Report to the Legislature:

English Language Acquisition Professional Development

Line Item 7027-1004

February 2008

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Department of Education

350 Main Street, Malden, Massachusetts 02148-5023

Telephone: (781) 338-3000
TTY: N.E.T. Relay 1-800-439-2370

Jeffrey Nellhaus
Acting Commissioner of Education

February 2008

Dear Members of the General Court:

The Department of Education respectfully submits this *Report to the Legislature: English Language Acquisition Professional Development* pursuant to Chapter 61 of the Acts of 2007, line item 7027-1004, and pursuant to G.L c. 69s.1I, the Department of Education addressing the following provisions:

> *"7027-1004…For English language acquisition, professional development to improve the academic performance of English language learners and effectively implement sheltered English immersion as outlined in chapter 386 of the acts of 2002.…"* and
> M.G.L. Chapter 69, section 1I (last paragraph)
> *"…The commissioner annually shall analyze and publish data reported by school districts under this section regarding English language learners programs and limited English proficient students.…[and] shall submit annually a report to the joint committee on education, arts and humanities on such data on a statewide and school district basis, including, but not limited to, by language group and type of English language learners programs."*

Sheltered English immersion is the program model required for most English language learners in Massachusetts's public schools since the change in the law in 2002. School district implementation of sheltered English immersion (SEI) began in school districts in September 2003 and has two components, English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction and sheltered content instruction taught in English, with all printed classroom materials in English. The change from Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) to sheltered English immersion has had a substantial impact on the skills and knowledge needed by elementary and secondary subject matter content teachers of English language learners. Under TBE, most English language learners had the opportunity to learn content (e.g., mathematics and science) through instruction in their first language while, at the same time, taking classes to develop proficiency in English. Now, English language learners must learn content through instruction delivered in English, with all printed materials in English. Content teachers must now adjust, or "shelter," their instruction to make it comprehensible to students not yet proficient in English.

The majority of classroom teachers in Massachusetts did not acquire the skills and knowledge required to effectively teach English language learners and shelter content instruction during their teacher preparation programs. This has created an urgent need for teachers of English language learners to acquire new skills and knowledge. The need to educate approximately

56,000 English language learners in Massachusetts has resulted in a statewide need to provide more hours of daily ESL instruction to English language learners, and consequently a need for more licensed ESL teachers throughout the state. Sheltered English immersion has also made it urgent that we reexamine and modify the role of the ESL teacher and the purpose and content of ESL instruction. Learning academic English is increasingly urgent, because subject matter content learning depends on students having relatively high levels of English language proficiency.

The Department is currently using a combination of state and federal funds to support the second year of the Massachusetts English Language Teacher Initiative (MELT), designed to provide instruction, support and mentoring to 40 licensed teachers currently employed in Boston Public Schools and Worcester Public Schools who wish to become licensed ESL teachers. The first cohort of MELT participants took the MTEL licensure test in spring 2007; 73 percent of those who participated obtained a passing score and became licensed ESL teachers. The second cohort will take the MTEL test in March 2008; an even higher pass rate is expected this year.

There are 290 school districts that report at least one English language learner, but ESL teachers are employed in only 129 districts. More districts currently need ESL teachers due to changing demographics, but face a shortage of available teachers. In the districts reporting 100 or more English language learners and that receive Title III/NCLB funds, the districts were asked to report the number of hours of ESL instruction received by ELL students at different levels of English language proficiency at different grades. Districts reported that:

- Approximately 8,200 English language learners receive no ESL instruction.
- Among those 8,200 students, approximately 2,800 are at the lowest levels of English proficiency (beginning and early intermediate).
- Approximately 5,160 English language learners receive 1–5 hours per week of ESL instruction.

Attachments 7 and 8 present district data on English language learners in Massachusetts by school district and English language learner program type using October 2007 data and the number of students in identified first language classifications. Data are provided for the five most common first languages of English language learners in Massachusetts: Spanish, Portuguese, Khmer, Vietnamese, and Creole Haitian. Others are available upon request.

The Department's budget request would increase the training opportunities for educators. I respectfully request support for this subgroup of students and their educators. If you have questions please feel free to contact Juliane Dow, Associate Commissioner, or Kathryn Riley, Administrator, Office of Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Nellhaus
Acting Commissioner

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The Department of Education respectfully submits this *Report to the Legislature: on English Language Acquisition Professional Development* pursuant to Chapter 61 of the Acts of 2007, line item 7027-1004, and pursuant to G.L c. 69s.1I, the Department of Education addressing the following provisions:

> *"7027-1004…For English language acquisition, professional development to improve the academic performance of English language learners and effectively implement sheltered English immersion as outlined in chapter 386 of the acts of 2002; provided, that the department shall only approve professional development courses and offerings with proven, replicable results in improving teacher performance, and which shall have demonstrated the use of best practices, as determined by the department, including data comparing pre-training and post-training knowledge; provided further, that the department shall, not later than February 15, 2007, provide a report on the number of educators who have received such training since passage of chapter 386 of the acts of 2002, the estimated number who need such additional training, and a review and analysis of the most effective types of professional development and the most common gaps in the knowledge base of educators implementing English immersion and teaching English language acquisition, along with legislative or regulatory recommendations of the department; and provided further, that said report shall be provided to the secretary of administration and finance, the senate president, the speaker of the house, the chairs of the house and senate ways and means committees and the house and senate chairs of the joint committee on education."*
>
> M.G.L. Chapter 69, section 1I (last paragraph)
> *"…The commissioner annually shall analyze and publish data reported by school districts under this section regarding English language learners programs and limited English proficient students. Publication shall include, but need not be limited to, availability on the department's worldwide web site. The commissioner shall submit annually a report to the joint committee on education, arts and humanities on such data on a statewide and school district basis, including, but not limited to, by language group and type of English language learners programs."*

The Legislature appropriated $470,987 in FY 08 through line item, 7027-1004, to support professional development for educators of English language learners implementing sheltered English immersion and teaching English language acquisition. In FY 07 the Legislature appropriated $500,000 through the same line item and in FY 05 and FY 06 appropriated $1,000,000 each year through line item 7061-9404 for a similar purpose.

Background
Sheltered English immersion is the program model required for most English language learners in Massachusetts's public schools since the change in the law in 2002. This new law was implemented in school districts beginning in September 2003. Sheltered English immersion (SEI) has two components, English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction and sheltered content instruction taught in English, with all printed classroom materials in English.

The change from Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) to sheltered English immersion has had a substantial impact on the skills and knowledge needed by elementary and secondary content teachers of English language learners. Under TBE, most English language learners had the opportunity to learn content (e.g., mathematics and science) through instruction in their first language while, they were, at the same time taking classes to develop proficiency in English. Now, due to the Commonwealth's SEI mandate, English language learners must learn content through instruction delivered in English, with all printed materials in English. Content teachers must now adjust, or "shelter", their instruction to make it comprehensible to students not yet proficient in English. Few teachers in Massachusetts knew how to do this when the new law took effect.

Another consequence of the new law has been that English language learners must acquire academic levels of English proficiency more quickly than before. If they don't, their ability to successfully comprehend content instruction delivered in English will be compromised. This calls for an emphasis on improving the quality and quantity of English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction, and has led to the recognition that we have a critical the shortage of licensed ESL teachers in the state.

Thus, the recent transition to sheltered English immersion for English language learners has created two distinct professional development needs among the state's educators: the need for elementary and secondary content teachers to improve their skills in sheltering content for English language learners, and the need to address the shortage of English as a Second Language teachers across the state. Each is addressed separately below.

Research on Professional Development for Educators of English Language Learners

There is growing consensus in the literature regarding both the elements of effective professional development for all teachers, and the additional elements necessary for teachers of English language learners. To be effective, professional development must accommodate the teachers' desire to be self-directed, provide an opportunity for timely application of new skills and knowledge, and be integrated into the context of the daily experience of a teachers' work. Also, high quality professional development must be internally coherent, rigorous, and aligned with the principles of effective teaching and learning.

In addition to embodying these more universal characteristics of high quality professional development, then professional development for teachers of English language learners must include specific knowledge relevant to teaching English language learners, including the basic tenants of bilingualism and second language acquisition, definitions of language proficiency, the role of first language and culture in learning and teaching, and the demands of academic language, spoken and written, in content classrooms. (Clair, 1993) A short bibliography of this research is included as Attachment 6.

II. Educators Implementing English Immersion: Elementary and Secondary Content Teachers of English Language Learners

The majority of classroom teachers in Massachusetts did not acquire the skills and knowledge required to effectively teach English language learners and shelter content instruction during their teacher preparation programs. The change in our state law mandating that schools adopt a Sheltered English Immersion instructional model, and the legal requirement that English language learners be taught by teachers with appropriate qualifications, created an urgent need for teachers of English language learners to acquire new skills and knowledge.

Gaps in Knowledge
After reviewing relevant research and consulting with leaders in the field of English language learner educators in Massachusetts and nationally, Department staff identified the most common gaps in the knowledge and skill base of educators implementing English immersion. In a Memorandum in June 2004, *Qualifications of Teachers of Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students in Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) Classrooms,* the Commissioner of Education described the skills and knowledge required to effectively shelter content instruction. (See Attachment 1)

They were organized into four categories, and the appropriate number of hours of professional development needed to cover each topic in sufficient depth was identified:

Category 1   Second Language Learning and Teaching
10–15 hours of professional development
Category 2   Sheltering Content Instruction
30–40 hours of professional development
Category 3   Assessing Speaking and Listening
10 hours of professional development
Category 4   Reading in the Sheltered Content Classroom
15–20 hours of professional development

Use of Funds
Over the four-year period from fiscal year 2005 to fiscal year 2008, the Department received a total of $2.9 million in the state budget to offer professional development to teachers of English language learners. This funding covered professional development in categories 1, 2, and 4; category 3 training (on delivering the state's assessment of English language proficiency) is funded separately and is not discussed in this report. Those funds have been used to design professional development curricula and train teams of teachers to deliver these curricula in their home districts and to purchase training services from outside providers. All of the professional development designed and delivered with these funds has been aligned with the four categories of teacher knowledge/skills described above. A chart detailing the professional development delivered to date is presented below. A more extensive accounting is provided in Attachment 2.

