



# **Miami-Dade County Public Schools**

## **ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS AND THEIR ACADEMIC PROGRESS: 2011-2012**

**Author: Aleksandr Shneyderman, Ed.D.**

January 2013

---

---

**Research Services**  
**Office of Assessment, Research, and Data Analysis**  
**1450 NE Second Avenue, Suite 208, Miami, Florida 33132**  
**(305) 995-7503 Fax (305) 995-7521**

---

---

**The School Board  
of Miami-Dade County, Florida**

Perla Tabares Hantman, Chair  
Dr. Martin Karp, Vice Chair  
Dr. Dorothy Bendross-Mindingall  
Susie V. Castillo  
Carlos L. Curbelo  
Dr. Lawrence S. Feldman  
Dr. Wilbert "Tee" Holloway  
Dr. Marta Pérez  
Raquel A. Regalado

Mr. Alberto M. Carvalho  
*Superintendent of Schools*

Ms. Debbie Karcher  
*Information Technology Services*

Ms. Gisela Feild, Administrative Director  
*Assessment, Research, and Data Analysis*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	ii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
SECTION I. 2011-2012 Students' Demographic Characteristics .....	2
SECTION II. 2011 and 2012 FCAT 2.0 Achievement Results by ESOL/ELL Status.....	3
SECTION III. Progress of ELL Students in the English language acquisition from 2011 to 2012.....	9
SECTION IV. Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives.....	13
SECTION V. 2012 Graduation and Dropout Rates.....	16
SECTION VI. 2011-2012 Retention Rates.....	17

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the 2011-2012 annual report on the academic progress of English language learners in Miami-Dade County Public Schools. The purpose of the report is to

- Describe the demographic characteristics of students classified as English Language Learners (ELL) in Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS),
- Provide data regarding ELL students' academic performance on the 2011 and 2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0),
- Describe the progress made by ELL students in English language acquisition based on the results of the 2011 and 2012 Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA),
- Discuss the District's progress in achieving the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs),
- Contrast 2012 high school graduation percentages of ELL and all M-DCPS students, and
- Examine 2012 in-grade retention rates for ELL students.

Demographically, ELL students, as a group, were more likely to come from poor households and less likely to be classified as gifted students than formerly ELL and non-ELL students. The majority of ELL and formerly ELL students in the District were of Hispanic origin.

Academic achievement results of ELL students expressed as the percentage of students scoring within achievement levels 3-5 on the reading, mathematics, and science components of the FCAT 2.0 improved between 2011 and 2012 for the majority of grade levels. Higher proportions of ELL students scored at the proficient levels on the Reading and Writing components of the 2012 CELLA than on the corresponding parts of the 2011 CELLA for most grade levels. On the other hand, the percentage of students scoring at the proficient level on the Listening/Speaking component of CELLA increased between 2011 and 2012 for only about one-half of all grade levels.

The District met the AMAO 1 targets for Reading and Writing, but missed the targets in Listening/Speaking domain of CELLA in 2012. In addition, the District met the AMAO 2 targets for most grade-level clusters in 2012 but missed the target for the grade 3-5 cluster. The District did not meet the AMAO 3 targets during the 2006-2007 through 2011-2012 period.

The graduation rate of ELL students increased as students acquired English proficiency. However, the graduation rate of ELL students remained lower than that of M-DCPS students as a whole. In addition, the in-grade retention rates of ELL students were higher than those of formerly ELL and non-ELL students.

## INTRODUCTION

This report is intended to address the following six areas. First, it describes the demographic characteristics of students classified as English Language Learners (ELL). Second, it compares and contrasts the academic achievement of students in the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) program on the 2011 and 2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0). Third, it describes the progress made by ELL students in the area of English proficiency based on the results of the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) during the 2011-2012 period. Fourth, it describes the progress made by the ELL students in the District in achieving the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) adopted by the State in September 2008. Fifth, the report contrasts 2012 high school graduation percentages for ELL and non-ELL students. Finally, the report examines 2012 retention rates for ELL students. Each of these six areas is described in a separate section of the report.

When a student enrolls in Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS) for the first time, a language survey inquiring about student and parent language use is completed. If the student's or parents' primary language is not English, the student is tested to determine his/her English proficiency. Based on the results of this assessment, the student is either classified as an English Language Learner (ELL) or deemed proficient in English. The English proficiency level for ELL students can range from ESOL 1 (lowest) to ESOL 4 (highest). ELL students are enrolled in specific ESOL courses tailored to meet students' language needs. The students' English proficiency levels are reassessed annually, and the appropriate ESOL placement is determined. Once it is ascertained that a student has acquired English proficiency, the student no longer participates in any ESOL course and is considered as having exited the ESOL program. At this point, the student is classified as *formerly* ELL (ESOL level 5); during the two-year period following the exit from the ESOL program, the student retains this status and the student's academic achievement is monitored.

In this report, the achievement of students in the ESOL program is disaggregated by grade and ESOL level. For comparison purposes, *formerly ELL* and *non-ELL* categories are included in the report. The non-ELL category includes students who have been out of the ESOL program for two years or longer, as well as those who have never been classified as ELL students. The achievement results of special education (SPED) students are not included in this report, except for those of students classified as gifted, speech impaired, or hospital/homebound.

## SECTION I

### 2011-2012 STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

This section describes certain demographic characteristics of ELL and non-ELL students in the District as of October 2011. Table 1 below exhibits demographic features for all K-12 students in the District disaggregated by their ELL status, race/ethnicity, free/reduced price lunch (FRL) status, SPED status, and student language.

