

# RESEARCH

**Student Assessment Report**



## **ESL Student Performance: English TAKS, Stanford, & TELPAS 2008-2009**



## 2009 Board of Education

---

**Lawrence Marshall**  
PRESIDENT

**Natasha M. Kamrani**  
FIRST VICE PRESIDENT

**Greg Meyers**  
SECOND VICE PRESIDENT

**Carol Mims Galloway**  
SECRETARY

**Diana Dávila**  
ASSISTANT SECRETARY

**Paula M. Harris**  
**Dianne Johnson**  
**Harvin C. Moore**  
**Manuel Rodríguez Jr**

**Melinda Garrett**  
INTERIM SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

**Carla Stevens**  
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT  
DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND ACCOUNTABILITY

**Kevin Briand**  
RESEARCH SPECIALIST

**Venita Holmes**  
RESEARCH MANAGER

**Houston Independent School District**

Hattie Mae White Educational Support Center  
4400 West 18th Street  
Houston, Texas 77092-8501

Website: [www.houstonisd.org](http://www.houstonisd.org)

It is the policy of the Houston Independent School District not to discriminate on the basis of age, color, handicap or disability, ancestry, national origin, marital status, race, religion, sex, veteran status, or political affiliation in its educational or employment programs and activities.

# RESEARCH

## Student Assessment Report

**HOUSTON**  
Independent School District



Creating a College-Bound Culture

# ESL Student Performance Report

2008–2009

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Purpose.....	1
ESL Student Assessment.....	1
Participants.....	2
Analysis.....	2
TAKS Results.....	3
Stanford Results.....	5
TELPAS Results.....	5
Summary.....	7

---



# **ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE STUDENT PERFORMANCE REPORT: ENGLISH TAKS, STANFORD AND TELPAS 2008–2009**

## **Introduction**

The Texas Education Code (§ 29.051) requires school districts to provide every language minority student with the opportunity to participate in a bilingual or other special language program. Texas Administrative Code (§ 89.BB) further specifies that all elementary schools must offer a bilingual program to English Language Learners (ELLs) whose home language is spoken by 20 or more students in any single grade level across the entire district. If an ELL student's home language is spoken by fewer than 20 students in any single grade level across the district, elementary schools must provide an English as a Second Language (ESL) program, regardless of the students' grade levels, home language, or the number of such students.

The district offers two different ESL programs for students whose native language is not English and who need to develop and enhance their English language skills. The Content-Based ESL model (CB-ESL) consists of an intensive program of English instruction in all subject areas with instruction delivered through the use of ESL methodology. Commensurate with the student's level of English proficiency, the ESL program provides English-only instruction at both the elementary and secondary grade levels. The district also offers a Pullout ESL model (PO-ESL), where students attend special intensive language classes for part of each day. In Pullout ESL, lessons from the English-language classes are typically not incorporated.

## **Purpose of Report**

The purpose of this report is to provide program staff with a detailed examination of ELL students enrolled in either of the two ESL programs. The following information is included:

- academic progress in English (TAKS and Stanford performance);
- level of English-language proficiency (TELPAS);

Districts are required to identify eligible ELL students for service in these programs. In satisfying this requirement, the Multilingual Department utilizes four comparison groups when examining student data:

- current ESL students;
- waived ELL students (students identified as ELL but not served in a bilingual or ESL program due to parental denial); and
- HISD districtwide data<sup>1</sup>.

## **ESL Student Assessment**

ESL student performance on three assessments is included in this report; the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), the Stanford Achievement Test Series, Tenth Edition (Stanford 10), and the Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS).

The TAKS is a state-mandated, criterion-referenced assessment used to measure student achievement. All students in the Houston Independent School District (HISD) are assessed in their primary language of instruction; therefore, ESL students are assessed in English. The TAKS measures academic achievement in reading at grades 3–9; English language arts at grades 10 and 11; mathematics at grades 3–11; writing at grades 4 and 7; social studies at grades 8, 10, and 11; and science at grades 5, 8, 10, and 11.

The Stanford 10 is a norm-referenced test used to assess the level of learning that has occurred as a result of exposure to specific learning experiences and an educational environment. This test also provides a means of determining the relative standing of ESL students' academic performance when com-

Table 1. ELL Enrollment by Program Type, 2006–2007 to 2008–2009

	Program	Number of Students			% of All Students			% of ELL Students		
		2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009	2007	2008	2009
Non-ELL		147,042	139,714	137,769	73	70	69			
ELL		55,407	59,055	61,755	27	30	31			
	<i>All Bilingual</i>	38,025	39,791	40,686	19	20	20	69	67	66
	<i>Content-Based ESL</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	9,232	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	5	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	15
	<i>Pullout ESL</i>	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	7,331	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	4	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	12
	<i>All ESL</i>	14,430	15,518	16,563	7	8	8	26	26	27
	<i>Not Served</i>	2,952	3,746	4,506	1	2	2	5	6	7
Total		<b>202,449</b>	<b>198,769</b>	<b>199,524</b>						

Source: PEIMS

pared to the performance of students from a nationally-representative sample. The Stanford 10 subtests included in this report are reading, mathematics, language, science, and social science.