SEI Professional Development Category	Trained 2004–2007	Number of hours of training provided
Category 1 for Teachers	5,538	66,456
Category 1 for Trainers	160	2,400
Category 2 for Teachers	5,053	151,590
Category 2 for Trainers	174	5,220
Category 4 for Teachers	995	19,900
Category 4 for Trainers	85	2,125
Totals	**Teachers 11,586** **Trainers 419** **Total 12,005**	**Teachers 237,946** **Trainers 9,745** **Total 247,691**

Teachers from 60 school districts, in association with 12 educational collaboratives, have received services supported by these funds. Attachment 3 and Attachment 4 list the districts and collaboratives that have participated in at least one of these professional development opportunities.

Future Need
English language learners are widely distributed in schools and districts throughout Massachusetts. At present, there are 57 districts that have reported an enrollment of 100 or more English language learners, while 290 districts report at least one English language learner. Districts that enroll fewer than 100 English language learners are often referred to as "low incidence" districts, and within these low-incidence districts there may be 10 or 20 English language learners, with English language learners distributed across all grades and all schools within the district.

It is within this complex context that estimates of future need for SEI teacher training are made. The following assumptions are made:

1) Each elementary and secondary educator who teaches English language learners needs to complete all four categories of professional development to develop the knowledge and skills required to effectively support English language development and deliver sheltered content instruction.
2) The acquisition of this knowledge and skill on average requires 70 hours of training.
3) Using the data provided above, if the total number of hours of teacher training provided to date is divided by 70, it can be said that the equivalent of 3,400 educators have been fully trained to date.
4) There are approximately 56,000 English language learners currently enrolled in Massachusetts public schools as reported by Massachusetts school districts in the October 2007 SIMS (Student Information Management System) data collection.
5) Given the current wide distribution of English language learner students across Massachusetts districts and schools, the Department estimates that a fully trained teacher is needed for every seven English language learners.
6) Using this one-to-seven ratio, approximately 8,000 teachers statewide require training on sheltered English instruction. Our data suggest that many teachers have received at

least some professional development in this area, based on the large number who have completed Category 1 or 2 training. However, relatively few are fully trained; only 995 have completed Category 4, so the total number of fully trained teachers must be 995 or fewer.

7) Thus, we estimate that about 6,000 to 7,000 teachers statewide require more training before they are fully prepared to serve English language learners in their classrooms. Note that due to retirements and the high rates of turnover in many high-need schools and districts, this is likely a conservative estimate of the state's unmet need for additional ELL teacher training.

III. <u>Educators Implementing English Immersion: English as a Second Language Teachers</u>

ESL Teacher Shortage

The majority of English language learners in Massachusetts must now learn all subject matter content in English. There is a resulting statewide need to provide more hours of daily English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction for English language learners, and consequently a need for more licensed ESL teachers in most districts that serve English language learners.[1] The Department emphasized the need for more ESL instruction in a Memorandum of Guidance in June 2005 that made recommendations as to the number of hours of ESL instruction for English language learners at the four levels of English proficiency used in Massachusetts. (See <u>Attachment 5</u>.) An excerpt from this guidance appears below.

English Proficiency Level: Beginning and Early Intermediate

"Students at the *Beginning and Early Intermediate* performance levels include those who cannot produce or understand any English, spoken or written, as well as those students with very basic skills in English. It is important that these students be involved in English language development instruction for a substantial component of their school day…"

- English language development (ELD) instruction: 2.5 hours per day to one full day, delivered by a teacher with an ESL/English language learner license

English Proficiency Level: Intermediate

LEP students at the intermediate level have not yet developed academic proficiency in English, and often have different levels of proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing. Sheltered content instruction delivered by a qualified teacher can be tailored to make content instruction comprehensible and learning tasks engaging. Intermediate level students also require ELD instruction as outlined below.

- English language development (ELD) instruction: 1–2 hours per day, delivered by a teacher with an ESL/English language learner license

---

[1] Additionally, M.GL. 71a, Section 24, mandates that by July 2008, each school district will have at least one teacher who is certified in English as a second language, bilingual education.

- ELA or reading instruction: 1–2 hours/day, delivered by a licensed Reading or English teacher qualified to teach LEP students

Improvement of ESL Instruction: Content-based ESL Instruction
As stated above, most of the approximately 56,000 English language learners in Massachusetts must now learn all subject matter content in English, and this has resulted in a statewide need to provide more hours of daily ESL instruction to English language learners, and consequently a need for more licensed ESL teachers throughout the state. Sheltered English immersion has also made it urgent that we reexamine and modify the role of the ESL teacher and the purpose and content of ESL instruction. Learning academic English is increasingly urgent, because subject matter content learning depends on students having relatively high levels of English language proficiency. Therefore English language teaching, i.e., ESL instruction, needs to become more curriculum-based and more intentional in developing the specific academic language that students will be required to understand and use in their subject matter content classes. Content-based ESL instruction, a well-established approach to teaching English, needs to become the orientation to ESL instruction that is used in ESL classrooms in Massachusetts.

During the last two years the Department has developed and published guidelines to support districts in developing a content-based ESL curriculum, *Guidelines for Developing a Content-based ESL Curriculum*. In the FY 09 budget request below is a proposal to provide financial support and technical assistance to 20 districts committed to developing a content-based ESL curriculum grounded in the Department's *Guidelines for Developing a Content-based ESL Curriculum*. Another proposal is to develop and implement a professional development curriculum for licensed ESL teachers that prepares them to plan and deliver content-based ESL instruction that is more efficient and effective in preparing their students to understand and use academic English.

Use of Funds: Massachusetts English Language Teacher Initiative: MELT
During the 2007–2008 school year, the Department is using a combination of state and federal funds to support the second year of the Massachusetts English Language Teacher Initiative (MELT), designed to provide instruction, support and mentoring to 40 licensed teachers, currently employed in Boston Public Schools and Worcester Public Schools, who wish to become licensed ESL teachers.

The curriculum of this initiative is based on the competencies as contained in the Massachusetts teacher licensure regulations: linguistics, second language acquisition, sociolinguistics, over a period of 10 months, second language pedagogy, literacy instruction and assessment of English language learners. Participants spend a total of 11 days in face-to-face classes, do weekly assigned readings, and submit weekly online summaries of reading and responses to reflective prompts. There are also formal written assignments. At the conclusion of the training programs each participating teacher engages in a mentored practicum, followed by a clinical classroom evaluation.

The first cohort of MELT participants took the MTEL licensure test in spring 2007. 73 percent of those who participated obtained a passing score and became licensed ESL teachers. The second

cohort will take the MTEL test in March 2008, and an even higher pass rate is expected this second year.

There has been a very positive response to this initiative at both the district and teacher level in both Boston and Worcester. The Department has received requests to offer such a program in other urban districts. There is also a critical shortage of ESL teachers in non-urban districts and regions in the state, as more and more immigrant families settle in cities and towns with more affordable housing than the state's large cities.

Future Need
To estimate future need, two data sets that look at this issue from two different perspectives were examined. The first data set comes from the District and School Staffing Report (DSSR). According to 2006 DSSR data (the most recent available), there are currently 860 licensed ESL teachers employed in 129 districts. Assuming that one licensed ESL teacher is needed for every 40 English language learners, and given that there are approximately 56,000 English language learners in Massachusetts public schools, the estimated need is 1,400 licensed ESL teachers to serve students enrolled in Massachusetts public schools. Currently there are approximately 860 licensed ESL teachers working in our schools. Therefore the estimated need is 500 additional licensed ESL teachers in the state. We expect to have even more precise data on the estimated need for ESL teachers later this year, once the Department completes the first data collection from its new Educator Personnel Information Management System.

As reported earlier, there are 290 school districts that report at least one English language learner, but as noted above, ESL teachers are employed in only 129 districts. So more districts currently need ESL teachers due to changing demographics, but face a shortage of available teachers. The Department notes also that the provisions of Section 24 of Chapter 218 of the Acts of 2002, will take effect in July of 2008, mandating that districts "shall have at least one teacher who is certified in English as a second language, bilingual education or other English language learners program(s) under Section 38G of Chapter 71 or regulations promulgated thereto."

The second data set examined comes from districts reporting 100 or more English language learners and that receive Title III/NCLB funds. Districts were asked to report the number of hours of ESL instruction received by ELL students at different levels of English language proficiency at different grades. Districts reported that:
- Approximately 8,200 English language learners receive no ESL instruction.
- Among those 8,200 students, approximately 2,800 are at the lowest levels of English proficiency (beginning and early intermediate).
- Approximately 5,160 English language learners receive 1–5 hours per week of ESL instruction.

If English language learners are expected to achieve academic levels of English proficiency that enable them to reach high academic performance, robust programs of ESL instruction must be provided. At present, this is not happening in many districts and for many students.

To address the shortage of licensed ESL teachers, and by extension the lack of adequate ESL instruction in our state, the budget requested seeks state funds to continue the MELT initiative in

Boston, expand the initiative to Springfield, and establish a MELT training program through a regional consortium in central Massachusetts.

IV.   Budgetary Requests

The Department respectfully requests that the Legislature restore the funding for FY 09 to $1,000,000. This would enable the Department to continue training elementary and secondary content teachers of English language learners to shelter content instruction as required by state law. It is estimated that training could be provided to 3,700 teachers with this level of funding; it would also permit the Department to continue and expand the MELT initiative and prepare 40–60 additional licensed teachers to become qualified ESL teachers.