Table 1

*2011-2012 Demographic Characteristics of Students in Grades K-12 by ELL Status*

		ELL (n = 67,639)		Formerly ELL (n = 18,045)		Non-ELL (n = 256,559)	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Race/ Ethnicity	Asian	618	<b>0.9</b>	271	<b>1.5</b>	3,221	<b>1.3</b>
	Black	6,523	<b>9.6</b>	952	<b>5.3</b>	73,809	<b>28.8</b>
	Hispanic	58,793	<b>86.9</b>	16,122	<b>89.3</b>	151,123	<b>58.9</b>
	White	1,525	<b>2.3</b>	674	<b>3.7</b>	26,405	<b>10.3</b>
	Other	180	<b>0.3</b>	26	<b>0.1</b>	2,001	<b>0.8</b>
FRL Status	Free	52,652	<b>77.8</b>	12,189	<b>67.6</b>	152,399	<b>59.4</b>
	Reduced	4,447	<b>6.6</b>	1,808	<b>10.0</b>	24,040	<b>9.4</b>
	Non-FRL	10,540	<b>15.6</b>	4,047	<b>22.5</b>	80,119	<b>31.2</b>
Student Language	Spanish	59,076	<b>87.3</b>	16,360	<b>90.6</b>	106,887	<b>41.7</b>
	Haitian Creole	5,973	<b>8.8</b>	833	<b>4.6</b>	8,307	<b>3.2</b>
	Other	2,590	<b>3.8</b>	852	<b>4.7</b>	141,366	<b>55.1</b>
SPED Status	Gifted	571	<b>0.8</b>	1,997	<b>11.1</b>	34,190	<b>13.3</b>
	Hospital/Homebound	44	<b>0.1</b>	16	<b>0.1</b>	294	<b>0.1</b>
	Speech Impaired	607	<b>0.9</b>	150	<b>0.8</b>	1,701	<b>0.7</b>
	Other SPED	5,460	<b>8.1</b>	678	<b>3.8</b>	25,388	<b>9.9</b>
	Non-SPED	60,957	<b>90.1</b>	15,204	<b>84.3</b>	194,986	<b>76.0</b>

Note: The percentages shown in Table 1 are those for subcategories of a particular demographic characteristic *within* each of the three ELL groups: ELL, formerly ELL, or non-ELL.

Table 1 shows that ELL students, as a group, differ from students in the formerly ELL and non-ELL groups on some important characteristics. Overall, ELL students are more likely to be eligible for the federal free/reduced price lunch program (the eligibility for which is based on the household income) than students in the non-ELL group. In addition, ELL students are much less likely to be classified as gifted than are students in the other two groups.

## SECTION II

### 2011 AND 2012 FCAT 2.0 ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS BY ELL STATUS

This section compares and contrasts the academic achievement of students in the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) program on the 2011 and 2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, Sunshine State Standards (FCAT 2.0). In addition, it depicts student results on the End of Course (EOC) exams. It is separated into several subsections dealing with different academic disciplines.

#### **2011 and 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading and Mathematics Results**

Beginning in 2011, the new version of the FCAT, known as the FCAT 2.0 was administered to students in Grades 3-10 in reading and students in Grades 3-8 in mathematics. This new version of the FCAT addressed the new curriculum standards adopted by the State and uses the unified vertical scale designed to monitor the academic progress of students as they move from one grade level to the next.

Overall, 26% of current ELL students in Grades 3-5 performed at or above achievement level 3 on the reading subtest of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 compared with 21% in 2011. The corresponding figures for Grades 3-5 for the mathematics subtest of the FCAT 2.0 were 37% and 33% for the years 2012 and 2011, respectively.

In Grades 6-8, 14% of current ELL students performed within achievement levels 3-5 on the reading subtest of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 compared with 12% in 2011. The corresponding figures for Grades 6-8 for the mathematics subtest of the FCAT 2.0 were 24% in 2012 and 23% in 2011.

In Grades 9-10, about 10% of current ELL students performed within achievement levels 3-5 on the reading subtest of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, the same performance as in 2011.

Table 2 shows student academic achievement disaggregated by student ESOL/ELL classification status for each of the grade levels. As mentioned earlier, the achievement results of SPED students are not included in this report, except for those of students classified as gifted, speech impaired, or hospital/homebound. In this regard, the results presented in Table 2 are different from those used by the State for the purposes of school and District accountability calculations.

The results show that in most cases the percentages of students at each grade level scoring at achievement level 3 or higher increase as students gain English proficiency moving from one ESOL level to the next. Note that the following table exhibits the academic performance of different groups of students for two academic years.

Table 2  
 Number and Percentage of Students in Grades 3-10 scoring at or above achievement level 3 by ELL status on the FCAT 2.0:  
 2011 and 2012

