESOL level for the different subgroups. The analyses not only contrast ATTLAS and non-ATTLAS students but also examine the effect of the different delivery modes (CCHL, ESOL self-contained, ESOL pull-out) on English acquisition. In order to obtain clear-cut comparisons, only students with identical initial ESOL levels were compared. Consequently, six different t-tests were performed in order to test for differences between ATTLAS and non-ATTLAS students in the following subgroups: CCHL Level I, CCHL Level II, ESOL self-contained Level III, ESOL self-contained Level IV, ESOL pull-out Level III, ESOL pull-out Level IV.

The results associated with these analyses are presented in Table 5. In the CCHL delivery mode, Level I and II ATTLAS students exhibited a greater mean increase in ESOL level than the comparison groups but the differences were not statistically significant. In the ESOL pull-out delivery mode, Level III ATTLAS students exhibited a statistically significantly greater change in mean ESOL level than the comparison group, $t = 3.01$ (204), $p < .003$. The Level IV ATTLAS group also had a higher mean ESOL level change than the comparison group, but it was not statistically significant. On the other hand, for Levels III and IV of the ESOL self-contained groups, the comparison groups exhibited larger mean ESOL changes, although not statistically significant, than the ATTLAS groups.

Overall, the results show no consistent pattern concerning the effect of ATTLAS on overall mean increases in ESOL levels. Nevertheless, the findings are reflective of the criterion measure used, mean changes in the subgroups' ESOL level during the school year, and do not necessarily contradict findings reported earlier (this point is discussed further in the Discussion section).

Comparison of ATTLAS Students in ESOL Self-Contained vs. Pull-Out

The present analyses compare the performance of ATTLAS students in the two ESOL delivery modes, pull-out and self-contained. For the purpose of clarity, students initially at Levels III and IV are considered separately.

As indicated by Table 6, there was no discernible effect of delivery mode on English language acquisition among ATTLAS students. Among Level III students, ESOL pull-out students exhibited higher mean ESOL level changes than self-contained students. But among Level IV students the reverse was true. That is, self-contained students displayed an overall higher increase in mean ESOL level than the pull-out group. These differences did not achieve statistical significance.

Summary: Effect of ATTLAS and Delivery Mode on Student Performance

On the basis of the observed results it may be concluded that ATTLAS exerted a noticeable although slight effect on English language acquisition. This interpretation is most compatible with results involving ESOL level retention rates. Those results tended to suggest that ATTLAS students were in fact advancing through the program at an apparent faster rate than non-ATTLAS students. More specifically, ATTLAS students exhibited a 7% greater likelihood of advancing to the next ESOL level than non-ATTLAS students. This finding is particularly relevant given that Level I students over the past three years have been moving through the ESOL program at a rate slower than that dictated by district standards.

Results associated with mean ESOL level changes, on the other hand, were not as clear. In some instances, particularly for CCHL (I, II) and pull-out (III, IV) students, it appears that ATTLAS may have increased the mean ESOL level standing. But, from a broader perspective, the effect of ATTLAS had no discernible pattern.

It is possible to speculate that the criterion measure, mean changes in ESOL levels, is insensitive to existing effects. Both the narrow range of that criterion measure (in some instances one level is all a student can change, e.g., Level IV) and occasional small sample groups, act to diminish the sensitivity of the statistical test. This is especially relevant since the total effect is thought to be small. Consequently, the analyses involving ESOL level retention rates are probably a clearer index of the effect of ATTLAS on language aquisition than findings associated with mean changes in ESOL levels (see Discussion section).

Finally, the different ESOL delivery modes (pull-out vs. self-contained) did not appear to influence language acquisition.

Views of School and Program Resource Personnel Toward Efficacy of the Program

ATTLAS Teachers and Principals

Surveys were sent to 41 ATTLAS teachers. Thirty-eight were returned, or a response rate of 93%. Surveys were also mailed to 20 ATTLAS principals; their response rate was 100%. The surveys are included in Appendix B.

The surveys for the ESOL teachers (SC and PO), and for the CCHL teachers were similar. First, the teachers were asked background information, i. e., number of ATTLAS classes taught, years of teaching experience, and university or inservice coursework they had taken in ESOL or CCHL methods. Next, teachers were asked to rate their views and feelings toward the program's efficacy. There were 23 rating questions, which focused on areas such as the training received in ATTLAS, student progress, instructional time and materials, and the overall merits of ATTLAS. A five-point rating scale was employed (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). Open-ended questions were also used that asked teachers what kinds of training needed additional emphasis, and how the program could be improved.

Principals filled out questionnaires similar to the teacher surveys. On a five-point scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree), they were asked to rate their views toward ATTLAS on such topics as program operations, efficacy of the program as a strategy for teaching ESOL, and teacher training. An open-ended question on program improvement was also included.

Mean ratings were calculated for the 23 rating items on the teacher surveys, and for the 11 rating items on the principal survey. These data are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

The mean ratings of items on each of the four scales (ESOL SC, ESOL PO and CCHL Teacher Surveys; Principal Survey) were then ranked from highest to lowest. The rank order of items for each set of respondents was then compared. Only the items on the principal survey which were the same as those asked in teacher surveys were included in the comparison. Many of the items shared common rank orders among the respondents, falling into patterns of high to low rankings. These items were grouped into the following four categories: 1) "high" agreement ratings - student progress in English and critical thinking; 2) "high-to-uncertain" agreement ratings - effect of training; 3) "uncertain" agreement ratings - impact of ATTLAS on learning English; and 4) "low" agreement ratings - adequacy of instructional time. The specific survey items for each of these categories are shown in Table 9.

While all of the item responses may provide useful information to program administrators, only responses to selected items are discussed below. The items discussed are those which appear to have the strongest implication for future program operations.

The open-ended questions were analyzed by the frequency of responses given by each set of respondents. These data are also discussed below.

1. <u>"High" agreement ratings: School personnel views on student progress in English and critical thinking.</u> Teachers in all three delivery systems felt that their students had increased in English proficiency during the year. (Other evidence shows that this effect was probably not attributable to ATTLAS). They also felt that their students had acquired greater skills in critical thinking. ESOL PO teachers, CCHL teachers, and principals agreed that students can more readily increase critical thinking skills through ATTLAS than through the regular ESOL program. ESOL SC teachers expressed uncertainty toward this statement. All of the respondents agreed that the students were enthusiastic toward the ATTLAS Program.

In summary, school personnel believed that students in ATTLAS had shown an increase in English and critical thinking skills during the year, and that the students were enthusiastic toward the program. They generally felt that the ATTLAS Program can increase critical thinking in LEP students.

2. "High-to-uncertain" agreement ratings: School personnel views on effect of training. The teachers felt that the training they had received in ATTLAS made them more aware of how their questioning strategies affect student responses. This is an important concept which was emphasized in training sessions. On this item, ESOL PO teachers rated higher agreement than ESOL SC teachers; CCHL teachers were the most positive toward the statement.