Finally, this level of funding would enable the development and implementation of a much-needed professional development initiative on content-based ESL curriculum development and content-based ESL instruction, to enhance the capacities of ESL teachers throughout the state. With these funds, the Department could develop a professional development curriculum on content-based ESL and provide high-quality professional development to approximately 100 ESL teachers during 2008-2009. The initiative would be expanded to reach an additional licensed 100 ESL teachers in both 2009–2010 and 2010–2011.

SEI Professional Development:……………………………… **$500,000**

	Estimated # teachers/trainers
Category 1 Training of Trainers	20
Category 1 Training of Teachers	1,500
Category 2 Training of Trainers	20
Category 2 Training of Teachers	1,200
Category 4 Training of Trainers	40
Category 4 Training of Teachers	1,000
	3,700 teachers
	80 trainers

MELT Initiative………………………………………………………. **$250,000**
Development of 40–60 licensed ESL Teachers

Content-based ESL Professional Development Initiative ……… **$250,000**

Total………………………………………………………….. **$1,000,000**

V. English Language Learners in Massachusetts

Attachment 7 displays data on English language learners in Massachusetts by school district and English language learner program type using October 2007 data. The brief summary below highlights the total number of students in each of the programs. See the attachment for specific school district and charter school data.

No ELL Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-way Bilingual Education	Other Bilingual Education	Parental Opt-out	LEP Students
1,352	44,927	1,985	1,781	6,472	55,726

Attachment 8 displays data on English language learners in Massachusetts by school district, and the number of students in identified first language classifications. Data are provided for the five most common first languages of English language learners in Massachusetts: Spanish, Portuguese, Khmer, Vietnamese, and Creole Haitian. All other languages are aggregated in the "Other" column. A complete file with all languages, disaggregated by district, is available from the Massachusetts Department of Education. A brief summary of the number of students in each language group appears below.

Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Haitian Creole	Other
30,685	4,460	2,366	2,104	2,180	13,935

<u>Appendices</u>

Guidance on Qualifications for Teachers of Limited English Proficient Students in Sheltered English Immersion Classrooms June 15, 2004

Attachment 1: Skills and Knowledge for Teachers of Limited English Proficient Students in Sheltered English Immersion Classrooms

Part A: For all teachers of limited English proficient students in Sheltered English Immersion classrooms.

Category 1: Second Language Learning and Teaching
Knowledge
- a) Key factors affecting second language acquisition.
- b) Implications of these factors on classroom organization and instruction.
- c) The implications of cultural difference for classroom organization and instruction.
- d) Organization, content, and performance levels in the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.**

Skills/Observable Outcomes
- Teacher can analyze his/her own classroom as a site for second language acquisition and make appropriate adjustments.
- Teacher can use knowledge of factors affecting second language acquisition to modify instruction for students who are having difficulty in learning English and/or subject matter content.

Note: Suggested number of professional development hours for Category 1 is 10-15.

Category 2: Sheltering Content Instruction
Knowledge
a. **Curriculum and Lesson Planning.** Teachers will be able to:
  - 1. plan lessons appropriate for LEP students at the four levels of proficiency described in the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.
  - 2. plan lessons that are guided by both language and content objectives appropriate for LEP students who are at different grade levels and different English proficiency levels, and that are aligned with the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and the Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.
  - 3. plan lessons that are characterized by student interaction, students' questions, and appropriate group work.

b. **Instructional Strategies.** While teaching, teachers will be able to:
  - 1. make language objectives, content objectives, and academic tasks explicit.
  - 2. use supplementary materials, including graphic organizers, visuals, and manipulatives to make content more comprehensible.
  - 3. group students so that all LEP students can participate.
  - 4. integrate language instruction and content instruction.

c. **Student Tasks.** Teachers will be able to:
  - 1. plan learning tasks that have a product and that enable all students, including LEP students, to work and ask questions in small groups.

2. provide opportunities for students to display their knowledge in various ways.

d. **Lesson Delivery.** While teaching, teachers will be able to:

    1. assess student comprehension and learning throughout the lesson.

    2. pace and organize learning activities so that students are engaged 90-100% of the time.

Skills/Observable Outcomes

- Teacher can plan and conduct content classes that are based on standards contained in the Massachusetts Curriculum Frameworks and that engage LEP students who are at different levels of English proficiency in learning throughout the duration of the class.
- Teacher can assess content learning of students who are at different levels of English proficiency.

Note: Suggested number of professional development hours for Category 2 is 30-40. Teachers with ESL and TBE licenses may possess these skills, but this cannot be assumed solely from the possession of either license.

Category 3: Assessment of Speaking and Listening

Knowledge

    a) Multiple dimensions of oral proficiency: comprehension, production, fluency, pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.

    b) Concept of communicative competence and its role in assessment.

    c) The six levels of oral proficiency assessed by the MELA-O and their relation to the four levels of English language proficiency as described in the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*.

Skills/Observable Outcomes

- Teacher can place students in the six-level continuum of oral proficiency as assessed by the MELA-O.
- Teacher is a Qualified MELA-O Administrator (QMA).

Note: Teachers who have participated in 8-10 hours of MELA-O training and passed the calibration test have met all Category 3 components.

Part B: For teachers who teach English language arts to LEP students at any grade level in Sheltered English Instruction classrooms.

Category 4: Teaching Reading and Writing to Limited English Proficient Students

Knowledge

    d) Basic concepts of linguistics, including phonology and syntax of English.

    e) Significant theories and practices for developing reading skills and reading comprehension in English for limited English proficient students who are at different English proficiency levels.

    f) A variety of strategies for teaching vocabulary.

    g) Approaches and practices for developing writing skills in limited English proficient students.

    h) Initial reading instruction, including phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension. The differences in initial reading instruction in English designed for those students who have no or limited oral proficiency in English compared to those who do have oral proficiency in English.

i) The performance criteria and scoring system used in the MEPA (Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment) and based on the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*.*

Skills/Observable Outcomes

- Teacher can plan and deliver reading instruction appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency.
- Teacher can plan and deliver writing instruction and activities appropriate for limited English proficient students who are at different levels of English language proficiency.
- Teacher can use the scoring rubric and test results of the MEPA to plan reading and writing instruction for limited English proficient students who are at different proficiency levels.
- Teacher can plan and deliver early literacy instruction for students who have no or limited oral proficiency or literacy in English.

Note: Suggested number of professional development hours for Category 4 is 30-40.

SEI Professional Development 2004-2008

SEI Professional Development Categories *	2004–2008				Total Participants (by category)
	2004–2005	2005–2006	2006–2007	2007–2008	
Category I Teachers	516	1,287	2,424	1,311	5,538
Category I Trainers	35	43	43	39	160
Total (Teachers and Trainers)	551	1,330	2,467	1,350	**5,698**
Category II Teachers	712	1,199	1,378	1,764	5,053
Category II Trainers	0	36	92	46	174
Total (Teachers and Trainers)	712	1,235	1,470	1,810	**5,227**
Category IV Teachers	36	202	276	481	995
Category IV Trainers	0	0	41	44	85
Total (Teachers and Trainers)	36	202	317	525	**1,080**

Total (by year)	1,299	2,767	4,254	3,685
Total Teachers Trained (2004–2008)	11,586			
Total Trainers Trained (2004–2008)	419			
Total Participants Trained (2004–2008)	12,005			

Massachusetts English Language Training Initiative (MELT) 2006-2008

Districts	Participants
Boston	39
Worcester	37
Total	**76**

* Category I - Second Language Learning and Teaching
   Category II - Sheltering Content Instruction
   Category IV - Reading and Writing in Sheltered Content Classrooms

** The total number of participants does not represent 11,992 different teachers. In many instances the same teacher participated in more than one training.

*** Please make note of our adjustment to the data submitted in the 2007 Legislative report for Category 2 teachers. Instead of the 1,991 that we submitted, it should have been 1,199. Also, please make note that the data provided for 2006-2007 in last year's report were projected figures, hence the difference in numbers this year. There are still some outstanding trainings and data that may eventually fall into our 2007-2008 data. As such, the data for 2007-2008 is also projected figures, as not all trainings have taken place.

Districts Receiving Sheltered English Immersion Professional Development

2004–2008

Abington	Academy of the Pacific Rim Charter	Acton
Acton-Boxborough	Amesbury	Andover
Arlington	Ashburnham-Westminster	Ashland
Attleboro	Ayer	Barnstable
Barnstable Horace Mann Charter	Bedford	Belchertown
Bellingham	Belmont	Benjamin Banneker Charter
Berlin	Beverly	Blackstone -Millville
Blackstone Valley Reg	Blue Hills Voc	Boston
Boston Renaissance Charter	Bourne	Boxborough
Braintree	Bridgewater	Bridgewater-Raynham
Bristol-Plymouth Voc Tech	Brockton	Brookline
Burlington	Cambridge	Canton
Cape Cod Region Voc Tech	Carlisle	Carver
Central Berkshire	Chatham	Chelmsford
Chelsea	Chicopee	Clarksburg
Clinton	Concord	Concord-Carlisle
Danvers	Dedham	Dennis-Yarmouth
Dighton-Rehoboth	Dover-Sherborn	Dudley-Charlton Regional
East Bridgewater	Edgartown	Everett
Fall River	Fitchburg	Foxboro Regional Charter
Framingham	Gardner	Gloucester
Grafton	Greater Fall River	Greenfield
Hampden-Wilbraham	Hanover	Harvard
Haverhill	Hingham	Holliston
Holbrook	Holyoke	Hudson
HWRSD	Kingston	Lawrence
Lawrence Family Dev. Charter	Lee	Leominster
Lexington	Lincoln	Lincoln-Sudbury
Littleton	Longmeadow	Lowell
Lowell CC Public	Lunenberg	Lynn
Malden	Manchester Essex Regional	Marblehead
Marlborough	Marshfield	Marthas Vineyard
Masconomet	Mashpee	Medford
Melrose	Methuen	Middleborough
Milford	Monson	Nantucket
Narrangansett	Nashoba	Natick
Needham	New Bedford	New Leadership Charter
Newton	North Adams	Northampton
North Attleborough	North Middlesex	Northboro-Southboro
Northborough	Northbridge	Northern Berkshire Voc
Norwood	Oak Bluffs	Peabody
Pembroke	Pentucket	Pittsfield
Plymouth	Provincetown	Randolph
Raynham	Revere	Rockland
Rockport	Salem	Scituate
Seven Hills Charter	Shirley	Shrewsbury
Smith Leadership Academy Charter	Somerset	Somerville
Southborough	Southbridge	Southern Berkshire
South Middlesex Voc Tech Reg	Springfield	Stoneham