		Reading						Mathematics					
		2011 <sup>a</sup>			2012			2011 <sup>a</sup>			2012		
		Total n	Levels 3-5 n	%	Total n	Levels 3-5 n	%	Total n	Levels 3-5 n	%	Total n	Levels 3-5 n	%
Grade 3	ESOL 1	1014	57	<b>6</b>	1128	85	<b>8</b>	1012	206	<b>20</b>	1130	292	<b>26</b>
	ESOL 2	561	76	<b>14</b>	796	148	<b>19</b>	561	184	<b>33</b>	796	320	<b>40</b>
	ESOL 3	1822	268	<b>15</b>	2024	419	<b>21</b>	1821	526	<b>29</b>	2023	648	<b>32</b>
	ESOL 4	2224	734	<b>33</b>	2043	778	<b>38</b>	2222	1034	<b>47</b>	2042	976	<b>48</b>
	Formerly ELL	4716	3652	<b>77</b>	6194	4828	<b>78</b>	4716	3783	<b>80</b>	6192	5020	<b>81</b>
	Non-ELL	14305	9023	<b>63</b>	12667	7862	<b>62</b>	14316	9329	<b>65</b>	12660	8359	<b>66</b>
Grade 4	ESOL 1	1221	66	<b>5</b>	1358	112	<b>8</b>	1214	252	<b>21</b>	1358	316	<b>23</b>
	ESOL 2	947	172	<b>18</b>	1281	255	<b>20</b>	943	311	<b>33</b>	1280	469	<b>37</b>
	ESOL 3	1236	462	<b>37</b>	1827	786	<b>43</b>	1233	611	<b>50</b>	1827	973	<b>53</b>
	ESOL 4	266	159	<b>60</b>	470	329	<b>70</b>	265	182	<b>69</b>	470	322	<b>69</b>
	Formerly ELL	2873	1988	<b>69</b>	3371	2636	<b>78</b>	2866	2037	<b>71</b>	3370	2545	<b>76</b>
	Non-ELL	16886	11323	<b>67</b>	14882	10544	<b>71</b>	16843	11644	<b>69</b>	14880	10522	<b>71</b>
Grade 5	ESOL 1	1153	32	<b>3</b>	1166	51	<b>4</b>	1148	175	<b>15</b>	1165	221	<b>19</b>
	ESOL 2	460	60	<b>13</b>	555	104	<b>19</b>	458	102	<b>22</b>	552	157	<b>28</b>
	ESOL 3	915	226	<b>25</b>	1176	351	<b>30</b>	912	266	<b>29</b>	1173	388	<b>33</b>
	ESOL 4	520	254	<b>49</b>	756	409	<b>54</b>	519	257	<b>50</b>	754	387	<b>51</b>
	Formerly ELL	1059	749	<b>71</b>	808	621	<b>77</b>	1059	681	<b>64</b>	806	593	<b>74</b>
	Non-ELL	19786	12750	<b>64</b>	19221	13662	<b>71</b>	19744	12188	<b>62</b>	19207	12768	<b>66</b>
Grade 6	ESOL 1	1163	41	<b>4</b>	1128	42	<b>4</b>	1158	122	<b>11</b>	1126	123	<b>11</b>
	ESOL 2	374	54	<b>14</b>	369	45	<b>12</b>	373	80	<b>21</b>	370	75	<b>20</b>
	ESOL 3	457	85	<b>19</b>	617	100	<b>16</b>	453	94	<b>21</b>	615	154	<b>25</b>
	ESOL 4	461	162	<b>35</b>	817	259	<b>32</b>	458	166	<b>36</b>	816	272	<b>33</b>
	Formerly ELL	852	596	<b>70</b>	1094	707	<b>65</b>	850	510	<b>60</b>	1094	626	<b>57</b>
	Non-ELL	20574	13056	<b>63</b>	20167	12544	<b>62</b>	20557	11197	<b>54</b>	20168	11616	<b>58</b>
Grade 7	ESOL 1	1263	26	<b>2</b>	1293	20	<b>2</b>	1251	160	<b>13</b>	1303	171	<b>13</b>
	ESOL 2	571	52	<b>9</b>	589	65	<b>11</b>	562	130	<b>23</b>	590	149	<b>25</b>
	ESOL 3	467	110	<b>24</b>	634	149	<b>24</b>	460	160	<b>35</b>	632	209	<b>33</b>
	ESOL 4	224	87	<b>39</b>	336	141	<b>42</b>	220	105	<b>48</b>	336	157	<b>47</b>
	Formerly ELL	667	473	<b>71</b>	676	419	<b>62</b>	666	431	<b>65</b>	673	419	<b>62</b>
	Non-ELL	20766	13046	<b>63</b>	20852	13227	<b>63</b>	20692	12098	<b>58</b>	20829	12425	<b>60</b>

Table 2 (continued)

		Reading						Mathematics					
		2011			2012			2011			2012		
		Total n	Levels 3-5 n %		Total n	Levels 3-5 n %		Total n	Levels 3-5 n %		Total n	Levels 3-5 n %	
Grade 8	ESOL 1	1141	30	<b>3</b>	1244	34	<b>3</b>	1118	183	<b>16</b>	1231	222	<b>18</b>
	ESOL 2	580	55	<b>9</b>	578	59	<b>10</b>	574	164	<b>29</b>	575	175	<b>30</b>
	ESOL 3	452	81	<b>18</b>	542	102	<b>19</b>	447	173	<b>39</b>	540	196	<b>36</b>
	ESOL 4	283	101	<b>36</b>	415	141	<b>34</b>	282	156	<b>55</b>	414	216	<b>52</b>
	Formerly ELL	542	330	<b>61</b>	568	343	<b>60</b>	543	370	<b>68</b>	565	370	<b>65</b>
	Non-ELL	21134	12224	<b>58</b>	20853	13070	<b>63</b>	21038	12763	<b>61</b>	20810	13054	<b>63</b>
Grade 9	ESOL 1	1326	13	<b>1</b>	1395	26	<b>2</b>						
	ESOL 2	599	32	<b>5</b>	559	45	<b>8</b>						
	ESOL 3	477	44	<b>9</b>	562	72	<b>13</b>						
	ESOL 4	390	84	<b>22</b>	494	143	<b>29</b>						
	Formerly ELL	464	224	<b>48</b>	532	326	<b>61</b>						
	Non-ELL	20587	11063	<b>54</b>	21126	11903	<b>56</b>						
Grade 10	ESOL 1	1133	37	<b>3</b>	1217	18	<b>1</b>						
	ESOL 2	560	83	<b>15</b>	608	37	<b>6</b>						
	ESOL 3	491	117	<b>24</b>	605	94	<b>16</b>						
	ESOL 4	260	111	<b>43</b>	481	143	<b>30</b>						
	Formerly ELL	357	218	<b>61</b>	366	205	<b>56</b>						
	Non-ELL	19282	11277	<b>58</b>	19449	10605	<b>55</b>						

Note: most students in Grades 9 and 10 participated in the Algebra or Geometry End of Course tests respectively.

<sup>a</sup>In this and other tables involving the FCAT 2011 data and in all corresponding analyses, the retrofitted FCAT scores were used.

## 2012 FCAT Writing Results

In the 2011-2012 school year, students were asked to write on an assigned topic: either narrative or expository in Grade 4, and either persuasive or expository in Grades 8 and 10. The State increased the rigor of essay scoring with more emphasis placed on the use of standard English conventions (such as, grammar, spelling, and punctuation) and supporting statements. In 2011-2012, the State used the percentage of those who scored 3 or higher on the writing component of the FCAT SSS as the accountability measure. Overall, about 53% of the current ELL students in Grades 4, 8, and 10 achieved scores of 3 or higher on the writing component of the 2012 FCAT.