The ESOL teachers were uncertain as to whether the training had increased their skills in the following areas: general questioning strategies, asking higher-order questions in evaluation and synthesis activities, and developing higher-order group activities, such as problem-solving. CCHL teachers felt they had improved in these skills (see Table 7).

Another area examined was the training effect on teachers' ability to integrate ATTLAS with ESOL or CCHL. ESOL teachers were uncertain as to whether they had improved in integrating ATTLAS into the ESOL curriculum. As ESOL and CCHL are the vehicles for teaching critical thinking to LEP students, it would seem that this area needs additional emphasis in future training.

Teachers were asked whether they felt that they needed additional training in ATTLAS methodologies. A similar item on the principal survey asked whether the training provided in ATTLAS was adequate. ESOL SC and CCHL teachers did not feel that they needed further training, ESOL PO teachers felt that they did. The principals generally felt that the training was adequate.

In summary, teachers perceived that through the training, they were more aware of how their questioning strategies affect the responses made by students. They were uncertain as to whether their skills had increased in a) integrating ATTLAS strategies with ESOL/CCHL or b) asking a variety of higher-order questions. These areas may be among those which require additional emphasis in future training. Of the three teacher groups, ESOL PO teachers felt that they needed more training in ATTLAS methodologies.

3. "Uncertain" agreement ratings: School personnel views on impact of ATTLAS on learning English. As seen in their rating for Item 11 (Table 7), ESOL SC and PO teachers were uncertain as to whether their students learned more English in ATTLAS than they would have through the regular ESOL curriculum. (CCHL teachers were asked whether their students learned more concepts through the program than they would have through a regular CCHL class. They tended to be positive (M = 3.67, Table 8), but the rank order of this item was low (rank 18 of 23 items).

In the same vein, teachers in the three delivery systems expressed uncertainty that ATTLAS is an effective way to teach English. The principals, on the other hand, were in high agreement with this statement.

To summarize, ESOL teachers in the program seem uncertain as to ATTLAS' impact on students' learning English. Similarly, all of the teachers expressed uncertainty regarding ATTLAS as a viable ESOL strategy. The principals tended to have a more positive view toward the program as a tool for teaching

English. The teachers, on the other hand, tended to think that the value of ATTLAS was in teaching critical thinking.

4. "Low" agreement ratings: School personnel views on instructional time. One of the most consistent patterns of agreement in each of the four surveys was the low rating given to the statement "the instructional time for ATTLAS was adequate." On the five-point scale, ESOL PO and ESOL SC teachers rated their agreement with this statement 2.9 and 2.4, respectively (see Item 16, Table 7). Although CCHL teacher and principal mean ratings on this item were higher, as seen in Tables 7 and 8, its rank order was among the lowest (rank 20 of 23 on the CCHL survey; rank 13 of 13 on the principal survey).

Overall, the time allocated to ATTLAS was rated as insufficient. To ensure more adequate and stable implementation of the program, it appears that instructional time is a program element that warrants further clarification.

School personnel views on training needs, as stated in response to an open-ended question. Teachers were asked what other kinds of training would enhance their skills in ATTLAS. Approximately one-third of the teachers responded. In general, they recommended more observations, demonstrations and "hands-on" types of workshops. Among the specific kinds of training cited were "questioning strategies" (ESOL PO and CCHL teachers); and "activities/strategies to use before and after ATTLAS" (ESOL SC and PO teachers). Two ESOL PO teachers recommended further training in integrating ATTLAS with ESOL. Among training needs cited by ESOL SC teachers were: ESOL methodology, problem-solving and other areas related to teaching the gifted, and classroom management.

School personnel views on how the program can be improved, as stated in response to an open-ended question. Teachers and principals were asked how ATTLAS could be improved. The number of responses was limited. There were 48 comments, several of which were offered by the same respondent. The majority of the suggestions related to improving the materials. For example, several teachers felt that the materials were too advanced for the lower grades (first and second). Other suggestions were: increase the time for instruction, and provide more training, more orientation and more on-site support/training.

ATTLAS Resource Teachers

The two resource teachers also completed surveys (see Appendix B). They were asked to rate the efficacy of different program operations, such as training, student progress, instructional time and materials, and the program's overall merits. A five-point rating scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree) was used. The teachers also completed questions on their responsibilities as support personnel, and on their professional training and experience in ESOL, CCHL and/or in programs similar to ATTLAS. They also completed open-ended questions, in which they were asked to identify the strengths and weaknesses of ATTLAS, and areas of training which would enhance their performance. Finally, they were asked how the program could be improved.

ATTLAS resource personnel described their responsibilities as "providing support and assistance to the teachers in implementing the program." They had very positive views toward ATTLAS. They felt that the program enabled students to develop both language and a higher level of thinking skills. The

main problem identified was the limited amount of instructional time for ESOL PO and CCHL teachers. Both resource teachers felt that they would profit from conferences or courses devoted to critical thinking.

To improve the program, the teachers recommended more materials, and a materials resource library for ATTLAS teachers. They also stated that ATTLAS should be implemented in self-contained classes.

Summary: School Personnel Views on the Efficacy of the Program

School personnel felt that students had increased their English proficiency, as well as their critical thinking skills, through participation in the first year of ATTLAS. Program teachers tended to perceive the program's value as one of teaching critical thinking. They seemed uncertain as to whether the program was an effective strategy for teaching English. Nevertheless, they thought that their students not only profited from the program, but also enjoyed it. The teachers themselves enjoyed teaching in the program.

The training received through ATTLAS was perceived as causing an important difference in teacher behavior. Teachers stated that they were more aware of the effect of their questioning strategies on pupil responses. Other areas of the training did not seem to have as strong an effect, and may warrant further emphasis. These areas include skills in, a) asking higher-order questions, and b) integrating ATTLAS with language development and content instruction.

Teachers and principals were in unanimous accord that the time for teaching ATTLAS was inadequate. This finding seems to indicate that the amount of time suggested for the program be re-examined and clarified.

To some degree, teachers and principals felt that the materials were too advanced for the students below third grade.

DISCUSSION

One of the basic goals of the ATTLAS program was to accelerate the rate at which ESOL students learn English. The evaluation of the program's first year operations suggest that to some extent that goal is being achieved. Evidence supporting ATTLAS' effect on language acquisition is strongest when the students' ESOL level retention rates are examined.

In general, over a quarter of all ESOL students fail to advance their ESOL level standing during the course of the school year. This statistic contrasts adversely with official expectations for student progress. More specifically, the past three years the ESOL level retention rate of Level I non-ATTLAS students, those who fail to advance beyond Level I in the span of one school year, ranged between 27% and 33%. This ESOLlevel retention rate is roughly twice as large as that expected by program administrators (i.e., 15%).