Districts Receiving Sheltered English Immersion Professional Development (SEI) Cont'd

Sudbury	Sutton	Swansea
Taunton	Tisbury	TriCounty
Triton	Tyngsborough	Up-Island Regional
Uxbridge	Wachusett	Walpole
Waltham	Watertown	Wayland
Wellesley	Westborough	West Boylston
West Bridgewater	Westfield	West Springfield
Weston	Westport	Weymouth
Whitman-Hanson	Wilbraham	Williamstown
Winchester	Winthrop	Worcester
WSHS	WSMS	

Attachment 4: Collaboratives Receiving Sheltered English Immersion Professional Development

Assabet Valley Collaborative

Bi-County Collaborative

Charms Collaborative

Coastal Collaborative

EDCO

FLLAC Collaborative

Lower Pioneer Valley Ed Collaborative

Merrimack Ed. Collaborative

North River Collaborative

PAC

South Shore Collaborative

TEC

Massachusetts Department of Education

**Guidelines for Using MEPA Results to Plan
Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) Instructional Programming and
Make Classification Decisions
for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students**

June 2005

Guidelines for Using MEPA Results for LEP Students

Introduction

The Massachusetts Department of Education (Department) has released results of the first administrations of our newly developed Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA) program. Annual assessment of limited English proficient (LEP) students' reading, writing, speaking and listening skills is mandated by state and federal law.

The guidance provided in this document is intended to assist districts in using the 2004-2005 MEPA results to plan sheltered English immersion (SEI) instructional programming and other programming, as permitted by law, for students at different English language proficiency performance levels. It will also assist districts in making decisions regarding the classification of LEP students. This guidance allows for professional judgment by teachers and others familiar with the student's academic performance.

This guidance is organized as follows:
> Overview
> Definitions and Requirements
> Guidelines for Instructional Programming and Classification
>> Step 1 – Review MEPA results
>> Step 2 – Review other district data
>> Step 3 – Plan an instructional program for the student for the next school year
>> Step 4 – Review student results on the MCAS ELA test
>> Step 5 – Classify the student as LEP or not LEP on the October SIMS report

Additional information and resources concerning limited English proficient students in Massachusetts can be found at http://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/. Comments or questions about this document should be forwarded to the Office of Language Acquisition and Academic Achievement, Massachusetts Department of Education, 781-338-3518.

Overview

The past two years have brought significant changes for limited English proficient (LEP) students and the districts that serve them. Commencing with the 2003-2004 school year, districts were required to implement the amended G.L. c. 71A, the state law governing the education of LEP students. The provisions of *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) further require that MCAS data be disaggregated for LEP students for purposes of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations, and that districts assess annually all LEP students for English language proficiency.

Definitions and Requirements

1. General Laws G.L. c.71A defines "English learner" as "a child who does not speak English or whose native language is not English and who is not currently able to perform ordinary class work in English." For purposes of this memorandum, we use the term "LEP student" to mean "English learner."

2. The amended law requires LEP students, with certain limited exceptions, to receive sheltered English immersion (SEI) instruction until they are proficient in English.

3. Districts must establish a process and a set of criteria to determine whether a LEP student who has been enrolled in the district during the school year is still limited English proficient at the end of the school year. Department regulations promulgated under G.L. c.71A state that the school district shall "establish criteria, in accordance with Department of Education guidelines, to identify students who may no longer be English learners." 603 CMR 14.02(4). In determining LEP status, the most important variable is **English language proficiency**, including speaking, listening, reading and writing in both social and academic settings.

4. If a student is determined to be LEP after applying these criteria, an instructional program should be designed for the student that meets the requirements of G.L c. 71A, and the student should continue to be designated as LEP on the October SIMS data collection. For most students, with some exceptions, this instructional program will be sheltered English immersion (SEI). Guidelines for SEI instructional programming for LEP students at different English language proficiency levels are outlined in this guidance document.

5. If a student is determined NOT to be LEP after applying these criteria, the district should no longer classify the student as LEP on the October SIMS data collection.

Guidelines for Instructional Programming and Classification

A school-based team, including members familiar with the student's English language proficiency in a classroom setting, should make the final decision about instructional programming for the student and about his/her classification as LEP. This team should use written district criteria based on the guidelines that follow in making these decisions.

Step 1: Review MEPA results

The MEPA *Parent/Guardian Report*, *School Roster,* and the MEPA data files (which can be uploaded into TestWiz) sent to your district provide:

- Student's overall performance level (*Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate* and *Transitioning);*
- Student's performance ("at or above", "approaching", and "below") for speaking, listening, reading and writing in English compared to a typical student performing at the *Transitioning* level.

Guidelines for Use of Spring 2005 MEPA Results by School-based Teams			
MEPA Overall Performance Level	**MEPA Performance Compared to a Typical Student Performing at the *Transitioning* Level for Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing**	**Local Academic Data and Classroom Performance**	**Recommended Action**
• Transitioning	"At or Above" in **all** 4 areas	Student's performance is consistent with MEPA results.	Probable candidate for reclassification from current LEP status. Academic performance monitored for two years if reclassified.
• Intermediate • Early Intermediate • Beginning	"Below" and/or "Approaching" in **all** 4 areas	Student's performance is consistent with MEPA results.	Not a probable candidate for reclassification from current LEP status. Team designs SEI or other English language learner instructional programming using guidance in this document.
• Transitioning • Intermediate	"At or Above" in **up to** 3 areas	Student may or may not be reclassified from current LEP status. Decision on best instructional programming for student for coming school year is made using MEPA and all other available data.	

Step 2: Review other district data

In addition to MEPA results, other evidence of student learning, including results of academic standardized tests administered in the district (e.g., DIBELS, GRADE, Terra Nova, Stanford 9), documented teacher observation, assessments and grades, should be reviewed when developing the district criteria and making decisions about individual students. It is a useful practice to collect all relevant data for each LEP student on an individual student record or in a student folder for use by the school-based team.

The collection and careful analysis of additional school and district level data will be crucial in the case of LEP students in grades K, 1 and 2 because at this time there is no K-2 statewide assessment for reading and writing. The district should use MELA-O scores for listening and speaking, and will need to use district-level data to determine English proficiency in reading and writing.

It is recommended that, in most cases, a child designated as LEP in Kindergarten continue to be designated as LEP in Grade 1, so that substantial data on achievement in reading will be available when making the decision to reclassify a young LEP student as English proficient.

Step 3: Plan an instructional program for the LEP student. Districts should use the guidelines below to plan instructional programs for LEP students enrolled in SEI.[2] The guidelines are organized by English Language Proficiency Performance Levels and address both **English language development (ELD)** instruction and **sheltered content** instruction.

a. English language development (ELD) instruction

1. ELD instruction, also referred to as English as a second language (ESL) instruction, addresses listening, speaking, reading and writing standards as contained in the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes.* ELD instruction is designed specifically for LEP students, and is essential if LEP students are to "catch up" to their classmates in academic content areas. A district-level ELD curriculum, based on the *Massachusetts English Language Proficiency Benchmarks and Outcomes*, should guide ELD instruction within the district.

Pursuant to G.L. c. 71A, districts must promote and support the rapid acquisition of English language proficiency by LEP students. Thus, districts must ensure that all LEP students receive ELD/ESL instruction, and those at the beginning and early intermediate levels of English language proficiency should receive as much as possible. The guidelines below reflect the significance of ELD instruction for all LEP students, and districts should make every effort to meet these guidelines.

---

[2] In addition to sheltered English immersion, there may be LEP students enrolled in two-way bilingual programs and transitional bilingual education (TBE) programs. Districts should make every effort to come as close as possible to meeting the guidelines for English language development (ELD) instruction described above. Content instruction should follow either the two-way or TBE program guidelines.

b. Sheltered content instruction
Sheltered content instruction is designed to make content instruction, delivered in English, more comprehensible to LEP students with an intermediate or higher level of English proficiency. It will be very challenging for beginning and early intermediate students.

Recommended Instructional Programming for LEP Students

English Proficiency Level: Beginning and Early Intermediate
Students at the *Beginning and Early Intermediate* performance levels include those who cannot produce or understand any English, spoken or written, as English language learner as those students with very basic skills in English. It is important that these students be involved in English language development instruction for a substantial component of their school day. This is particularly important because sheltered content instruction, the other component of SEI, will be very challenging for beginning and early intermediate students.

Elementary, Middle and High School
- English language development (ELD) instruction: 2.5 hours/day–full day, delivered by a teacher with an ESL or English language learner license
- Content instruction: hours available outside of ELD, delivered by a teacher qualified to teach LEP students[3]
- Specials/electives, e.g., physical education, art, music, same schedule as all students at grade level

English Proficiency Level: Intermediate
LEP students at the intermediate level have not yet developed academic proficiency in English, and often have different levels of proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing. Sheltered content instruction delivered by a qualified teacher can be tailored to make content instruction comprehensible and learning tasks engaging. Intermediate level students also require ELD instruction as outlined below.