Table 3 shows student writing performance disaggregated by student ESOL/ELL classification status for each of the grade levels. The results show that the percentages of students at each grade level scoring 3 or higher increase as students gain English proficiency moving from one ESOL level to the next.

Table 3

*Number and Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or Above on the Writing Component of the FCAT-SSS in 2012*

	ESOL/ELL Status	2012		
		Total n	Scored 3 or higher n	%
Grade 4	ESOL 1	1281	383	<b>30</b>
	ESOL 2	1283	937	<b>73</b>
	ESOL 3	1832	1522	<b>83</b>
	ESOL 4	475	418	<b>88</b>
	Formerly ELL	3381	3137	<b>93</b>
	Non-ELL	14885	13003	<b>87</b>
Grade 8	ESOL 1	23137	19400	<b>84</b>
	ESOL 2	1166	117	<b>10</b>
	ESOL 3	580	213	<b>37</b>
	ESOL 4	545	316	<b>58</b>
	Formerly ELL	415	305	<b>73</b>
	Non-ELL	562	444	<b>79</b>
Grade 10	ESOL 1	20823	17332	<b>83</b>
	ESOL 2	24091	18727	<b>78</b>
	ESOL 3	1185	172	<b>15</b>
	ESOL 4	624	300	<b>48</b>
	Formerly ELL	618	457	<b>74</b>
	Non-ELL	489	419	<b>86</b>

## 2011 and 2012 FCAT Science Results

This part of Section II describes student academic performance on the science component of the 2011 and 2012 FCAT. In 2012, the new version of the test known as the FCAT 2.0 was administered. However, the results presented below are expressed using the previous FCAT science scale. Table 4 shows student performance on the science subtest disaggregated by student ESOL/ELL classification status for each of the grade levels.

Overall, only 12% of current ELL students in Grades 5 and 8 scored within achievement levels 3-5 on the science component of the 2011 FCAT. In 2012, the corresponding figure increased to about 14%.

Table 4 shows student science performance disaggregated by student ESOL/ELL classification status for each of the grade levels. The results show that the percentages of students at each grade level scoring 3 or higher increase as students gain English proficiency moving from one ESOL level to the next. In addition, Table 4 shows that the percentages of students who scored 3 or higher on the FCAT science increased between 2011 and 2012 for almost all ELL groups. Note that the table below exhibits the academic performance of different groups of students for two academic years.

Table 4

*Number and Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or above on the Science Component of the FCAT 2011 and 2012*

	ESOL/ELL Status	2011			2012		
		Total n	Scored 3 or higher n	Scored 3 or higher %	Total n	Scored 3 or higher n	Scored 3 or higher %
Grade 5	ESOL 1	1169	56	<b>5</b>	1157	58	<b>5</b>
	ESOL 2	458	58	<b>13</b>	555	76	<b>14</b>
	ESOL 3	915	187	<b>20</b>	1168	211	<b>18</b>
	ESOL 4	521	196	<b>38</b>	752	276	<b>37</b>
	Formerly ELL	1061	631	<b>59</b>	809	462	<b>57</b>
	Non-ELL	19790	11252	<b>57</b>	19196	10953	<b>57</b>
Grade 8	ESOL 1	1114	31	<b>3</b>	1225	51	<b>4</b>
	ESOL 2	574	46	<b>8</b>	578	58	<b>10</b>
	ESOL 3	450	49	<b>11</b>	538	77	<b>14</b>
	ESOL 4	278	57	<b>21</b>	411	104	<b>25</b>
	Formerly ELL	546	250	<b>46</b>	565	271	<b>48</b>
	Non-ELL	21012	10020	<b>48</b>	20713	10384	<b>50</b>

## 2012 Algebra End of Course Results

In 2012, the results of the Algebra End of Course (EOC) exam were reported in terms of achievement levels for the first time. Students who took the Algebra I course during the 2011-2012 academic year participated in the exam. In M-DCPS, participants were students in Grades 6-12 and some adult education students. Because the numbers of students participating in the test were small (fewer than 20 students) for certain ELL groups in most grade levels, only the results of students in Grades 9 are reported below. Of the current ELL students, approximately 34% scored within achievement levels 3-5 on the 2012 Algebra EOC.

Table 5

*Number and Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or above on the 2012 Algebra EOC*

	ESOL/ELL Status	2012		
		Total n	Scored 3 or higher n	%
Grade 9	ESOL 1	1215	299	<b>25</b>
	ESOL 2	528	189	<b>36</b>
	ESOL 3	529	209	<b>40</b>
	ESOL 4	451	233	<b>52</b>
	Formerly ELL	393	279	<b>71</b>
	Non-ELL	13300	6631	<b>50</b>

Although both the Geometry and Biology EOC exams were administered statewide in 2012 for the first time, their results in terms of achievement levels will only be available after the 2013 administration. These will be reported in the future editions of the annual ELL report.

### SECTION III

## PROGRESS OF ELL STUDENTS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

This section illustrates the progress in acquiring English proficiency made by students enrolled in the ESOL program, as measured by the Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA). The CELLA outcomes are reported in three areas: Listening/Speaking, Reading, and Writing. In each of these three areas both the scale scores and proficiency levels are reported. CELLA uses four proficiency levels: Beginning, Low Intermediate, High Intermediate, and Proficient. Table 6 shows the numbers and percentages of ESOL students who made progress in each of the three CELLA areas. “Making progress” is defined as earning a higher proficiency level or staying within the Proficient level. Only the results of those students classified as ELL in 2011 are included in the calculations. In addition, as before, the results of the majority of SPED students are not included.