The TELPAS is an English language proficiency assessment which is administered to all ELL students in kindergarten through twelfth grade and was developed by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in response to federal testing requirements. Proficiency scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are used to calculate a composite score. Composite scores are in turn used to determine whether districts receiving Title III funds meet federally-mandated Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAO) indicating where ELL students are on a continuum of English language development. This continuum, based on the stages of language development for second language learners, is divided into four proficiency levels: Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced, and Advanced High.

TELPAS scores are used in other contexts besides the AMAOs. One important function is in determining whether ELLs can exit from a special language program. TELPAS writing scores are used in part to make this decision for those grades where a TAKS writing test is not offered. TELPAS performance is also one of the criteria used to determine whether ELLs can be exempted from taking the TAKS test.

### Participation

ELL students in either the Content-Based or Pullout ESL program were identified using 2008–2009 Chancery Student Management System (SMS) and Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) databases. A summary of enrollment figures for ELL students in the two programs is shown in **Table 1**. Data for ESL students are contained within the shaded section of the table. Note that the majority of ESL students are served under the CB-ESL program (15%), with a slightly smaller number served under the PO-ESL program (12%). All ESL students in grades K through 12 with valid TAKS, Stanford 10, or TELPAS test results from 2008–2009 were included in the analyses for this report.

### Analysis

Results from the TAKS, Stanford 10, and TELPAS were analyzed only at the district level (more detailed region and campus-level data for ESL programs can be found in the district's 2009 Bilingual and ESL program evaluation report). The analyses used in this report were designed to assess the performance of ESL students. Data from 2009 are presented, and comparisons are made between CB-ESL, PO-ESL, and waived ELL students. ESL students are also compared to all students districtwide.

TAKS results are reported and analyzed for the reading and mathematics portions of the test. For each subtest, the number and percent of students who met the 2009 passing standards are presented (first administration only).

Stanford 10 results are reported and analyzed for reading, mathematics, and language (grades 1–11), science and social science (grades 3–11), and the environment subtest (grades 1 and 2). Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) are reported by grade level. The NCE is a normalized standard score most often

used when interpolating or averaging scores. Like the National Percentile Rank (NPR), the NCE is a norm-referenced score. In contrast to the NPR, however, the NCE provides an equal-interval scale that allows computations such as averaging or subtraction, which are useful in studying academic progress. Both 2009 as well as 2008 Stanford data were scored with reference to the 2007 normative sample.

TELPAS results are reported and analyzed for two of the indicators included in the federally-mandated AMAO system used by the Texas Education Agency (TEA). One of these concerns attainment, i.e., the overall level of English language proficiency exhibited by ESL students. For this indicator, the number and percent of students at each proficiency level are presented. The second indicator concerns progress, i.e., whether ESL students gained one or more levels of English language proficiency between testing in 2008 and 2009. For this second TELPAS indicator, the number and percent gaining one or more proficiency levels in the previous year are reported.

### Results

#### TAKS

**Table 2** presents the number of students tested and the percent of students who passed the reading and mathematics sections of the TAKS in 2008 and 2009. All data represent average performance by grade level. Data are presented for Content-Based ESL, Pullout ESL, and all students districtwide.