Elementary, Middle and High School
- English language development (ELD) instruction: 1-2 hours/day, delivered by teacher with ESL/ English language learner license
- ELA or reading instruction: 1-2 hours/day, delivered by a teacher qualified to teach LEP students
- Content instruction: hours available outside ELD and ELA or reading, delivered by a teacher qualified to teach LEP students
- Specials/electives, e.g., physical education, art, music, same schedule as all students at grade level

---

[3] Qualifications for teachers of LEP students in Sheltered English Immersion are described in the Commissioner's Memorandum of June 15, 2004. Hhttp://www.doe.mass.edu/ell/sei/qualifications.pdf.

English Proficiency Level: Transitioning

Upper elementary, middle and high school content standards present a significant challenge for LEP students, even those at the transitioning level. This is due to the substantial and different vocabulary demands of each content area, the demanding reading requirements of content textbooks and the "lecture style" of teaching that characterizes many secondary classrooms.

Elementary, Middle and High School

- Assign students at the transitioning level to a teacher who is qualified to teach LEP students. This will enhance the likelihood of continued growth in their English language proficiency and content learning.
- Provide additional opportunities for small group instruction and learning during the school day, after school and during the summer.
- Design and implement a regular process for monitoring students' academic progress.
- Design and provide additional learning support and opportunities.
- Monitor the academic progress of former LEP students (FLEPs) for two years after reclassifying them.
- If a FLEP student fails to make academic progress, as measured by grades and assessments, during the first 3-6 months after not being classified as "LEP," and if a school-based team familiar with the student determines that this failure is due to lack of English proficiency, the student's instructional programming should be redesigned and the student may be reclassified as LEP.

Step 4: Review Student Performance on MCAS English language arts (ELA) test

In most cases, MCAS ELA results are available for LEP students [4] and should be used to validate the preliminary decision made in the Spring regarding the student's instructional programming and whether the student continues to be LEP or not.

If the MCAS ELA results present strong evidence that contradicts the instructional program decision(s) made in the Spring (based on the student's MEPA test results and other district data) and/or the decision as to whether the student continues to be LEP, seek additional teacher consultation, input and evidence of the student's readiness to perform ordinary classroom work in English without special support.

Step 5: Reclassification

- Reclassify the students as proficient in English by NOT coding them as LEP on the **October** SIMS data collection. (SIMS: DOE 25 – record 00 under "LEP").
- Notify parents/guardians of reclassification.
- Update school/district records.
- It is recommended that, in most cases, a child designated as LEP in Kindergarten continue to be designated as LEP in Grade 1, so that more substantial data on achievement in reading will be available when making the decision to reclassify a young LEP student as English proficient.

---

[4] LEP students in their first year of school in the United States are not required to participate in the MCAS ELA test and, if they do participate, their scores are not used for AYP calculations.

Attachment 6

Bibliography: Professional Development for Teachers of English Language Learners
Brown, H. Douglas. <u>Principles of Language Learning and Teaching</u>, 4th Edition. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. 2000.

August, D., and Hakuta, K. 1997. <u>Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Children: A Research Agenda</u>. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Freeman, D. (Ed.). (1993). <u>New ways in teacher education</u>. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Garcia, G. <u>Lessons from Research: What is the length of time it takes limited English proficient students to acquire English and succeed in an all-English classroom?</u> (Issue Brief No. 5), Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 2000.

Effective reading programs for English language learners: A best-evidence synthesis by Robert E. Slavin, Johns Hopkins University Center for Research. <u>Review of Educational Research</u> <u>(2003),</u> at: http://www.ucfed.ucf.edu

Walqui, A. (1999, July) "Professional development for teachers of English language learners." Paper presented at an invitational conference. www.ericdigests.org/2004-1/english.htm

Clair, Nancy and Adger, Carolyn Temple Adger. "Professional Development for Teachers in Culturally Diverse Schools." CAL: Digests, October 1999.
http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/profdvpt.html

Knight, Stephanie L. "Investigating the Impact of Professional Development for Teachers of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students." Texas A&M University. Synthesis Team Executive Summary available through the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) at http://crede.berkeley.edu/research/crede/synthesis/pd/pd_exsum.html

Professional Development Guidelines. <u>Handbook on Planning for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Student Success</u>. Colorado State DOE, March 1997.

Frutiger, Eliso. "Selected Strategies and Activities to Provide Challenging Instruction to ESOL Students in Content Area Courses." KeKalb County School System, Decatur, GA: 1999.

Baker, Colin and Hornberger, Nancy. <u>An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins</u>. Multilingual Matters, Ltd., 2001.

<u>Approaches to Writing Instruction for Adolescent English Language Learners</u>: A discussion of recent research and practice literature in relation to nationwide standards on writing. The Education Alliance at Brown University, 2005.

Attachment 7

English language learners in Massachusetts: District and Program Type: October 2007

District Name	Enrollment	LEP Students	No English language learners Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way bilingual	Other bilingual education	Parental Opt-Out
Abington	2316	23	0	23	0	0	0
Acton	2584	50	1	49	0	0	0
Acushnet	1072	0	0	0	0	0	0
Agawam	4355	101	0	83	0	0	18
Amesbury	2426	19	0	19	0	0	0
Amherst	1399	187	0	186	1	0	0
Andover	6089	62	0	62	0	0	0
Arlington	4532	173	0	169	0	0	4
Ashland	2672	64	0	64	9	0	0
Attleboro	5989	269	1	268	0	0	0
Auburn	2384	23	9	14	0	0	0
Avon	752	2	0	2	0	0	0
Ayer	1234	45	0	45	0	0	0
Barnstable	4457	150	0	150	0	0	0
Bedford	2342	25	2	23	0	0	0
Belchertown	2681	29	5	24	0	0	0
Bellingham	2668	31	14	17	31	0	0
Belmont	3759	101	0	97	0	0	4
Berkley	964	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berlin	216	1	0	1	0	0	0
Beverly	4396	43	12	31	0	0	0
Billerica	6242	49	7	42	0	0	0
Boston	56170	10731	0	5567	340	211	4613
Bourne	2537	1	0	0	0	1	0
Boxborough	548	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boxford	980	3	0	3	0	0	0
Boylston	369	4	0	4	0	0	0
Braintree	5246	93	0	93	0	0	0
Brewster	523	6	0	6	0	0	0
Brimfield	350	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brockton	15338	2273	413	1245	75	335	205
Brookfield	270	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brookline	6168	442	0	439	0	0	3
Burlington	3686	81	0	81	0	0	0
Cambridge	5682	375	0	309	377	0	0
Canton	3049	39	1	38	0	0	0
Carlisle	766	12	0	11	0	0	1
Carver	1970	5	0	5	5	0	0
Chatham	710	12	0	12	0	0	0
Chelmsford	5564	64	0	54	0	9	1
Chelsea	5493	1032	0	996	36	0	0
Chicopee	7754	352	1	347	0	0	4
Clarksburg	207	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	2029	150	0	150	0	0	0
Cohasset	1421	0	0	0	1	0	0
Concord	1831	27	0	27	0	0	0
Conway	177	0	0	0	0	0	0
Danvers	3573	25	12	12	0	0	1

District Name	Enrollment	LEP Students	No English language learners Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way bilingual	Other bilingual education	Parental Opt-Out
Dartmouth	4239	63	0	58	0	0	5
Dedham	2879	113	0	113	0	0	0
Deerfield	487	9	7	2	0	0	0
Douglas	1761	6	5	1	0	0	0
Dover	580	2	0	2	0	0	0
Dracut	4206	66	0	66	0	0	0
Duxbury	3391	0	0	0	0	0	0
East Bridgewater	2488	5	0	5	0	0	0
Eastham	232	1	0	1	0	0	0
Easthampton	1702	29	20	9	0	0	0
East Longmeadow	2863	0	0	0	0	0	0
Easton	3914	24	0	24	0	0	0
Edgartown	336	24	0	24	0	0	0
Erving	189	0	0	0	0	0	0
Everett	5600	544	65	200	0	0	279
Fairhaven	2066	4	0	4	0	0	0
Fall River	10109	645	0	504	0	0	141
Falmouth	3894	34	0	34	0	0	0
Fitchburg	5331	685	0	640	118	0	0
Florida	105	0	0	0	0	0	0
Foxborough	2933	8	2	6	0	0	0
Framingham	8038	1178	0	476	208	430	64
Franklin	6236	26	0	26	0	0	0
Freetown	535	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gardner	2913	109	0	107	0	0	2
Georgetown	1687	3	3	0	0	0	0
Gloucester	3505	74	0	74	4	0	0
Gosnold	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grafton	2844	6	0	6	0	0	0
Granby	1137	8	0	8	0	0	0
Granville	192	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greenfield	1708	65	0	65	0	0	0
Hadley	654	8	0	8	0	0	0
Halifax	711	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hancock	39	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hanover	2725	6	0	5	0	0	1
Harvard	1306	3	0	1	2	0	0
Harwich	1358	28	0	28	0	0	0
Hatfield	419	0	0	0	0	0	0
Haverhill	7389	433	7	406	0	0	20
Hingham	3848	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holbrook	1280	21	0	21	0	0	0
Holland	267	1	0	1	0	0	0
Holliston	2951	29	1	28	0	0	0
Holyoke	6121	1481	0	1481	1	0	0
Hopedale	1323	2	0	2	0	0	0
Hopkinton	3423	12	0	0	34	0	12
Hudson	2901	114	6	108	0	0	0
Hull	1216	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ipswich	2096	6	1	5	0	0	0
Kingston	1159	2	2	0	0	0	0
Lakeville	769	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lanesborough	295	0	0	0	0	0	0