The ESOL level retention rate for Level I ATTLAS students (23%), on the other hand, was 4% to 10% lower than that of the three non-ATTLAS samples; which represented three previous school years. Moreover, across all ESOL levels, ATTLAS students' ESOL level retention rate was 7% lower than that of non-ATTLAS students. In a group the size of the ATTLAS sample (n = 672) 7% represents roughly 47 students. At a county level, the percentage differential could account for an even larger number of students. Therefore,

when considering the rate at which students advance through the program, ATTLAS seems to be impacting significantly on language acquisition.

The effect of ATTLAS was less evident when taking into account mean changes in ESOL level for the different subgroups. It could be concluded on the basis of that set of analyses that ATTLAS did not impact on English language acquisition. Nevertheless, it should be noted that there are limitations associated with the criterion measure used in these analyses. In particular, note that students initially at ESOL Level III can increase only two levels during the year (to Level IV and exit). Level IV students can only increase 1 level (i.e., exit). Therefore, the narrow range of responses is equivalent to truncating the range of the criterion measure which in turn makes it less likely that differences between the subgroups (e.g., ATTLAS vs. non-ATTLAS) will be detected.

In addition, it was considered necessary, for a variety of reasons, to divide the two samples into six subgroups on the basis of pre-ESOL level and delivery mode. Subdividing the samples made some of the subgroups, especially among the comparison sample, unusually small in size (e.g., $n = 10$). Small samples are likely to be skewed and unrepresentative of the population from which they are drawn. Hence, some of the statistical comparisons might be invalid. In fact, if the ATTLAS and comparison samples were collapsed across pre-ESOL level and delivery mode, you would find that the ATTLAS group did increase their mean ESOL level slightly more ($M = 1.08$) than the comparison group ($M = 0.99$). This finding coincides with results concerning the rate at which students advance through the program.

Consequently, it was concluded that proportions of students advancing (or not) one or more levels, as represented by ESOL level retention rates, provide a clearer index of the effect of ATTLAS on language acquisition than findings associated with mean changes in ESOL level.

Mean changes in ESOL levels were used after recognizing that alternative, standardized measures of performance indexing English acquisition were non-existent within the school system's bilingual program. In other words, the actual tests administered for ESOL classification purposes vary from one school to the next (see Table 1). The actual tests administered are selected from a list of tests deemed appropriate by district guidelines (DCPS, 1986). The teachers select specific tests to be used at their discretion, taking into account grade level restrictions. Consequently, the only constant index of language proficiency across schools is the ESOL level classification. It is possible that a classification scheme which categorizes students across a broader continuum and which is consistent for all schools might prove advantageous to the program. The advantage would address not only evaluation concerns but proper identification of special students as well.

In this last regard, it should be noted that within the ATTLAS sample 20 students exhibited reversals in their level of progress. That is to say, these students ended the school year at a lower level of ESOL than the one at which they started. It is hard to speculate about the reasons for these reversals in ESOL level standings. In any event, the possibility exists that the present classification scheme fails to properly identify students whose abilities lie at the extremes, students either learning disabled or gifted.

The question . the program's effectiveness was also evaluated by assessing the reactions . teachers and related personnel to the program. In general, the program was regarded positively. The majority of personnel surveyed felt that the program should be continued, which suggests that they support ATTLAS, and have a favorable reaction toward it. However, there was less favorable reaction with regard to the adequacy of the time for teaching ATTLAS. Nearly all reported that the instructional time for ATTLAS was insufficient.

It should be noted that the original intent was for teachers to use ATTLAS for 20 minutes daily. According to the resource teachers, many teachers found this schedule difficult. Therefore, the recommended time was modified during the course of the year to 20 minutes, at least three times a week. Even so, the low rating given to the statement on 'adequacy of time' by the teachers indicates that at the end of the year, the amount of time was still not perceived as sufficient. The evaluators would expect it to still be insufficient since the recommended time was reduced. Instructional time is a factor that warrants clearer guidelines.

At the end of the year, some variation in instructional time and delivery mode was reported by the resource teachers. For example, in one school, students received more than one class of ESOL (ATTLAS-ESOL PO plus regular ESOL). In two other schools, students in ESOL SC classes were not Levels III-IV, but mixed Levels I-IV. In one of these classes, the teacher started the year with the CCHL ATTLAS strategy, and finished it by delivering ATTLAS through ESOL. In the other class, the regular ESOL teacher taught Levels I and II students, while the ESOL SC teacher taught Levels III and IV students ATTLAS. It is not clear how much instruction in ATTLAS the students in these schools actually received.

It is possible that these irregularities in implementation affected student performance. They suggest that instructional time and program delivery may warrant more specific guidelines (as well as closer monitoring).

CONCLUSIONS

1. On the basis of the observed results it may be concluded that ATTLAS is exerting a noticeable although slight effect on language acquisition. The effect is particularly evident when considering the rate at which students advance through the program. From that perspective ATTLAS seems to be impacting significantly on language acquisition.

2. It appears that ATTLAS students were more likely to advance beyond Level I than non-ATTLAS students. However, LEP students, in general, are not advancing through the program as quickly as expected, according to district standards.

3. When considering mean changes in ESOL levels, ATTLAS' effect on language acquisition was not statistically significant. This non-significant effect was attributed, in part, to lack of variability in the criterion measure. More specifically, students were limited with respect to the number of ESOL level changes they could undergo. Therefore, it was unlikely that large group differences in mean ESOL level changes could be detected. It was concluded that the ESOL level retention rate proves to be a clearer indicator of progress within the program.

4. The different delivery modes used to introduce ATTLAS (pull-out vs. self-contained) did not influence language acquisition.

5. Overall, the school personnel surveyed had positive reactions to the program. The majority believed that the students had improved their skills in English and critical thinking during the year, and had enjoyed ATTLAS. Most of the teachers enjoyed teaching in ATTLAS; all of the teachers and principals felt that the program should be continued.

6. School personnel felt that instruction time for ATTLAS was inadequate. Several variations in instruction time and program delivery were also reported, suggesting that these areas of program implementation may warrant further clarification.

7. Some need was expressed for materials which are more appropriate for first and second grade students.

8. The training provided in ATTLAS seemed to influence the teachers' skills in basic questioning strategies but not in higher-order questioning strategies. Other areas of training which may require additional emphasis were identified.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The program should be continued.

2. More comprehensive program guidelines should be developed.

3. The program should be monitored more closely.

4. Appropriate materials for first and second grade students in the program should be acquired.

5. Training efforts should be emphasize higher-order questioning strategies for teachers, and techniques in relating ATTLAS to ESOL and content subjects. More demonstrations of ATTLAS strategies should also be provided.

6. Program personnel should consider testing students in critical thinking skills.

REFERENCES

Black, H. and Black, S. (1984). Building Thinking Skills, Pacific Grove, CA: Midwest Publications.

Dade County Public Schools. (1986). Procedures Manual: Bilingual/Foreign Language Education, Bulletin 1-C, Revised, Miami.