Table 2. English TAKS Passing Rates by ESL Program and Grade Level, 2008–2009

Program	Grade	Enrollment		English Reading				English Mathematics			
				2008		2009		2008		2009	
		2008 N	2009 N	# tested	% passed	# tested	% passed	# tested	% passed	# tested	% passed
Content-Based ESL	3	642	826	457	67	617	78	462	71	625	77
	4	752	813	552	65	600	74	559	77	605	82
	5	903	1,039	645	61	786	66	683	76	799	77
	6	2,814	1,181	2,194	68	972	69	2,244	59	978	59
	7	1,911	886	1,329	40	605	46	1,324	40	610	55
	8	1,619	639	978	51	374	55	1,025	33	387	48
	9	2,089	595	1,211	31	286	33	1,221	22	282	21
	10	935	415	524	36	232	28	519	22	279	21
	11	590	192	446	29	140	21	435	39	132	44
	<b>Total</b>	<b>12,255</b>	<b>6,586</b>	<b>8,359</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>4,612</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>8,472</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>4,697</b>	<b>61</b>
	Pullout ESL	3	--	71	--	--	58	81	--	--	58
4		--	52	--	--	39	82	--	--	39	85
5		--	58	--	--	33	64	--	--	34	74
6		--	1,704	--	--	1,375	73	--	--	1,396	68
7		--	1,371	--	--	1,016	47	--	--	1,040	55
8		--	993	--	--	641	60	--	--	648	49
9		--	1,255	--	--	648	40	--	--	669	28
10		--	752	--	--	482	29	--	--	556	21
11		--	456	--	--	298	39	--	--	303	46
<b>Total</b>		<b>--</b>	<b>6,712</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>4,590</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>4,743</b>	<b>50</b>
HISD		3	15,665	16,395	9,888	82	10,174	85	9,897	78	10,175
	4	15,491	15,302	11,580	77	11,239	82	11,594	82	11,269	86
	5	14,552	14,533	13,157	77	13,078	79	13,228	82	13,137	84
	6	12,950	12,905	11,513	85	11,614	86	11,577	71	11,682	74
	7	13,461	12,477	11,894	79	11,103	78	11,925	67	11,121	74
	8	13,164	12,740	11,662	87	11,460	89	11,653	66	11,377	72
	9	16,868	14,550	14,018	77	12,920	82	13,688	51	12,535	57
	10	11,275	11,333	9,573	83	10,454	83	9,380	57	10,376	58
	11	9,844	9,509	8,274	89	8,399	90	8,206	78	8,340	80
	<b>Total</b>	<b>123,270</b>	<b>119,744</b>	<b>101,559</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100,441</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>101,148</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100,012</b>	<b>74</b>

Source: TAKS, Chancery

Although Table 2 shows two years of data for the Content-Based ESL program, note that only during the past school year was a distinction made between the two types of ESL programs in the district. In 2007–2008, all ESL students were grouped together. The 2007–2008 data are included merely for comparison purposes so that performance in the most recent year can be gauged accordingly. Both the CB-ESL and PO-ESL programs can equally be compared to these previous results.

TAKS passing rates for both ESL programs in 2009 were higher than the average passing rates for ESL students in the previous year. In terms of comparison of the two programs, however, the results are somewhat difficult to interpret. On the one hand, overall passing rates in both reading and mathematics were higher for students in the CB-ESL program than for those in the PO program (61% vs. 54% for reading, and 61% vs. 50% for math). However, at the individual grade level, PO-ESL had higher passing rates than CB-ESL every grade level except grade 5 for reading, and most grade levels in mathematics. The results for PO-ESL students may be skewed by the relatively large enrollment in the program at higher versus lower grades (TAKS passing rates for all ELLs tend to decrease as grade level increases).

Table 3. Mean NCE Scores by ESL Program and Grade Level, 2008–2009

Program	Grade	Tested		Reading		Math		Language		Env/Science		Soc Sci	
		2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009	2008	2009
Content-Based ESL	1	759	586	46	46	48	47	55	53	39	42	--	--
	2	652	607	39	38	46	47	40	40	40	45	--	--
	3	541	733	33	38	44	47	36	40	34	42	30	37
	4	648	727	31	37	46	47	38	44	38	40	36	37
	5	800	947	33	35	46	46	37	37	42	44	35	38
	6	2,631	1,105	28	31	42	43	31	35	36	41	32	33
	7	1,749	785	24	29	38	39	27	30	29	40	31	37
	8	1,448	544	22	24	38	37	26	26	37	36	31	31
	9	1,787	450	20	20	39	43	23	26	32	35	32	28
	10	801	340	20	24	39	38	26	24	32	35	34	35
	11	526	158	25	26	39	42	27	27	39	36	41	41
<b>Total</b>		<b>12,342</b>	<b>6,982</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>35</b>
Pullout ESL	1	--	36	--	46	--	52	--	55	--	46	--	--
	2	--	60	--	41	--	56	--	44	--	52	--	--
	3	--	66	--	38	--	49	--	41	--	45	--	38
	4	--	49	--	39	--	48	--	42	--	43	--	39
	5	--	48	--	36	--	49	--	36	--	43	--	40
	6	--	1,605	--	32	--	44	--	35	--	42	--	34
	7	--	1,279	--	30	--	40	--	32	--	41	--	37
	8	--	906	--	26	--	39	--	28	--	39	--	33
	9	--	1,077	--	20	--	43	--	26	--	35	--	29
	10	--	674	--	25	--	38	--	24	--	36	--	36
	11	--	377	--	28	--	42	--	28	--	36	--	42
<b>Total</b>		--	<b>6,177</b>	--	<b>28</b>	--	<b>42</b>	--	<b>31</b>	--	<b>39</b>	--	<b>34</b>
HISD	1	11,014	10,712	46	46	46	46	56	54	43	46	--	--
	2	10,513	10,688	46	45	49	48	48	45	47	50	--	--
	3	10,323	10,739	45	46	51	51	47	47	46	50	42	45
	4	12,251	11,972	44	47	52	53	49	52	49	49	45	46
	5	14,170	14,193	43	47	52	52	47	48	50	55	44	46
	6	12,497	12,587	43	44	49	49	44	45	48	49	42	43
	7	12,924	12,136	42	46	49	50	44	47	46	53	44	49
	8	12,639	12,456	45	45	51	51	45	45	51	52	47	45
	9	15,205	14,099	42	45	50	54	42	47	46	50	44	42
	10	10,228	11,018	46	48	53	51	46	45	47	50	48	49
	11	8,631	8,724	51	53	53	53	50	51	53	52	53	55
<b>Total</b>		<b>130,395</b>	<b>129,324</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>46</b>