District Name	Enrollment	LEP Students	No English language learners Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way bilingual	Other bilingual education	Parental Opt-Out
Lawrence	12301	2891	0	2890	0	0	1
Lee	899	23	0	23	0	0	0
Leicester	1922	9	4	5	0	0	0
Lenox	813	2	1	1	0	0	0
Leominster	6287	752	23	729	0	0	0
Leverett	161	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lexington	6253	235	0	235	0	0	0
Lincoln	1219	28	0	28	0	0	0
Littleton	1606	0	0	0	0	0	0
Longmeadow	3155	34	0	33	0	0	1
Lowell	13505	4112	58	4007	0	14	33
Ludlow	3111	42	0	41	0	0	1
Lunenburg	1824	3	0	3	0	0	0
Lynn	13481	3373	10	2882	0	64	417
Lynnfield	2339	2	0	2	0	0	0
Malden	6387	619	0	607	116	0	0
Mansfield	4887	25	0	25	5	0	0
Marblehead	3212	33	8	25	0	0	0
Marion	435	1	0	1	0	0	0
Marlborough	4594	519	4	515	0	0	0
Marshfield	4718	10	1	8	0	0	1
Mashpee	2055	5	2	0	0	0	3
Mattapoisett	496	2	0	2	0	0	0
Maynard	1340	31	0	31	0	0	0
Medfield	3038	6	0	6	0	0	0
Medford	4798	233	1	232	2	0	0
Medway	2778	10	0	10	0	0	0
Melrose	3579	54	28	26	0	0	0
Methuen	7426	431	0	426	0	0	5
Middleborough	3510	6	0	6	0	0	0
Middleton	872	7	0	7	0	0	0
Milford	4210	214	0	212	0	0	2
Millbury	1942	1	1	0	0	0	0
Millis	1346	5	0	5	0	0	0
Milton	3768	28	0	28	0	0	0
Monson	1525	15	0	15	0	0	0
Nahant	256	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nantucket	1295	34	3	26	4	0	2
Natick	4648	37	0	37	0	0	0
Needham	5011	46	0	46	0	0	0
New Bedford	12988	543	0	543	0	0	0
Newburyport	2302	10	0	10	0	0	0
Newton	11700	651	4	634	0	0	13
Norfolk	1080	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Adams	1684	37	0	37	0	0	0
Northampton	2793	46	2	44	0	0	0
North Andover	4546	65	6	59	0	0	0
North Attleborough	4772	43	0	43	0	0	0
Northborough	1854	65	0	65	0	0	0
Northbridge	2542	7	0	7	0	0	0
North Brookfield	693	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Reading	2811	16	0	16	0	0	0
Norton	3010	0	0	0	0	0	0

District Name	Enrollment	LEP Students	No English language learners Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way bilingual	Other bilingual education	Parental Opt-Out
Norwell	2306	3	0	3	0	0	0
Norwood	3491	145	0	144	1	0	1
Oak Bluffs	412	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orange	823	0	0	0	0	0	0
Orleans	198	2	0	0	0	2	0
Oxford	2068	7	0	7	0	0	0
Palmer	1883	5	3	2	0	0	0
Peabody	6274	292	1	291	0	0	0
Pelham	120	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pembroke	3413	1	1	0	0	0	0
Petersham	120	0	0	0	1	0	0
Pittsfield	6238	216	0	216	0	0	0
Plainville	833	0	0	0	0	0	0
Plymouth	8312	50	10	40	4	0	0
Plympton	228	0	0	0	0	0	0
Provincetown	195	11	3	2	0	0	6
Quincy	8883	1109	0	1109	0	0	0
Randolph	3138	273	3	261	0	2	7
Reading	4416	17	0	17	0	0	0
Revere	5899	602	0	600	0	0	2
Richmond	188	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rochester	589	2	0	2	0	0	0
Rockland	2483	44	0	44	0	0	0
Rockport	1045	2	0	2	0	0	0
Rowe	61	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salem	4422	455	0	375	113	0	15
Sandwich	3622	2	0	1	1	0	0
Saugus	3009	38	16	22	0	0	0
Savoy	54	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scituate	3228	30	0	30	0	0	0
Seekonk	2189	7	0	7	1	0	0
Sharon	3409	32	0	32	0	0	0
Sherborn	484	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shirley	631	2	0	2	0	0	0
Shrewsbury	5896	184	0	184	0	0	0
Shutesbury	167	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerset	2841	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somerville	4890	865	153	421	254	47	123
Southampton	553	2	0	2	0	0	0
Southborough	1615	34	1	33	0	0	0
Southbridge	2148	152	2	148	2	0	0
South Hadley	2285	16	16	0	0	0	0
Springfield	25227	3287	0	3002	0	0	285
Stoneham	2730	58	0	58	0	0	0
Stoughton	3874	151	0	132	0	0	19
Sturbridge	889	4	4	0	0	0	0
Sudbury	3232	27	1	26	0	0	0
Sunderland	220	10	0	10	0	0	0
Sutton	1682	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swampscott	2367	38	0	36	0	0	2
Swansea	2077	14	0	14	0	0	0
Taunton	7998	166	0	166	0	0	0
Tewksbury	4577	11	3	8	0	0	0

District Name	Enrollment	LEP Students	No English language learners Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way bilingual	Other bilingual education	Parental Opt-Out
Tisbury	302	27	0	27	0	0	0
Topsfield	695	4	3	1	0	0	0
Truro	137	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tyngsborough	2185	8	0	8	0	0	0
Uxbridge	2022	23	0	21	5	0	0
Wakefield	3458	18	0	18	0	0	0
Wales	165	0	0	0	0	0	0
Walpole	3926	55	2	53	0	0	0
Waltham	4725	455	1	357	0	0	97
Ware	1201	8	4	4	0	0	0
Wareham	3307	7	0	7	0	0	0
Watertown	2511	242	0	241	0	0	1
Wayland	2820	6	1	5	0	0	0
Webster	1890	56	0	56	0	0	0
Wellesley	4765	76	0	57	0	0	19
Wellfleet	140	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westborough	3542	260	1	259	0	0	0
West Boylston	1089	4	0	4	0	0	0
West Bridgewater	1262	0	0	0	0	0	0
Westfield	6265	233	38	190	0	0	5
Westford	5284	41	0	38	0	0	3
Westhampton	140	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weston	2416	42	0	42	0	0	0
Westport	1964	8	0	8	0	0	0
West Springfield	3951	271	0	271	0	0	0
Westwood	3008	0	0	0	0	0	0
Weymouth	6933	91	0	85	0	0	6
Whately	128	0	0	0	0	0	0
Williamsburg	165	0	0	0	0	0	0
Williamstown	438	6	0	6	0	0	0
Wilmington	3841	10	3	7	0	0	0
Winchendon	1647	10	2	8	0	0	0
Winchester	3989	89	0	89	0	0	0
Winthrop	1951	60	1	59	3	0	0
Woburn	4775	174	0	173	0	0	1
Worcester	22876	4723	209	3846	0	660	8
Wrentham	1299	3	0	3	0	0	0
Northampton-Smith Voc. Agr.	453	1	0	1	0	0	0
Excel Academy CS	204	10	0	10	0	0	0
Academy Of the Pacific Rim CS	472	6	0	0	0	6	0
Four Rivers CS	193	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berkshire Arts and Technology CS	246	4	0	4	1	0	0
Academy of Strategic Learning CS	48	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boston Preparatory CS	269	0	0	0	0	0	0
Christa McAuliffe Regional CS	247	11	0	10	0	0	1
Smith Leadership Academy CS	200	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benjamin Banneker CCS	325	28	0	28	0	0	0
Barnstable Horace Mann CS	854	23	0	23	0	0	0
Boston Day and Evening Academy CS	267	0	0	0	0	0	0
Marstons Mills East HM CS	474	0	0	0	0	0	0
Edward Brooke CS	366	12	0	12	0	0	0
Kipp Academy Lynn CS	302	0	0	0	0	0	0

District Name	Enrollment	LEP Students	No English language learners Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way bilingual	Other bilingual education	Parental Opt-Out
Advanced Math and Science Academy CS	523	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cape Cod Lighthouse CS	216	0	0	0	0	0	0
Champion CS	135	0	0	0	0	0	0
Innovation Academy CS	347	0	0	0	0	0	0
Community Charter School of Cambridge	228	8	0	8	0	0	0
City On A Hill CS	282	1	1	0	0	0	0
Codman Academy CS	120	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conservatory Lab CS	133	23	0	23	0	0	0
Community Day CS	330	95	0	95	0	0	0
Sabis International CS	1519	17	17	0	0	0	0
Neighborhood House CS	399	8	0	8	0	0	0
Abby Kelley Foster CS	1426	54	0	54	0	0	0
Foxborough Regional CS	1062	10	0	10	0	0	0
Benjamin Franklin Classical CS	394	0	0	0	0	0	0
Boston Collegiate CS	412	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hilltown Cooperative CS	154	1	0	1	0	0	0
Robert M. Hughes Academy CS	186	0	0	0	0	0	0
Health Careers Academy CS	208	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holyoke Community CS	699	74	0	74	0	0	0
Lawrence Family Development CS	594	215	0	0	215	0	0
Hill View Montessori CS	220	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lowell Community CS	923	295	0	295	0	0	0
Lowell Middlesex Academy CS	94	3	0	3	0	0	0
Marblehead Community CS	192	0	0	0	0	0	0
Martha's Vineyard CS	168	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ma Academy for Math and Science	93	0	0	0	0	0	0
MATCH Charter Public High	222	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mystic Valley Regional Charter	1270	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Leadership Charter	490	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Central Charter Essential	324	0	0	0	0	0	0
Francis W. Parker Charter Essential	374	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pioneer Valley Performing Arts CS	407	2	0	2	0	0	0
Boston Renaissance Charter Public	1250	39	0	39	0	0	0
River Valley Charter	288	1	0	1	0	0	0
Rising Tide Charter Public	307	0	0	0	0	0	0
Roxbury Preparatory Charter	198	1	0	1	0	0	0
Salem Academy Charter	249	8	0	8	0	0	0
Seven Hills Charter	678	61	0	61	0	0	0
Prospect Hill Academy Charter	911	9	0	9	0	0	0
South Shore Charter Public	525	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sturgis Charter Public	352	0	0	0	0	0	0
Uphams Corner Charter	168	1	1	0	0	0	0
Atlantis Charter	702	0	0	0	0	0	0
Martin Luther King Jr. CS of Excellence	240	3	0	3	0	0	0
Phoenix Charter Academy	123	9	0	9	0	0	0
Pioneer CS of Science	91	2	2	0	0	0	0
Global Learning CS	384	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pioneer Valley Chinese Immersion CS	42	0	0	0	0	0	0
Acton-Boxborough	2922	32	0	29	0	0	3