Paul, R. W. (1987). Highlights of seventh annual conference on critical thinking and education reform. Unpublished Manuscript, Rehnert Park, CA: Sonoma State University.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Table 1

Number and Proportion of Language Proficiency Tests Administered to ATTLAS Students at Beginning and End of School Year

Test	Pre-test n	Pre-test %	Post-test n	Post-test %
Dade County Test of Language Development (Receptive) Aural Comprehension	475	57%	519	57%
Dade County/Michigan Oral Language Productive Test	45	5%	223	25%
Oral Language Proficiency Scale	246	30%	112	12%
Oral Interview	22	3%	5	1%
Teacher Judgement	32	4%	42	4%
Other	0	0%	9	1%
Total	820	100%	910	100%

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Selected Variables
Describing the ATTLAS and Comparison Samples

Variable		ATTLAS n	ATTLAS %	Comparison n	Comparison %
1. Ethnicity	Hispanic	605	90%	200	94%
	Haitian	62	9%	13	6%
	Other	5	1%	0	0%
2. Sex	Male	336	50%	111	52%
	Female	336	50%	102	48%
3. Grade	1	205	31%	17	8%
	2	305	45%	153	72%
	3	117	17%	6	3%
	4	28	4%	12	6%
	5	12	2%	13	6%
	6	5	1%	12	6%
4. Delivery	ESOL S.C.	119	18%	34	16%
	ESOL P.O.	402	60%	101	47%
	CCHL	151	22%	78	37%
5. Pre-ESOL Level	I	81	12%	52	24%
	II	59	9%	24	11%
	III	231	34%	54	25%
	IV	301	45%	83	39%

Table 3

Percentage of Students not Advancing in ESOL Level in 1986-87 by Pre-ESOL Level and Treatment

Pre-ESOL Level	Percentage Not Advancing	
	ATTLAS	Comparison
I	23%	29%
II	10%	22%
III [a]	18%	16%
IV [a]	27%	34%
TOTAL	21%	28%

[a] Combining ESOL S.C. and ESOL P.O.

Table 4

Percentage of Level I Students not Advancing in ESOL Level for Each of the Past Three Years, by Treatment for 1986-87

Year	Treatment	Total n	Not Advan n	Not Advan %
86-87	ATTLAS	81	19	23%
	Comparison	52	15	29%
86-87	Total	133	34	27%
85-86		34	11	33%
84-85		52	14	27%
Total		219	59	27%

Table 5

Effect of ATTLAS on Mean Changes in ESOL Levels
by Delivery Mode and Pre-ESOL Level

Delivery Mode	Pre-ESOL Level	Treatment Condition	n	Mean
CCHL	I [a]	ATTLAS	81	1.52
		Comparison	52	1.40
	II [b]	ATTLAS	59	1.66
		Comparison	24	1.45
ESOL SELF-CONTAINED	III [c]	ATTLAS	59	1.23
		Comparison	10	1.40
	IV [d]	ATTLAS	60	.75
		Comparison	24	.83
ESOL PULL-OUT	III [e]	ATTLAS	165	1.31
		Comparison	41	.93
	IV [f]	ATTLAS	232	.67
		Comparison	59	.59

a. t (131) = .53, p = ns

b. t (81) = .83, p = ns

c. t (67) = -.70, p = ns

d. t (82) = -.76, p = ns

e. t (204) = 3.01, p § .003

f. t (289) = .88, p = ns

Table 6

Effect of Delivery Mode on Mean ESOL Level
Change For ATTLAS Students Pre-ESOL Levels III & IV

Pre-ESOL Level	Delivery Mode	n	Mean
III [a]	Self-Contained	59	1.24
	Pull-out	165	1.31
IV [b]	Self-Contained	60	.75
	Pull-out	232	.67

a. t (222) = -.64, p = ns

b. t (290) = .99, p = ns

Table 7

Mean Ratings of ATTLAS Teachers
on Program Efficacy

RATINGS				
Strongly Disagree 1	*Disagree* 2	*Uncertain* 3	*Strongly Agree* 4	*Agree* 5

ITEM	Teachers SC (n = 11)	PO (n = 18)	CCHL (n = 9)
		MEAN RATINGS	
1. I understand the goals and objectives of the ATTLAS Program.	4.09	4.22	4.56
2. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in questioning strategies.	3.45	3.44	4.25
3. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in asking "clarifying" questions or making "clarifying" statements.	3.40	3.44	4.00
4. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my ability to ask "elaborating" questions.	3.27	3.50	4.00
5. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in asking higher order questions in evaluation and synthesis activities.	3.36	3.56	4.00
6. The training I received in ATTLAS helped me increase the "wait time" between my questions and students' responses.	3.18	3.61	4.11

ITEM	Teachers SC (n = 11)	PO (n = 18)	CCHL (n = 9)
7. The training I received in ATTLAS made me more aware of the effect of my questioning strategies on students' responses.	3.64	3.84	4.00
8. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in organizing higher order activities, such as group problem-solving.	3.36	3.56	3.89
9. The training I received in ATTLAS helped me integrate ATTLAS strategies (i.e., group problem-solving activities) and ESOL instruction.	3.50	3.35	
The training helped me integrate ATTLAS and CCHL.			3.67
10. My students have increased their English proficiency this year.	4.18	4.17	4.44
11. My students have learned more concepts through ATTLAS than they would have learned in a regular ESOL class.	3.45	3.39	
My students have learned more concepts in content subjects through ATTLAS than they would have in a regular CCHL class.			3.67
12. My students have increased their critical thinking abilities this year.	4.00	4.11	4.22
13. My students have increased their critical thinking abilities through ATTLAS more than they would have through a regular ESOL class.	3.54	3.83	
My students increased their critical thinking abilities through ATTLAS more than they would have through a regular CCHL class.			4.00

ITEM	Teachers		
	SC (n = 11)	PO (n = 18)	CCHL (n = 9)
14. The ATTLAS materials were adequate for the level of ESOL of my students.	3.64	3.28	
The ATTLAS materials were adequate for teaching my students in their home language.			3.56
15. The ATTLAS materials were adequate for my students' grade level.	3.64	3.44	3.78
16. The instructional time for ATTLAS was adequate.	3.00	2.94	3.56
17. I enjoyed teaching in ATTLAS.	4.36	3.82	4.11
18. My students were enthusiastic toward the ATTLAS Program.	4.30	4.00	4.22
19. I feel that I need additional training in ATTLAS methodology.	3.54	3.78	3.44
20. I feel that I need additional training in ESOL methodology.	2.90	2.41	
I feel that I need additional training in CCHL methodology.			2.78
21. The ATTLAS Program is an effective way to teach LEP students English.	3.50	3.17	3.44
22. The ATTLAS Program should be continued.	4.00	4.00	4.22
23. The ATTLAS Program should be expanded to LEP students in other grades.	4.00	3.53	3.89

Table 8

Mean Ratings of ATTLAS Principals on Program Efficacy

RATINGS					
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree	NR
1	2	3	4	5	6