Table 6

*Numbers and Percentages of Students Making Progress in English Language Acquisition Between 2011 and 2012*

2012 Grade	Listening/Speaking			Reading			Writing		
	Total n	Made progress n	%	Total n	Made progress n	%	Total n	Made progress n	%
1	8859	6782	<b>77</b>	8815	5123	<b>58</b>	8829	6144	<b>70</b>
2	8072	7133	<b>88</b>	8100	5520	<b>68</b>	8056	5409	<b>67</b>
3	5064	1843	<b>36</b>	5010	1684	<b>34</b>	5018	2089	<b>42</b>
4	4078	2539	<b>62</b>	4053	2388	<b>59</b>	4021	2304	<b>57</b>
5	2759	1989	<b>72</b>	2733	1959	<b>72</b>	2735	1650	<b>60</b>
6	2158	1509	<b>70</b>	2167	957	<b>44</b>	2110	883	<b>42</b>
7	2023	1421	<b>70</b>	2028	1104	<b>54</b>	1967	999	<b>51</b>
8	2009	1443	<b>72</b>	2016	1189	<b>59</b>	1962	1025	<b>52</b>
9	2016	1238	<b>61</b>	2026	712	<b>35</b>	1966	796	<b>40</b>
10	2202	1335	<b>61</b>	2226	988	<b>44</b>	2179	948	<b>44</b>
11	1791	1091	<b>61</b>	1818	809	<b>44</b>	1769	729	<b>41</b>
12	1364	780	<b>57</b>	1374	531	<b>39</b>	1344	484	<b>36</b>
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>42395</b>	<b>29103</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>42366</b>	<b>22964</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>41956</b>	<b>23460</b>	<b>56</b>

The drop in the percentage of students making progress from 2011 to 2012 shown for Grades 3, 6, and 9 students in Reading and Writing and to a smaller degree in Listening/Speaking is likely explained by the fact that proficiency level standards are defined for grade clusters K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12, but not for individual grades. This means that the standards are likely to be geared toward a student in the middle of the grade span of each cluster: a 1<sup>st</sup> grader for the K-2 cluster, and a 4<sup>th</sup> grader in the 3-5 cluster. Consequently, proficiency standards are likely to be easier to achieve for an average ELL student in the highest grade of a grade cluster than for a student in the lowest grade level of the next grade cluster.

For example, proficiency standards are likely to be easier for a 2<sup>nd</sup> grader than they are for a 3<sup>rd</sup> grader. As a result, many students in grade 3 in 2012 who were at a particular proficiency level in 2011 as grade 2 students did not meet the higher proficiency standards for the next level, thus failing to “make progress”.

Table 7 shows the 2011 and 2012 numbers and percentages of ELL students who scored within the Proficient category in each of the three CELLA areas. The results are disaggregated by grade level. Again, the results of the SPED students are not included in the calculations, except for those of students classified as gifted, speech impaired, or hospital/homebound.

Table 7

*Numbers and Percentages of ELL Students Scoring in the Proficient Category on the 2011 and 2012 CELLA*

Grade	Listening/Speaking						Reading						Writing					
	2011			2012			2011			2012			2011			2012		
	Total n	Scored Proficient n	%	Total n	Scored Proficient n	%	Total n	Scored Proficient n	%	Total n	Scored Proficient n	%	Total n	Scored Proficient n	%	Total n	Scored Proficient n	%
K	9491	2139	<b>23</b>	10217	2499	<b>24</b>	9485	140	<b>1</b>	10108	288	<b>3</b>	9450	197	<b>2</b>	10240	343	<b>3</b>
1	10535	6413	<b>61</b>	9661	5675	<b>59</b>	10541	2805	<b>27</b>	9619	2836	<b>29</b>	10497	3502	<b>33</b>	9688	3663	<b>38</b>
2	8873	7124	<b>80</b>	8904	7188	<b>81</b>	8841	5556	<b>63</b>	8921	5493	<b>62</b>	8816	4880	<b>55</b>	8954	5109	<b>57</b>
3	5540	1747	<b>32</b>	5911	1284	<b>22</b>	5538	476	<b>9</b>	5802	695	<b>12</b>	5484	364	<b>7</b>	5880	573	<b>10</b>
4	3608	1821	<b>50</b>	4786	2113	<b>44</b>	3597	1043	<b>29</b>	4705	1949	<b>41</b>	3553	820	<b>23</b>	4779	1848	<b>39</b>
5	2965	1640	<b>55</b>	3509	1812	<b>52</b>	2966	1256	<b>42</b>	3444	1777	<b>52</b>	2922	924	<b>32</b>	3517	1455	<b>41</b>
6	2380	729	<b>31</b>	2802	1272	<b>45</b>	2379	381	<b>16</b>	2856	585	<b>20</b>	2334	304	<b>13</b>	2804	514	<b>18</b>
7	2449	803	<b>33</b>	2714	1241	<b>46</b>	2437	527	<b>22</b>	2755	687	<b>25</b>	2391	380	<b>16</b>	2714	708	<b>26</b>
8	2411	919	<b>38</b>	2666	1243	<b>47</b>	2408	661	<b>27</b>	2710	852	<b>31</b>	2373	507	<b>21</b>	2672	778	<b>29</b>
9	2757	962	<b>35</b>	2868	1056	<b>37</b>	2766	451	<b>16</b>	2896	450	<b>16</b>	2698	520	<b>19</b>	2821	518	<b>18</b>
10	2595	1012	<b>39</b>	2927	1146	<b>39</b>	2609	617	<b>24</b>	2974	602	<b>20</b>	2546	579	<b>23</b>	2920	662	<b>23</b>
11	2162	926	<b>43</b>	2335	955	<b>41</b>	2169	574	<b>26</b>	2373	521	<b>22</b>	2130	473	<b>22</b>	2331	492	<b>21</b>
12	1840	876	<b>48</b>	1708	716	<b>42</b>	1847	576	<b>31</b>	1728	379	<b>22</b>	1811	452	<b>25</b>	1707	331	<b>19</b>
K-12	57606	27111	<b>47</b>	61008	28200	<b>46</b>	57583	15063	<b>26</b>	60891	17114	<b>28</b>	57005	13902	<b>24</b>	61027	16994	<b>28</b>

Table 7 shows that higher percentages of ESOL students scored at the proficient levels on the Reading and Writing components of the 2012 CELLA than on the corresponding parts of the 2011 CELLA for most grade levels. The combined K-12 percentage of students scoring proficient increased from 26% in 2011 to 28% in 2012 in the Reading modality and from 24% to 28% in the Writing modality. This percentage slightly decreased in the Listening/Speaking modality.