District Name	Enrollment	LEP Students	No English language learners Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way bilingual	Other bilingual education	Parental Opt-Out
Adams-Cheshire	1596	4	0	4	0	0	0
Amherst-Pelham	1786	48	0	48	0	0	0
Ashburnham-Westminster	2457	2	0	2	0	0	0
Athol-Royalston	1846	16	1	15	0	0	0
Berkshire Hills	1421	25	2	23	0	0	0
Berlin-Boylston	478	1	0	1	0	0	0
Blackstone-Millville	2136	14	1	13	0	0	0
Bridgewater-Raynham	5873	9	7	0	0	0	2
Chesterfield-Goshen	176	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central Berkshire	2104	0	0	0	0	0	0
Concord-Carlisle	1258	2	0	2	0	0	0
Dennis-Yarmouth	3586	134	1	132	0	0	1
Dighton-Rehoboth	3364	2	0	2	0	0	0
Dover-Sherborn	1096	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dudley-Charlton Reg	4443	32	0	32	0	0	0
Nauset	1528	6	1	5	0	0	0
Farmington River Reg	144	0	0	0	0	0	0
Freetown-Lakeville	1965	2	1	1	0	0	0
Frontier	716	6	4	2	0	0	0
Gateway	1286	11	0	11	0	0	0
Groton-Dunstable	2896	3	0	3	0	0	0
Gill-Montague	1127	28	15	11	0	0	2
Hamilton-Wenham	2097	32	29	2	0	0	1
Hampden-Wilbraham	3687	19	0	19	0	0	0
Hampshire	841	4	0	3	0	0	1
Hawlemont	118	0	0	0	0	0	0
King Philip	2086	2	0	2	0	0	0
Lincoln-Sudbury	1622	5	0	5	0	0	0
Manchester Essex Reg	1360	3	0	3	0	0	0
Marthas Vineyard	754	24	0	24	0	0	0
Masconomet	2100	5	5	0	0	0	0
Mendon-Upton	2874	11	0	11	0	0	0
Mount Greylock	627	4	1	3	0	0	0
Mohawk Trail	1153	4	0	4	1	0	0
Narragansett	1696	2	2	0	0	0	0
Nashoba	3292	12	0	12	0	0	0
New Salem-Wendell	147	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northboro-Southboro	1414	9	2	6	0	0	1
North Middlesex	4389	5	0	4	14	0	1
Old Rochester	1205	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pentucket	3294	1	0	1	0	0	0
Pioneer Valley	1107	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quabbin	3184	3	0	1	0	0	2
Ralph C Mahar	759	3	0	3	0	0	0
Silver Lake	1894	3	3	0	0	0	0
Southern Berkshire	887	5	4	1	0	0	0
Southwick-Tolland	1888	16	2	14	0	0	0
Spencer-E Brookfield	2142	7	0	7	0	0	0
Tantasqua	1854	1	1	0	0	0	0
Triton	3220	27	0	27	0	0	0
Up-Island Regional	329	6	0	6	0	0	0
Wachusett	7258	30	2	28	0	0	0
Quaboag Regional	1436	0	0	0	0	0	0

District Name	Enrollment	LEP Students	No English language learners Program	Sheltered English Immersion	Two-Way bilingual	Other bilingual education	Parental Opt-Out
Whitman-Hanson	4388	13	4	9	0	0	0
Assabet Valley R.V.T.	930	15	0	15	0	0	0
Blackstone Valley R.V.T.	1045	1	0	1	0	0	0
Blue Hills R.V.T.	851	3	0	3	0	0	0
Bristol-Plymouth R.V.T.	1163	8	0	8	0	0	0
Cape Cod R.V.T.l	724	5	0	5	0	0	0
Franklin County R.V.T.	525	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greater Fall River R.V.T.	1354	7	7	0	0	0	0
Greater Lawrence R.V.T.	1261	36	0	36	0	0	0
Greater New Bedford R.V.T.	2022	23	0	23	0	0	0
Greater Lowell R.V.T.	1951	19	0	19	0	0	0
South Middlesex R.V.T.	670	53	0	53	0	0	0
Minuteman R.V.T.	638	3	0	3	0	0	0
Montachusett R.V.T.	1323	18	0	18	0	0	0
Northern Berkshire R.V.T.	511	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nashoba Valley R.V.T.	619	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northeast Metropolitan R.V.T.	1244	57	0	57	0	0	0
North Shore R.V.T.	443	0	0	0	0	0	0
Old Colony R.V.T.	569	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pathfinder R.V.T.	664	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shawsheen Valley R.V.T.	1258	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southeastern R.V.T.	1233	9	0	9	0	0	0
South Shore R.V.T.	592	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Worcester County R.V.T.	1105	1	1	0	0	0	0
Tri County R.V.T.	916	2	0	2	0	0	0
Upper Cape Cod R.V.T.	653	0	0	0	0	0	0
Whittier R.V.T.	1091	10	0	10	0	0	0
Bristol County Agr.	429	0	0	0	0	0	0
Essex Agr. Tech.	449	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norfolk County Agr.	459	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Totals	962785	55726	1352	44927	1985	1781	6472

Attachment 8

English language learners in Massachusetts: First Language: October 2007

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Abington	3	11	0	2	0	7	23
Acton	8	7	0	0	0	35	50
Agawam	7	2	0	2	0	90	101
Amesbury	4	8	0	0	1	6	19
Amherst	57	1	22	2	2	103	187
Andover	19	2	0	1	0	40	62
Arlington	15	11	0	0	7	140	173
Ashland	13	29	0	0	0	22	64
Attleboro	166	6	52	5	3	37	269
Auburn	7	3	0	3	3	7	23
Avon	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Ayer	25	16	0	0	0	4	45
Barnstable	32	100	0	1	0	17	150
Bedford	6	3	0	0	0	16	25
Belchertown	7	0	3	0	0	19	29
Bellingham	7	7	0	4	0	13	31
Belmont	13	1	0	0	0	87	101
Berlin	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Beverly	11	10	1	2	0	19	43
Billerica	9	5	3	2	1	29	49
Boston	6189	256	11	597	905	2772	10730
Bourne	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Boxford	0	1	0	0	0	2	3
Boylston	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Braintree	9	4	1	13	3	63	93
Brewster	4	0	0	0	0	2	6
Brockton	465	134	5	33	399	1237	2273
Brookline	34	10	0	6	0	392	442
Burlington	9	6	0	2	1	63	81
Cambridge	77	23	0	1	63	211	375
Canton	3	4	0	2	3	27	39
Carlisle	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Carver	1	2	0	0	0	2	5
Chatham	5	0	0	0	1	6	12
Chelmsford	9	4	7	4	0	40	64
Chelsea	855	22	2	12	8	133	1032
Chicopee	205	6	0	1	0	140	352
Clinton	102	23	0	0	9	16	150
Concord	7	1	0	2	1	16	27
Danvers	3	2	1	0	0	19	25
Dartmouth	4	37	0	2	0	20	63
Dedham	40	7	0	3	17	46	113
Deerfield	5	1	0	1	0	2	9

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Douglas	2	2	0	0	0	2	6
Dover	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Dracut	14	9	14	1	1	27	66
East Bridgewater	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
Eastham	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Easthampton	8	0	10	0	0	11	29
Easton	7	2	0	4	2	9	24
Edgartown	2	21	0	0	0	1	24
Everett	257	151	0	26	74	36	544
Fairhaven	1	2	0	0	0	1	4
Fall River	325	197	59	5	2	57	645
Falmouth	3	8	0	1	0	22	34
Fitchburg	542	3	6	18	2	114	685
Foxborough	3	2	0	0	0	3	8
Framingham	518	532	1	0	13	114	1178
Franklin	6	3	0	4	0	13	26
Gardner	87	4	0	2	0	16	109
Georgetown	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Gloucester	30	30	0	0	0	14	74
Grafton	0	1	0	0	0	5	6
Granby	1	0	0	0	0	7	8
Greenfield	10	0	0	0	0	55	65
Hadley	4	0	0	0	0	4	8
Hanover	1	0	0	0	0	5	6
Harvard	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Harwich	7	2	0	0	3	16	28
Haverhill	380	13	0	3	6	31	433
Holbrook	4	7	0	1	0	9	21
Holland	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Holliston	6	10	0	0	0	13	29
Holyoke	1473	0	1	0	0	7	1481
Hopedale	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Hopkinton	2	1	0	0	0	9	12
Hudson	33	60	0	0	0	21	114
Ipswich	1	2	0	0	0	3	6
Kingston	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lawrence	2786	4	30	26	0	45	2891
Lee	12	6	0	0	0	5	23
Leicester	4	0	0	2	0	3	9
Lenox	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Leominster	521	95	1	10	6	119	752
Lexington	11	3	0	0	1	220	235
Lincoln	6	1	0	0	0	21	28
Longmeadow	3	0	0	1	0	30	34
Lowell	1573	358	1658	120	3	400	4112
Ludlow	6	14	0	0	0	22	42