		MEAN RATING
1.	I understand the goals and objectives of the ATTLAS Program	4.65
2.	The ATTLAS Program is operating in my school according to the guidelines	4.45
3.	The ATTLAS teachers are enthusiastic toward the program	4.10
4.	The students are enthusiastic toward learning through the ATTLAS Program	4.30
5.	The ATTLAS Program is an effective way to teach limited English proficient students English	4.20
6.	The ATTLAS Program is an effective way to teach limited English proficient students language skills and concepts through the home language	4.06
7.	Through ATTLAS, limited English proficient students can increase their critical thinking skills	4.50
8.	The ATTLAS training my teachers received appeared to be adequate	4.15
9.	The instructional materials were adequate for delivering ATTLAS through ESOL	4.35
10.	The instructional materials were adequate for delivering ATTLAS through Curriculum Content In Home Language (CCHL)	4.00
11.	The instructional time for ATTLAS was adequate	3.75
12.	The ATTLAS Program should be continued	4.55
13.	The ATTLAS Program should be expanded to LEP students in other grades	4.40

NOTE: n = 20

Table 9

Items on Teacher and Principal Surveys in Four Categories Discussed

1. "High" Agreement Ratings: School Personnel Views on Student Progress in English and Critical Thinking

   10. Students increased in English proficiency [a]

   12. Students increased in critical thinking skills [b]

   13. Students increased in critical thinking more through ATTLAS than they would have in a regular ESOL (or CCHL) class

   18. Students were enthusiastic

2. "Uncertain" Agreement Ratings: School Personnel Views on Impact of ATTLAS on English Learning

   11. Students learned more English through ATTLAS than they would have in a regular ESOL class

   21. ATTLAS is an effective way to teach English [c]

3. "Uncertain to Moderately High" Agreement Ratings: School Personnel Views on Effect of ATTLAS Training

   7. Training made me more aware of how my questioning strategies affect students' responses

   2. Training increased my skills in asking questions

   5. Training increased my skills in asking higher order questions in evaluation and synthesis activities

   8. Training increased my skills in organizing higher order activities, such as group problem-solving

   9. Training helped me intergrate ATTLAS and ESOL (CCHL) instruction

   19. I feel that I need additional training in ATTLAS methods [d]

4. "Low" Agreement Ratings: School Personnel Views on Instructional Time

   16. Instructional time was adequate

---

[a] Item 6 on Principal Survey
[b] Item 2 on Principal Survey
[c] Item 5 on Principal Survey
[d] Item 10 on Principal Survey

APPENDIX B

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

M E M O R A N D U M

RT-2827
March 6, 1987

TO: Principals of Elementary Schools With ATTLAS Program

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF ATTLAS PROGRAM

The Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is conducting an evaluation of the ATTLAS Program in selected schools. In order to carry out the evaluation, we are requesting that rosters of participating students be updated. We are also requesting information on the students' ESOL level at the beginning of the current year, 1986-87; and the ESOL test used to determine the ESOL level.

Please distribute the enclosed roster(s) to the ATTLAS teacher(s) identified, for updating and filling in the information requested. The completed rosters should then be returned in the envelopes provided, by March 30, 1987. If you have any further questions, please contact Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb or Dr. Maria Ariza, at 376-1506.

Your cooperation is very much aporeciated.

RT/SR:cj

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Horace L. Martin
Mr. Gary Rito
Mr. Ralph Robinett
Area Directors
Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb
Mrs. Mercedes Toural
Dr. Maria Ariza

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
ATTLAS EVALUATION
UPDATE OF ROSTERS AND STUDENTS' ESOL LEVEL INFORMATION

School _____ ATTLAS Teacher _____ Program Delivery: ESOL _____ CCHL* _____

In order to evaluate the ATTLAS program in elementary schools, the Office of Educational Accountability is updating current rosters. The purpose of this roster is to obtain each student's ESOL level as it was in September, 1986; the name of the ESOL test used in September (or June) 1986 to determine the ESOL level; the name of the ESOL test which will be used in May/June, 1987; and the number of months that the student has been in the ATTLAS program. Write this information in the space provided under each column heading. (Teachers delivering ATTLAS in CCHL should obtain ESOL information from the student's ESOL teacher, if necessary). New ATTLAS students not on the roster should be added in at the end of the list. Please return your completed roster to Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb by March 30, 1987. Thank you for your cooperation.

Student Name	ESOL Level Sept. 1986	ESOL Test Used for ESOL Level Sept. (or June) '86	ESOL Test To Be Used for ESOL Level May/ June '87	Number of Months in ATTLAS Sept. '86 - Mar. '87

*Previously referred to as BCC

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

M E M O R A N D U M

RT-2906
May 8, 1987

TO: Principals of Elementary Schools with ATTLAS Program

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: ATTLAS STUDENT INFORMATION

As you know, the Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is conducting an evaluation of the ATTLAS Program in selected schools. The primary purpose of ATTLAS (Augmenting Thinking Through Language Acquisition Skills) is to increase the rate in which limited English proficient student acquire English, by incorporating critical thinking skills into ESOL or Curriculum Content in the Home Language classes. In order to carry out the evaluation, we are requesting information on the students' ESOL level at the end of the current year, 1986-87.

Please distribute the enclosed roster(s) to the ATTLAS teacher(s) identified for filling in the information requested. The completed rosters should then be returned in the envelopes provided, by June 5, 1987. If you have any further questions, please contact Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb or Dr. Maria Ariza, at 376-1506.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

RT/SR:cj

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Horace L. Martin
Mr. Gary Rito
Mr. Ralph Robinett
Area Directors
Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb
Mrs. Mercedes Toural
Dr. Maria Ariza

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
ATTLAS EVALUATION
STUDENTS' END OF YEAR ESOL LEVEL

School _____ ATTLAS Teacher _____ Program Delivery: ESOL _____ CCHL* _____

In order to evaluate the ATTLAS program in elementary schools, the Office of Educational Accountability is requesting that you fill in each student's ESOL level as of the end of May, 1987. Write this information in the space provided next to the student's name. (Teachers delivering ATTLAS in CCHL should obtain ESOL information from the student's ESOL teacher, if necessary). Please return your completed roster to Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb by June 5, 1987. Thank you for your cooperation.

Student Name	ESOL Level May 1987

*Previously referred to as BCC

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

M E M O R A N D U M

RT-2910
May 8, 1987

TO: Principals of Elementary Schools with ATTLAS Program

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: SURVEY OF ATTLAS PRINCIPALS

As you know, The Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is conducting an evaluation of the ATTLAS Program in selected schools. As part o the evaluation, we are conducting a survey of participating ATTLAS principals.

Please take a few moments to fill out the enclosed brief survey. DO NOT sign your name, as survey data will be treated anonymously. The completed surveys should then be returned in the envelopes provided, by June 12, 1987. If you have any further questions, please contact Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb or Dr. Maria Ariza, at 376-1506.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

RT/SR:de

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Horace L. Martin
Mr. Gary Rito
Mr. Ralph Robinett
Area Directors
Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb
Mrs. Mercedes Toural
Dr. Maria Ariza

41

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

SURVEY OF ATTLAS PRINCIPALS

PLEASE WRITE THE NUMBER OF THE RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR RESPONSE.