Table 8 compares ESOL exit rates for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. The column labeled “Total n” refers to the number of ELLs as of February of a given school year. The figures shown in the next two columns reflect those who exited the ESOL program by the end of the school year. As before, SPED students are not included in the calculations, except for those classified as gifted, hospital/homebound, or speech impaired.

Table 8

*Numbers and Percentages of Students Exiting the ESOL Program in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012*

Grade	2010-2011			2011-2012		
	Total n	Exited ESOL n	%	Total n	Exited ESOL n	%
K	9621	60	<b>1</b>	10411	115	<b>1</b>
1	10667	1839	<b>17</b>	9825	1840	<b>19</b>
2	8989	3709	<b>41</b>	9103	3959	<b>43</b>
3	5613	216	<b>4</b>	6036	119	<b>2</b>
4	3675	489	<b>13</b>	4902	585	<b>12</b>
5	3026	475	<b>16</b>	3611	536	<b>15</b>
6	2442	147	<b>6</b>	2917	165	<b>6</b>
7	2509	187	<b>7</b>	2826	204	<b>7</b>
8	2474	166	<b>7</b>	2768	225	<b>8</b>
9	2889	97	<b>3</b>	3056	128	<b>4</b>
10	2721	261	<b>10</b>	3062	171	<b>6</b>
11	2266	242	<b>11</b>	2463	199	<b>8</b>
12	1997	252	<b>13</b>	1838	153	<b>8</b>
K-12	58889	8140	<b>14</b>	62818	8399	<b>13</b>

Table 8 shows that the ESOL exit rates for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 were comparable for most grade levels. Overall, the ESOL exit rate decreased from 14% in 2010-2011 to 13% in 2011-2012.

## SECTION IV

### ANNUAL MEASURABLE ACHIEVEMENT OBJECTIVES

Title III, Part A, of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires all states to hold school districts accountable for the progress of their English Language Learners (ELLs). To meet this requirement, the State's Department of Education established three Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). These instituted specific English language acquisition and academic proficiency targets for academic years 2006-2007 through 2013-2014. The first two of the three AMAOs are based on the results of the Comprehensive English Language Assessment (CELLA), while the third AMAO is based on the FCAT results.

#### AMAO 1: Progress

AMAO 1 is based on progress in English language acquisition as measured by CELLA. School districts must demonstrate that a specified percentage of their ELLs are making progress from year to year in each of CELLA's three areas: Listening/Speaking, Writing, and Reading. Making progress is defined as either increasing a proficiency level or staying within the "Proficient" level in a specific area. The results of all students (including formerly ELL students) who have been assessed on CELLA in the current and prior year are included in the AMAO 1 calculation. The AMAO 1 targets and actual results are given in the following table.

Table 10  
*AMAO 1 Targets and Miami-Dade Results*

Academic Year	Listening/ Speaking (K-12)		Writing (K-12)		Reading (K-12)	
	Goal	Result	Goal	Result	Goal	Result
2006-2007	70	<b>70</b>	54	<b>58</b>	56	<b>59</b>
2007-2008	70	<b>78</b>	54	<b>66</b>	56	<b>70</b>
2008-2009	70	<b>77</b>	54	<b>68</b>	56	<b>71</b>
2009-2010	72	<b>75</b>	56	<b>69</b>	58	<b>70</b>
2010-2011	74	<b>75</b>	58	<b>61</b>	60	<b>64</b>
2011-2012	75	<b>72</b>	59	<b>64</b>	61	<b>65</b>
2012-2013	77		61		63	
2013-2014	79		63		65	

Table 10 shows that the District met AMAO 1 targets during the 2006-2007 through 2010-2011 academic years. In 2011-2012, the District met the AMAO 1 targets in Writing and Reading, but missed the target in the Listening/Speaking domain.

#### AMAO 2: Proficiency

AMAO 2 is based on achieving English proficiency as measured by CELLA. Achieving proficiency is defined as scoring within the proficient level in all three domains: Listening/Speaking, Writing, and Reading. The AMAO 2 is established separately for four grade

clusters: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. School districts must demonstrate that specified percentages of ELLs in each grade cluster achieve English language proficiency. Prior to 2009-2010, only CELLA results of students who have been in the ESOL program more than three years were included in the AMAO 2 calculations. Starting with 2009-2010, this “time in program” restriction is not used and all ELL students’ results are included in the calculations. Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, the “time in program” is used to weight the students’ English language acquisition results when calculating the outcomes. The AMAO 2 targets are given in the following table.

Table 11  
*AMAO 2 Targets and Miami-Dade Results (in Parentheses)*

Academic Year	Grades K-2		Grades 3-5		Grades 6-8		Grades 9-12	
	Goal	Result	Goal	Result	Goal	Result	Goal	Result
2006-2007	23	<b>24</b>	8	<b>9</b>	7	<b>9</b>	7	<b>7</b>
2007-2008	23	<b>36</b>	8	<b>15</b>	7	<b>15</b>	7	<b>15</b>
2008-2009	23	<b>38</b>	8	<b>18</b>	7	<b>21</b>	7	<b>17</b>
2009-2010	15	<b>24</b>	16	<b>18</b>	13	<b>17</b>	12	<b>14</b>
2010-2011	17	<b>50</b>	19	<b>12</b>	16	<b>17</b>	14	<b>22</b>
2011-2012	18	<b>52</b>	21	<b>16</b>	16	<b>21</b>	17	<b>17</b>
2012-2013	20		24		21		19	
2013-2014	22		26		24		21	

Table 11 shows that the District met all AMAO 2 targets during the 2006-2007 through 2009-2010 academic years, but missed the target for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 in the Grades 3-5 cluster.