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Lunenburg	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Lynn	2508	35	291	58	61	420	3373
Lynnfield	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Malden	106	96	0	34	71	312	619
Mansfield	7	2	0	1	0	15	25
Marblehead	9	0	0	0	0	24	33
Marion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Marlborough	282	208	0	3	4	22	519
Marshfield	2	5	0	0	0	3	10
Mashpee	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Mattapoisett	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Maynard	14	5	0	0	5	7	31
Medfield	0	3	0	0	0	3	6
Medford	24	71	0	12	71	55	233
Medway	4	1	0	0	1	4	10
Melrose	8	8	0	1	3	34	54
Methuen	340	2	5	18	3	63	431
Middleborough	2	0	0	0	0	4	6
Middleton	0	0	0	1	0	6	7
Milford	60	125	0	4	0	25	214
Millbury	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Millis	0	1	0	0	0	4	5
Milton	2	0	0	1	13	12	28
Monson	1	0	0	0	0	14	15
Nantucket	29	3	0	0	0	2	34
Natick	2	7	0	3	0	25	37
Needham	5	4	0	0	1	36	46
New Bedford	356	96	0	1	29	61	543
Newburyport	5	5	0	0	0	0	10
Newton	88	26	1	9	11	516	651
North Adams	30	0	2	0	0	5	37
Northampton	40	0	3	0	0	3	46
North Andover	25	2	0	1	0	37	65
North Attleborough	12	2	0	0	0	29	43
Northborough	10	12	0	0	0	43	65
Northbridge	2	0	0	0	0	5	7
North Reading	3	2	0	0	0	11	16
Norwell	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Norwood	26	35	0	1	4	79	145
Orleans	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Oxford	4	0	0	1	0	2	7
Palmer	0	2	0	0	0	3	5
Peabody	134	90	2	11	0	55	292
Pembroke	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Pittsfield	153	4	0	5	0	54	216
Plymouth	15	23	1	3	1	7	50

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Provincetown	10	0	0	0	0	1	11
Quincy	50	31	0	166	5	857	1109
Randolph	26	11	0	91	77	68	273
Reading	2	0	0	0	0	15	17
Revere	396	51	15	15	3	122	602
Rochester	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Rockland	6	34	0	0	0	4	44
Rockport	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Salem	390	14	0	3	1	47	455
Sandwich	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
Saugus	13	6	3	4	3	9	38
Scituate	0	3	0	0	4	23	30
Seekonk	4	0	0	0	0	3	7
Sharon	0	0	0	7	5	20	32
Shirley	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Shrewsbury	16	46	1	7	0	114	184
Somerville	399	200	0	7	90	169	865
Southampton	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Southborough	2	5	0	0	0	27	34
Southbridge	145	0	0	0	0	7	152
South Hadley	7	0	1	0	0	8	16
Springfield	3030	2	3	78	2	173	3288
Stoneham	21	8	0	3	0	26	58
Stoughton	13	76	0	4	11	47	151
Sturbridge	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Sudbury	5	3	1	1	2	15	27
Sunderland	1	0	0	0	0	9	10
Swampscott	6	1	1	1	2	27	38
Swansea	3	4	0	2	0	5	14
Taunton	81	46	0	3	3	33	166
Tewksbury	1	2	1	4	0	3	11
Tisbury	0	26	0	0	0	1	27
Topsfield	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Tyngsborough	2	1	2	0	0	3	8
Uxbridge	8	3	0	0	0	12	23
Wakefield	7	7	0	0	2	2	18
Walpole	8	9	0	0	9	29	55
Waltham	323	18	0	2	27	85	455
Ware	3	0	0	0	0	5	8
Wareham	2	3	0	0	0	2	7
Watertown	54	27	0	2	4	155	242
Wayland	2	0	0	0	0	4	6
Webster	30	9	0	0	0	17	56
Wellesley	22	0	0	0	0	54	76
Westborough	44	43	0	0	1	172	260
West Boylston	3	0	0	0	0	1	4

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Westfield	33	0	0	0	0	200	233
Westford	3	0	0	3	0	35	41
Weston	6	1	0	1	2	32	42
Westport	4	4	0	0	0	0	8
West Springfield	24	3	0	3	0	241	271
Weymouth	13	40	0	3	0	35	91
Williamstown	1	2	0	0	0	3	6
Wilmington	1	1	0	2	0	6	10
Winchendon	8	0	0	0	0	2	10
Winchester	9	7	0	3	2	68	89
Winthrop	11	12	0	0	0	37	60
Woburn	31	55	0	7	5	76	174
Worcester	2925	214	27	551	31	975	4723
Wrentham	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
Northampton-Smith Vocational Agricultural	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Excel Academy Charter	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
Academy Of the Pacific Rim Charter Public	3	1	0	0	1	1	6
Berkshire Arts and Technology Charter	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Christa McAuliffe Regional Charter Public	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
Benjamin Banneker Charter Public	4	0	0	0	23	1	28
Barnstable Horace Mann Charter	7	16	0	0	0	0	23
Edward Brooke Charter	11	0	0	0	0	1	12
Kipp Academy Lynn Charter	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Community Charter School of Cambridge	1	1	0	0	6	0	8
City On A Hill Charter Public	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Conservatory Lab Charter	13	5	0	0	1	4	23
Community Day Charter Public	93	0	0	0	2	0	95
Sabis International Charter	9	1	1	4	0	2	17
Neighborhood House Charter	5	0	0	1	0	2	8
Abby Kelley Foster Charter Public	15	5	1	3	2	28	54
Foxborough Regional Charter	0	0	0	0	2	8	10
Hilltown Cooperative Charter Public	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Holyoke Community Charter	74	0	0	0	0	0	74
Lawrence Family Development Charter	215	0	0	0	0	0	215
Lowell Community Charter Public	137	16	113	1	2	26	295
Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
Pioneer Valley Performing Arts Charter Public	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Boston Renaissance Charter Public	31	0	0	1	3	4	39
River Valley Charter	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Roxbury Preparatory Charter	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Salem Academy Charter	7	0	0	0	0	1	8

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Seven Hills Charter	54	0	0	0	0	7	61
Prospect Hill Academy Charter	3	4	0	0	1	1	9
Uphams Corner Charter	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Martin Luther King Jr. Charter School of Excellence	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
Phoenix Charter Academy	6	0	0	0	0	3	9
Pioneer Charter School of Science	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Acton-Boxborough	7	5	0	1	2	17	32
Adams-Cheshire	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Amherst-Pelham	21	1	0	1	1	24	48
Ashburnham-Westminster	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Athol-Royalston	13	0	0	0	0	3	16
Berkshire Hills	18	0	0	0	0	7	25
Berlin-Boylston	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Blackstone-Millville	7	3	0	0	0	4	14
Bridgewater-Raynham	3	0	0	1	0	5	9
Concord-Carlisle	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Dennis-Yarmouth	29	63	0	5	16	21	134
Dighton-Rehoboth	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Dudley-Charlton Reg	9	0	0	0	1	22	32
Nauset	2	1	0	0	0	3	6
Freetown-Lakeville	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Frontier	1	1	0	1	0	3	6
Gateway	1	0	0	0	0	10	11
Groton-Dunstable	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
Gill-Montague	19	0	0	0	0	9	28
Hamilton-Wenham	0	0	0	0	0	32	32
Hampden-Wilbraham	2	0	0	0	0	17	19
Hampshire	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
King Philip	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Lincoln-Sudbury	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Manchester Essex Regional	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Marthas Vineyard	1	21	0	0	0	2	24
Masconomet	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Mendon-Upton	1	3	0	0	0	7	11
Mount Greylock	1	0	0	0	0	3	4
Mohawk Trail	0	0	0	1	0	3	4
Narragansett	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Nashoba	4	3	0	0	0	5	12
Northboro-Southboro	1	3	0	0	0	5	9
North Middlesex	2	0	0	0	0	3	5
Pentucket	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Quabbin	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Ralph C Mahar	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Silver Lake	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
Southern Berkshire	5	0	0	0	0	0	5

District Name	Spanish	Portuguese	Khmer	Vietnamese	Creole Haitian	Other	LEP
Southwick-Tolland	1	0	0	0	0	15	16
Spencer-E Brookfield	5	0	0	0	0	2	7
Tantasqua	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Triton	2	3	0	9	0	13	27
Up-Island Regional	2	1	0	0	0	3	6
Wachusett	5	4	0	2	0	19	30
Whitman-Hanson	5	3	0	0	0	5	13
Assabet Valley Regional Vocational Technical	6	8	0	1	0	0	15
Blackstone Valley Regional Vocational Technical	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Blue Hills Regional Vocational Technical	1	1	0	0	1	0	3
Bristol-Plymouth Regional Vocational Technical	2	6	0	0	0	0	8
Cape Cod Regional Vocational Technical	1	3	0	0	0	1	5
Greater Fall River Regional Vocational Technical	3	3	1	0	0	0	7
Greater Lawrence Regional Vocational Technical	34	0	0	0	0	2	36
Greater New Bedford Regional Vocational Technical	17	6	0	0	0	0	23
Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical	11	5	1	0	0	2	19
South Middlesex Regional Vocational Technical	24	23	0	0	0	6	53
Minuteman Regional Vocational Technical	1	1	0	0	0	1	3
Montachusett Regional Vocational Technical	14	1	0	1	0	2	18
Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational Technical	53	2	0	0	2	0	57
Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical	2	1	0	0	0	6	9
Southern Worcester County Regional Vocational Technical	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Tri County Regional Vocational Technical	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Whittier Regional Vocational Technical	6	3	0	0	0	1	10
State Totals	30685	4460	2366	2104	2180	13935	55730