RATINGS					
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	6

RATING

1. I understand the goals and objectives of the ATTLAS Program ..... ____
2. The ATTLAS Program is operating in my school according to the guidelines .... ____
3. The ATTLAS teachers are enthusiastic toward the program ..... ____
4. The students are enthusiastic toward learning through the ATTLAS Program .... ____
5. The ATTLAS Program is an effective way to teach limited English proficient students English ..... ____
6. The ATTLAS Program is an effective way to teach limited English proficient students language skills and concepts through the home language ..... ____
7. Through ATTLAS, limited English proficient students can increase their critical thinking skills ..... ____
8. The ATTLAS training my teachers received appeared to be adequate ..... ____
9. The instructional materials were adequate for delivering ATTLAS through ESOL ..... ____
10. The instructional materials were adequate for delivering ATTLAS through Curriculum Content In Home Language (CCHL) ..... ____
11. The instructional time for ATTLAS was adequate ..... ____
12. The ATTLAS Program should be continued ..... ____
13. The ATTLAS Program should be expanded to LEP students in other grades ..... ____

PLEASE WRITE A BRIEF RESPONSE TO QUESTION 14. (USE REVERSE SIDE IF NEEDED)

14. How could the ATTLAS Program be improved?

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

RT-2907
May 8, 1987

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Principals of Elementary Schools with ATTLAS Program

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: SURVEY OF ATTLAS TEACHERS

As you know, The Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is conducting an evaluation of the ATTLAS Program in selected schools. As part of the evaluation, we are conducting a survey of participating ATTLAS teachers.

Please distribute the enclosed surveys to the ATTLAS teacher(s), for the information requested. Teachers should NOT sign their names, as survey data will be treated anonymously. The completed surveys should then be returned in the envelopes provided, by June 5, 1987. If you you have any further questions, please contact Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb or Dr. Maria Ariza, at 376-1506.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

RT/SR:cj

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Horace L. Martin
Mr. Gary Rito
Mr. Ralph Robinett
Area Directors
Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb
Mrs. Mercedes Toural
Dr. Maria Ariza

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
1450 NORTHEAST SECOND AVENUE
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132

DR. LEONARD BRITTON
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

DR. RAY TURNER
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
(305) 376-1506

May 6, 1987

Dear ATTLAS Teacher:

As part of the evaluation of the ATTLAS Program, the Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is surveying ATTLAS teachers. As one of the ATTLAS teachers, your opinions and experiences are important to this evaluation.

Please read and complete the enclosed survey. It should take approximately fifteen minutes of your time. Do NOT put your name on the survey, as we want to keep your responses anonymous. When you have finished, return the survey in the enclosed envelope to Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb, #9999, Room 500, by June 5.

If you have any questions, call Dr. Rothfarb at 376-1506. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Ray Turner/sm

Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SR:de

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

SURVEY OF ATTLAS ESOL TEACHERS

CHECK THE RESPONSES THAT APPLY.

1. How is ATTLAS delivered to your students?

   Self-contained class ____ Pull-out class ____

2. How many classes of ATTLAS do you teach, and in what grades?

Number of ATTLAS Classes	Grades (Fill in)
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____

3. How long have you taught ESOL? (Include the present year.)

   0-5 years _____ 11-15 years _____

   6-10 years _____ 16-20 years _____

   21+ years _____

4. How long have you been a teacher? (Include the present year.)

   0-5 years _____ 11-15 years _____

   6-10 years _____ 16-20 years _____

   21+ years _____

5. PLEASE LIST ANY DEGREE, STATE CERTIFICATION, AND/OR TRAINING YOU HAVE IN TEACHING ESOL. USE REVERSE SIDE IF NECESSARY.

   Degree _____ State Certification _____

University Course(s) Specify:	Staff Development in ESOL (Specify):
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Auth: MIS, Exp. Date: June 30, 1987

IN QUESTIONS 6-24 WRITE THE NUMBER OF THE RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR RESPONSE.

RATINGS				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Rating

6. I understand the goals and objectives of the ATTLAS Program ..... _____

7. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in questioning strategies ..... _____

8. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in asking "clarifying" questions or making "clarifying" statements ..... _____

9. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my ability to ask "elaborating" questions ..... _____

10. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in asking higher order questions in evaluation and synthesis activities ..... _____

11. The training I received in ATTLAS helped me increase the "wait time" between my questions and students' responses ..... _____

12. The training I received in ATTLAS made me more aware of the effect of my questioning strategies on students' responses ..... _____

13. The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in organizing higher order activities, such as group problem-solving ..... _____

14. The training I received in ATTLAS helped me integrate ATTLAS strategies (i.e., group problem-solving activities) and ESOL instruction . _____

15. My students have increased their English proficiency this year ..... _____

16. My students have learned more English through ATTLAS than they would have learned in a regular ESOL class ..... _____

17. My students have increased their critical thinking abilities this year ..... _____

18. My students have increased their critical thinking abilities through ATTLAS more than they would have through a regular ESOL class ..... _____

19. The ATTLAS materials were adequate for the level of ESOL of my students ..... _____

20. The ATTLAS materials were adequate for my students' grade level ..... _____

RATINGS				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Rating

21. The instructional time for ATTLAS was adequate ..... _____

22. I enjoyed teaching in ATTLAS ..... _____

23. My students were enthusiastic toward the ATTLAS Program ..... _____

24. I feel that I need additional training in ATTLAS methodology ..... _____

25. I feel that I need additional training in ESOL methodology ..... _____

26. The ATTLAS Program is an effective way to teach LEP students English ..... _____

27. The ATTLAS Program should be continued ..... _____

28. The ATTLAS Program should be expanded to LEP students in other grades ..... _____

PLEASE WRITE A BRIEF RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 29-30.

29. What other kinds of training would enhance/improve your skills as an ATTLAS teacher?

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. How could the ATTLAS Program be improved?

_____

_____

_____

_____

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

SURVEY OF ATTLAS CCHL TEACHERS

CHECK THE RESPONSES THAT APPLY.

1. How is ATTLAS delivered to your students?

   Pull-out group of 8-14 students ____

   Pull-out class of 15-30 students ____

   Other (describe): _____

2. How many classes of ATTLAS do you teach, and in what grades?

Number of ATTLAS Classes	Grades (Fill in)
1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____

3. How long have you taught CCHL? (Include the present year.)

   0-5 years _____ 11-15 years _____

   6-10 years _____ 16-20 years _____

   21+ years _____

4. How long have you been a teacher? (Include the present year.)

   0-5 years _____ 11-15 years _____

   6-10 years _____ 16-20 years _____

   21+ years _____

5. PLEASE LIST THE COURSES IN TEACHING CCHL WHICH YOU HAVE TAKEN. USE REVERSE SIDE IF NECESSARY.

Staff Development courses in CCHL (Specify):	University Course(s) (Specify):
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: June 30, 1987

IN QUESTIONS 6-24 WRITE THE NUMBER OF THE RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR RESPONSE.