Section III of this report (p. 10) showed the results of ELL students in the District in English language acquisition. It should be noted that the computational rules used in that section are different from those used by the State in calculating AMAO 1 and AMAO 2 results. The outcomes of only those students who were participating in the ESOL program during the time of the 2012 CELLA administration were used to compute the results shown in Table 6 of Section III. In addition, the results of SPED students were not included in the calculations, except for those of students classified as gifted, speech impaired, or hospital/homebound. On the other hand, the State used the results of all students who participated in CELLA in two consecutive years (regardless of their ESOL or SPED status) when making AMAO 1 calculations.

### **AMAO 3: Academic Achievement**

AMAO 3 is based on demonstrating proficiency in reading and mathematics on the FCAT. Demonstrating proficiency is defined as scoring at achievement level three or higher. School districts must demonstrate that a specified percentage of students in the ELL subgroup achieve proficiency in reading and mathematics. The ELL subgroup includes students who receive ESOL services at the time of FCAT testing as well as those who exited the ESOL program no longer

than two years before the testing. In practice, meeting AMAO 3 targets was equivalent to making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the ELL subgroup for the 2006-2007 through 2010-2011 school years. Beginning with the 2011-2012 academic year, AMAO 3 is based on making the new Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) for the ELL subgroup based on the FCAT 2.0 results. The AMAO 3 targets and the District's results are given in the following table.

Table 12  
*AMAO 3 Targets and Miami-Dade Results (in Parentheses)*

Academic Year	Reading		Mathematics	
	Goal	Result	Goal	Result
2006-2007	51	<b>37</b>	56	<b>48</b>
2007-2008	58	<b>40</b>	62	<b>52</b>
2008-2009	65	<b>45</b>	68	<b>57</b>
2009-2010	72	<b>47</b>	74	<b>58</b>
2010-2011	79	<b>47</b>	80	<b>60</b>
2011-2012	42	<b>39</b>	50	<b>49</b>
2012-2013	48		54	
2013-2014	53		59	
2014-2015	58		63	
2015-2016	63		68	
2016-2017	69		73	

Table 12 shows that the District has not met the AMAO 3 targets during the 2006-2007 through 2011-2012 academic years. A plausible explanation for this apparent “lack of progress” is that the composition of the ELL subgroup changes from one academic year to the next. As ELL students gain English proficiency, they exit the ESOL program. After completing a two-year post-program review period, they are no longer part of the ELL subgroup. At the same time, each academic year a group of new ELL students with virtually no English proficiency becomes part of the ELL subgroup. These two processes assure that in any given school year, a sizable proportion of students in the ELL subgroup are not yet proficient in English. These students cannot fully demonstrate their knowledge and skills on tests in English. Because of this fact, it would be unreasonable to expect that students in the ELL subgroup, as a whole, would meet the rising AMAO 3 targets.

## SECTION V GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

This section contrasts graduation and dropout rates for students classified as ELL with those for M-DCPS students as a whole. Beginning with 2011-2012, the State began using the Federal Unified Rate. The calculation rules for this rate changed in two important aspects: the recipients of Special Diplomas are no longer counted as graduates; instead, they are counted as dropouts. In addition, students transferring to adult education settings also counted as dropouts. Because of these changes, the graduation rates reported below are not fully comparable to those reported in prior years.

Florida calculates a cohort graduation rate. A cohort is defined as a group of students on the same schedule to graduate. The graduation rate measures the percentage of students who graduate within four years of their first enrollment in ninth grade. Subsequent to their enrollment in ninth grade, exiting transfers and deceased students are removed from the calculation. Entering transfer students are included in the count of the class with which they are scheduled to graduate, based on their date of enrollment.

The results of the calculation that focused on a cohort of students who began high school as 9<sup>th</sup> graders during the 2008-2009 school year and who would be expected to graduate in June of 2012, under the normal high school progression, are presented in Table 13. For this analysis, a particular student was defined as ELL if he/she had been identified as an ELL student in 2008-2009.

Table 13

*Longitudinal Graduation and Dropout Rates for the 2008-2009 Cohort by ELL Status*

ELL Status	2011-2012				
	Final Cohort Membership	Dropouts <sup>a</sup>		Graduates	
		n	%	n	%
ELL	3647	523	<b>14.3</b>	2021	<b>55.4</b>
M-DCPS	23125	2473	<b>10.7</b>	17574	<b>76.0</b>

<sup>a</sup> Dropout rates are calculated in the same way as the graduation rates.

Table 13 shows that the 2012 four-year longitudinal graduation rate for ELL students is less than that of all M-DCPS. In addition, the four-year longitudinal dropout rate for ELL students is higher than that for all M-DCPS students.

It is important to note that not all students in the cohort are accounted for by the dropout and graduate categories. For instance, 9.2% of ELL students in the 2008-2009 cohort were still enrolled in M-DCPS schools at the end of 2011-2012 school year; some of them might graduate from school later. The corresponding figure for all M-DCPS students in the 2008-2009 cohort was 7.1%.

## SECTION VI

### 2011-2012 RETENTION RATES

This section examines student retention rates disaggregated by student ESOL/ELL classification status for each of the grade levels. ESOL levels shown in Table 14 below are those as of June 2012, before the new ESOL levels based on the CELLA results were determined. The retention rates are computed based on the student enrollment as of the end of the 2011-2012 school year and using the November 2012 retention status. As mentioned earlier, the results of SPED students are not included in this report, except for those of students classified as gifted, speech impaired, or hospital/homebound. The results show that, in most cases, greater percentages of students classified as ELL were retained than those who are classified as former or non-ELL. Overall, 2,079 ELL students were retained across the grade levels K-11 in 2011-2012, which constituted a 3.4% retention rate. This retention rate was lower than the corresponding 2010-2011 rate of 4.8%. The 2011-2012 retention rate of formerly ELL was 0.5% and that of non-ELL students was 1.7%.

It is important to note that beginning in the 2002-03 school year, the revised Florida School Code required 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students to demonstrate reading proficiency by scoring at Level 2 or higher on the reading portion of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Students scoring at Level 1 must be retained in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade for another year, unless exempted from mandatory retention for special circumstances. One of these special circumstances pertains to ELL students. If a student has been participating in the ESOL program for less than 2 years, he/she may be promoted to 4<sup>th</sup> grade with “good cause.”

Table 14

*Number and Percentage of Students Retained by ELL Status: 2011 -12*

Grade	June 2012 ESOL LEVEL	Total n	Retained		2010-2011 Retention Rate
			n	%	
K	ESOL 1	2465	87	<b>3.5</b>	<b>5.3</b>
	ESOL 2	1405	31	<b>2.2</b>	<b>0.4</b>
	ESOL 3	1602	22	<b>1.4</b>	<b>0.1</b>
	ESOL 4	4820	45	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.1</b>
	Overall ELL	10292	185	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.4</b>
	Formerly ELL	4	0	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.4</b>
	Non-ELL	13946	341	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.1</b>
1	ESOL 1	4064	179	<b>4.4</b>	<b>16.3</b>
	ESOL 2	3610	23	<b>0.6</b>	<b>6.3</b>
	ESOL 3	1710	6	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>
	ESOL 4	276	3	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>
	Overall ELL	9660	211	<b>2.2</b>	<b>3.1</b>
	Formerly ELL	93	1	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.2</b>
	Non-ELL	14367	405	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>

Grade	June 2012 ESOL LEVEL	Total n	Retained		2010-2011 Retention Rate
			n	%	
2	ESOL 1	1105	89	<b>8.1</b>	<b>5.5</b>
	ESOL 2	1526	104	<b>6.8</b>	<b>14.9</b>
	ESOL 3	4275	82	<b>1.9</b>	<b>9.5</b>
	ESOL 4	2078	2	<b>0.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>
	Overall ELL	8984	277	<b>3.1</b>	<b>6.4</b>
	Formerly ELL	1844	1	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>
	Non-ELL	12850	305	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.0</b>
3	ESOL 1	1126	88	<b>7.8</b>	<b>30.9</b>
	ESOL 2	786	174	<b>22.1</b>	<b>23.6</b>
	ESOL 3	1985	444	<b>22.4</b>	<b>3.6</b>
	ESOL 4	2014	116	<b>5.8</b>	<b>0.9</b>
	Overall ELL	5911	822	<b>13.9</b>	<b>16.3</b>
	Formerly ELL	3637	26	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.6</b>
	Non-ELL	14899	743	<b>5.0</b>	<b>6.1</b>
4	ESOL 1	1371	23	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.4</b>
	ESOL 2	1256	19	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.2</b>
	ESOL 3	1805	3	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.7</b>
	ESOL 4	465	0	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>
	Overall ELL	4897	45	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.0</b>
	Formerly ELL	446	3	<b>0.7</b>	<b>0.2</b>
	Non-ELL	17601	80	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.3</b>
5	ESOL 1	1164	6	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>
	ESOL 2	541	6	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>
	ESOL 3	1154	2	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.8</b>
	ESOL 4	749	1	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>
	Overall ELL	3608	15	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.6</b>
	Formerly ELL	631	0	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>
	Non-ELL	19063	38	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.1</b>
6	ESOL 1	1158	43	<b>3.7</b>	<b>5.3</b>
	ESOL 2	367	9	<b>2.5</b>	<b>1.7</b>
	ESOL 3	614	13	<b>2.1</b>	<b>0.8</b>
	ESOL 4	812	7	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.3</b>
	Overall ELL	2951	72	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	Formerly ELL	677	4	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.4</b>
	Non-ELL	20544	271	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>
7	ESOL 1	1329	52	<b>3.9</b>	<b>5.0</b>
	ESOL 2	579	9	<b>1.6</b>	<b>2.1</b>
	ESOL 3	630	5	<b>0.8</b>	<b>2.2</b>
	ESOL 4	330	3	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.2</b>
	Overall ELL	2868	69	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.8</b>
	Formerly ELL	358	5	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>
	Non-ELL	21106	315	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.9</b>

Grade	June 2012 ESOL LEVEL	Total n	Retained		2010-2011 Retention Rate
			n	%	
8	ESOL 1	1262	50	<b>4.0</b>	<b>6.2</b>
	ESOL 2	574	16	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.2</b>
	ESOL 3	540	10	<b>1.9</b>	<b>0.7</b>
	ESOL 4	410	5	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.0</b>
	Overall ELL	2786	81	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>
	Formerly ELL	390	3	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.7</b>
	Non-ELL	20835	284	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>
9	ESOL 1	1408	124	<b>8.8</b>	<b>12.2</b>
	ESOL 2	566	9	<b>1.6</b>	<b>3.4</b>
	ESOL 3	561	9	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.9</b>
	ESOL 4	498	5	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.5</b>
	Overall ELL	3033	147	<b>4.8</b>	<b>5.6</b>
	Formerly ELL	319	4	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>
	Non-ELL	21437	363	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.8</b>
10	ESOL 1	1292	63	<b>4.9</b>	<b>10.7</b>
	ESOL 2	620	13	<b>2.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>
	ESOL 3	616	9	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.8</b>
	ESOL 4	481	4	<b>0.8</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	Overall ELL	3009	89	<b>3.0</b>	<b>5.4</b>
	Formerly ELL	249	1	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.2</b>
	Non-ELL	19949	269	<b>1.3</b>	<b>2.6</b>
11	ESOL 1	965	47	<b>4.9</b>	<b>10.4</b>
	ESOL 2	537	10	<b>1.9</b>	<b>5.4</b>
	ESOL 3	553	5	<b>0.9</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	ESOL 4	333	4	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.8</b>
	Overall ELL	2388	66	<b>2.8</b>	<b>5.3</b>
	Formerly ELL	419	1	<b>0.2</b>	<b>1.4</b>
	Non-ELL	18661	138	<b>0.7</b>	<b>2.3</b>