RATINGS				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

		Rating
6.	I understand the goals and objectives of the ATTLAS Program	_____
7.	The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in questioning strategies	_____
8.	The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in asking "clarifying" questions or making "clarifying" statements	_____
9.	The training I received in ATTLAS increased my ability to ask "elaborating" questions	_____
10.	The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in asking higher order questions in evaluation and synthesis activities	_____
11.	The training I received in ATTLAS helped me increase the "wait time" between my questions and students' responses	_____
12.	The training I received in ATTLAS made me more aware of the effect of my questioning strategies on students' responses	_____
13.	The training I received in ATTLAS increased my skills in organizing higher order activities, such as group problem-solving	_____
14.	The training I received in ATTLAS helped me integrate ATTLAS strategies (i.e., group problem-solving activities) and CCHL instruction .	_____
15.	My students have increased their English proficiency this year	_____
16.	My students have learned more concepts in content subjects through ATTLAS than they would have learned in a regular CCHL class	_____
17.	My students have increased their critical thinking abilities this year	_____
18.	My students have increased their critical thinking abilities through ATTLAS more than they would have through a regular CCHL class	_____
19.	The ATTLAS materials were adequate for teaching my students in their home language	_____
20.	The ATTLAS materials were adequate for my students' grade level	_____

RATINGS				
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

		Rating
21.	The instructional time for ATTLAS was adequate	_____
22.	I enjoyed teaching in ATTLAS	_____
23.	My students were enthusiastic toward the ATTLAS Program	_____
24.	I feel that I need additional training in ATTLAS methodology	_____
25.	I feel that I need additional training in CCHL methodology	_____
26.	The ATTLAS Program is an effective way to teach language development skills to LEP students	_____
27.	The ATTLAS Program should be continued	_____
28.	The ATTLAS Program should be expanded to LEP students in other grades	_____

PLEASE WRITE A BRIEF RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 29-30.

29. What other kinds of training would enhance/improve your skills as an ATTLAS teacher?

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. How could the ATTLAS Program be improved?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Auth: MIS; Exp. Date: June 30, 1987

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

RT-2939
May 29, 1987

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Mr. Gary Rito, Director of ATTLAS Program

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: SURVEY OF ATTLAS RESOURCE TEACHERS

As you know, The Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is conducting an evaluation of the ATTLAS Program in selected schools. As part of the evaluation, we are conducting a survey of the ATTLAS resource teachers.

Please distribute the enclosed surveys to the ATTLAS teacher(s), for the information requested. Teachers should NOT sign their names, as survey data will be treated anonymously. The completed surveys should then be returned in the envelopes provided, by June 12, 1987. If you have any further questions, please contact Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb or Dr. Maria Ariza, at 376-1506.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

RT/SR:cj

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Horace L. Martin
Mr. Ralph Robinett
Area Directors
Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb
Mrs. Mercedes Toural
Dr. Maria Ariza

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
1450 NORTHEAST SECOND AVENUE
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132

DR. LEONARD BRITTON
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

DR. RAY TURNER
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
(305) 376-1506

May 29, 1987

Dear ATTLAS Resource Teacher:

As part of the evaluation of the ATTLAS Resource Program, the Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is surveying ATTLAS resource teachers. As one of these teachers, your opinions and experiences are important to this evaluation.

Please read and complete the enclosed survey. It should take approximately thirty minutes of your time. Do NOT put your name on the survey as we want to keep your responses anonymous. When you have finished, return the survey in the enclosed envelope to Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb, =9999, Room 500, by June 12.

If you have any questions, call Dr. Rothfarb at 376-1506. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

RT/SR:cj
Enclosure(s)

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

SURVEY OF ATTLAS RESOURCE TEACHERS

1. Briefly, what are your major duties and responsibilities in the ATTLAS Program? (Use reverse side, if necessary).

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. a) Have you taught ESOL? Yes___ No___
If "yes," how long did you teach ESOL? _____years

b) Have you taught CCHL? Yes___ No___
If "yes," how long did you teach CCHL? _____years

3. Have you had any other teaching experience? Yes___ No___
If "yes," please describe below.

_____

_____

_____

4. How long have you been a teacher? (Include the present year.)

0-5 years _____ 11-15 years _____

6-10 years _____ 16-20 years _____ 21+ years _____

5. PLEASE LIST ANY DEGREE, STATE CERTIFICATION, AND/OR TRAINING YOU HAVE IN TEACHING ESOL. USE REVERSE SIDE IF NECESSARY.

Degree _____ State Certification _____

University Course(s) Specify: Staff Development in ESOL (Specify):

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

6. PLEASE LIST THE COURSES IN TEACHING CCHL WHICH YOU HAVE TAKEN. USE REVERSE SIDE IF NECESSARY.

Staff Development Courses in CCHL (Specify): University Courses(s) (Specify):

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

7. PLEASE LIST THE COURSES/TRAINING WHICH YOU HAVE TAKEN IN CRITICAL THINKING.

Staff Development Courses in Critical Thinking (Specify):	University Courses(s) (Specify):
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

IN QUESTIONS 8-21 WRITE THE NUMBER OF THE RATING WHICH BEST REFLECTS YOUR RESPONSE.

RATINGS

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	6

		Rating
8.	I understand the goals and objectives of the ATTLAS Program	_____
9.	The ATTLAS Program is operating in the schools assigned to me according to the guidelines	_____
10.	The ATTLAS teachers are enthusiastic toward the program	_____
11.	The students are enthusiastic toward learning through the ATTLAS Program	_____
12.	The ATTLAS Program is an effective way to teach limited English proficient students English	_____
13.	The ATTLAS Program is an effective way to teach limited English proficient students language skills and concepts through the home language	_____
14.	Through ATTLAS, limited English proficient students can increase their critical thinking skills	_____
15.	My contacts with ATTLAS teachers were sufficient	_____
16.	The training ATTLAS teachers received appeared to be adequate	_____
17.	The instructional materials were adequate for delivering ATTLAS through ESOL	_____
18.	The instructional materials were adequate for delivering ATTLAS through Curriculum Content in Home Language (CCHL)	_____
19.	The instructional time for ATTLAS was adequate	_____
20.	The ATTLAS Program should be continued	_____
21.	The ATTLAS Program should be expanded to LEP students in other grades	_____

Auth: FM; Exp. Date: June 30, 1987

..EASE WRITE A BRIEF RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS 22-26 (USE REVERSE SIDE IF NEEDED).

22. What are the strengths of the ATTLAS Program?

23. What problems (if any) did you encounter in helping implement the ATTLAS Program?

24. Beyond the training given this year, what other kinds of training would enhance/improve the skills of ATTLAS teachers?

25. What other kinds of training would enhance/improve your skills as an ATTLAS resource teacher?

26. How could the ATTLAS Program be improved?

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

M E M O R A N D U M

RT-2908
May 26, 1987

TO: Principals of Selected Elementary Schools

FROM: Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF ATTLAS PROGRAM

The Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is conducting an evaluation of the ATTLAS Program (Augmenting Thinking Through Language Acquisition Skills). The primary purpose of ATTLAS is to increase the rate in which Limited English Proficient (LEP) students acquire English, by incorporating critical thinking skills into ESOL or Curriculum Content in the Home Language (CCHL) classes. As part of the evaluation, OEA will compare gains in ESOL levels achieved by LEP students in ATTLAS during 1986-87, with gains achieved by LEP students in comparison schools. Through consultation with the Area Office, your school has been selected as one of the comparison schools for this evaluation.

Please distribute the enclosed forms to the ESOL and CCHL teachers identified, who should fill in the information requested. The completed forms should then be returned in the envelopes provided by June 5, 1987. If you have any further questions please contact Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb or Dr. Maria Ariza at 376-1506. Thank you for your cooperation.

RT/SR:cj

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Horace L. Martin
Mr. Gary Rito
Mr. Ralph Robinett
Area Directors
Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb
Mrs. Mercedes Toural
Dr. Maria Ariza

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

BOARD ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

DR. LEONARD BRITTON
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

DR. RAY TURNER
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
(305) 376-1506

1450 NORTHEAST SECOND AVENUE
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33132

DADE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD
MR. ROBERT RENICK, CHAIRMAN
MR. WILLIAM H. TURNER, VICE-CHAIRMAN
MR. G. HOLMES BRADDOCK
MR. PAUL L. CEJAS
DR. ROSA CASTRO FEINBERG
DR. MICHAEL KROP
MS. JANET R. McALILEY

May 8, 1987

Dear ESOL or CCHL Teacher:

The Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) is conducting an evaluation of the ATTLAS Program (Augmenting Thinking Through Language Acquisition Skills). The primary purpose of ATTLAS is to increase the rate in which limited English proficient students acquire English by incorporating critical thinking skills into ESOL or CCHL classes. As part of the evaluation, OEA will compare gains in ESOL levels achieved by LEP students in ATTLAS during 1986-87, with gains achieved by LEP students in comparison schools. The students in your _____ _____ class have been selected for this comparison.

On the enclosed forms, please write in the students' name, identification number and ESOL level in September 1986, and in May 1987, under the appropriate column headings. (CCHL teachers should obtain the ESOL levels from the students' ESOL teacher). Return the completed forms in the enclosed envelope by June 5, to Dr. Sylvia Rothfarb, 9999, Room 500. If you have any questions, please call Dr. Rothfarb or Dr. Maria Ariza at 376-1506.

We appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ray Turner/sm

Ray Turner, Assistant Superintendent
Office of Educational Accountability

RT/SR:cj

Enclosures

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

ATTLAS EVALUATION: COMPARISON STUDENTS' BEGINNING AND END OF YEAR ESOL LEVELS

School _____ ESOL Teacher _____ CCHL Teacher _____

Student Name	ID Number	ESOL Level September 1986	ESOL Level May 1987

BOARD FOLLOW-UP FOR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 9, 1987

BOARD ITEM D-41

Staff to address concerns regarding the inclusion of an ATTLAS-type program in Spanish-S and BCC. (Dr. Feinberg)

OVERVIEW

The Augmenting Thinking Through Language Acquisition Skills program (ATTLAS) was designed as a three-year experimental curriculum project to provide information to staff regarding the feasibility of including direct instruction in higher order thinking skills in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) and Curriculum Content in the Home Language (BCC) classes.

The project began in 1986-87 with 20 pilot schools located throughout the district. Project teachers were trained to provide instruction which incorporated specific teaching strategies and specialized materials designed to promote a classroom atmosphere which would cause students to utilize analytical reasoning skills to solve problems.

A secondary purpose of the project was to study the effects of specific thinking skills instruction on the subsequent acquisition of language skills.

THREE-YEAR PLAN

1986/87

During 1986-87, the initial implementation year, ESOL students at Levels III and IV received ATTLAS-type instruction in English during the ESOL period. ESOL students at Levels I and II (those eligible for Curriculum Content in the Home Language-BCC) received ATTLAS-type training in the home language from a specially allocated bilingual teacher. These teachers (9-BCC, 23 ESOL pull-out, and 10 ESOL self-contained=total 42) experimented with various teaching strategies, alternative curriculum materials, and classroom organizational techniques to determine if students could, in fact, improve their ability to think critically (Strategic Planning Goal VII) without hindering their language acquisition skills. As noted in the Evaluation of the ATTLAS Program (OEA, August 1987) the program was successful in creating a thinking skills classroom atmosphere and even had a slight positive effect on students' ability to move through the ESOL program.

1987/88

Based on the results of the OEA evaluation and program personnel feedback, the program will be adjusted in the following manner:

1. Two schools (Kendale Elementary and Edison Park Elementary) will be dropped from the experiment (by request of the principals).

2. One new school (Shadowlawn) will be added in order to include Haitian students.

3. The program will be extended to additional classes in eight schools which were involved in the program last year.

4. Eighteen new teachers will be trained (8 to replace teachers who left the program and 10 new to the project).

5. **Adjustments to the ESOL delivery will be made to include more self-contained teachers (1986/87 10 self contained ESOL - 1987/88 25 self-contained ESOL)**

Schools	1986/87 20	1987/88 19
BCC	9	9
ESOL (pull-out)	23	15
ESOL (self-contained)	10	25
	42	49

6. Students in self-contained ESOL Levels I and II will receive ATTLAS-type instruction in English during ESOL and with additional optional instruction in the home language during BCC class time.

Also during the first semester of 1987-88, an analysis will be made of those ATTLAS-type activities which best lend themselves to infusion into the already tightly-structured home language arts (Spanish-S) program. These activities will be piloted during the second semester of 1987-88.

Project teachers will also identify those teaching strategies which may have potential for inclusion in staff development activities for all ESOL and BCC teachers. Staff from the Division of Bilingual/Foreign Language Education will subsequently evaluate these strategies to determine the extent to which they can be incorporated into the existing ESOL, BCC and Spanish-S curriculum.

1988/89

The ATTLAS project will conclude in June 1989. During the school year, staff will utilize existing training mechanisms to incorporate those ATTLAS-type strategies which have been determined to be effective, into ESOL and BCC at a district level. ATTLAS project teachers will be utilized to assist in training [illegible].

The School Board of Dade County, Florida adheres to a policy of nondiscrimination in educational programs/activities and employment and strives affirmatively to provide equal opportunity for all as required by:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964– prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended - prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 - prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex.

Age Discrimination Act of 1967, as amended - prohibits discrimination on the basis of age between 40 and 70.

Section 504 of the Rehbilitation Act of 1973 - prohibits discrimination against the handicapped.

Florida Educational Equity Act - prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, national origin, marital status or handicap against a student or employee.

Veterans are provided re-employment rights in accordance with P.L. 93–508 (Federal) and Section 295.07, Florida Statutes, which also stipulates categorical preferences for employment.