Source: Stanford, Chancery

**Stanford**

**Table 3** (see p. 4) summarizes Stanford 10 data for the 2007–2008 and 2008–2009 school years. Shown are mean NCE scores for the reading, mathematics, language, science, and social science subtests of the Stanford for ELLs in the CB-ESL and PO-ESL programs, and for all students districtwide.

With only one exception, overall NCE scores for both programs were higher in 2009 than for all ESL students in the previous year, across all subjects. As with the TAKS data, conclusions as to which ESL program performed better are affected by aggregation of the raw data. Average NCE scores were higher for students in the CB-ESL program than for those in the PO-ESL program on each of the five subtests. However, at the individual grade level, the PO-ESL program was dominant. Specifically, for reading, mathematics, and social science, PO-ESL program students had a higher mean NCE than the CB-ESL students at eight grade levels; there was no individual grade where CB-ESL scores were highest. For the language and science subscales, results were less dramatic but still favored the PO-ESL program; students in that program scored better than those in the CB-ESL program at most grades. Again, distribution of relative student enrollment across grades for the two programs leads to the apparently conflicting conclusions.

**TELPAS**

Attainment:

Data concerning the overall levels of English language proficiency amongst ESL students are presented in **Table 4** (for CB-ESL) and **Table 5** (for PO-ESL, see p. 6). Shown are the number and percent of students rated at each of the four levels of English language proficiency from the TELPAS for both 2008 and 2009.

For ELL students in grades K through 2, those in the CB-ESL program had higher average levels of English language proficiency. Twenty-six percent of students in the CB-ESL program had a proficiency rating of Advanced High, whereas only 19 percent of those in the PO-ESL program had an Advanced High rating. For students in grades 3 through 12, the opposite was the case. Forty percent of students in the CB-ESL program had a proficiency rating of Advanced High, while 43 percent of those in the PO-ESL program had this rating. This same pattern was seen at each individual grade level. For grades K through 2, a higher percentage of CB-ESL students were rated Advanced high, while for grades 3 through 11, a higher percentage of PO-ESL students were rated Advanced High.

Table 4. Composite TELPAS Scores: Number and Percent of CB-ESL at Each Proficiency Level, 2009

Program	Grade Level	# Tested	Beginning		Intermediate		Advanced		Advanced High		Composite Score
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Content Based ESL	K	488	179	37	133	27	103	21	73	15	2.2
	1	608	99	16	166	27	156	26	187	31	2.7
	2	601	71	12	161	27	185	31	184	31	2.8
	3	746	84	11	150	20	249	33	263	35	2.9
	4	732	57	8	126	17	245	33	304	42	3.1
	5	957	59	6	102	11	269	28	527	55	3.3
	6	1,112	73	7	147	13	395	36	497	45	3.2
	7	814	82	10	145	18	216	27	371	46	3.1
	8	565	88	16	113	20	183	32	181	32	2.9
	9	514	98	19	142	28	133	26	141	27	2.7
	10	376	50	13	100	27	124	33	102	27	2.8
	11	161	11	7	37	23	56	35	57	35	3.0
	12	200	37	19	48	24	59	30	56	28	2.7
	<b>K-2</b>	<b>1,697</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2.6</b>
	<b>3-12</b>	<b>6,177</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1,110</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1,929</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>2,499</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>3.0</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>7,874</b>	<b>988</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>1,570</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2,373</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>2,943</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>2.9</b>

Source: TELPAS, Chancery

Table 5. Composite TELPAS Scores: Number and Percent of PO-ESL at Each Proficiency Level, 2009

Program	Grade Level	# Tested	Beginning		Intermediate		Advanced		Advanced High		Composite Score
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Pullout ESL	K	42	22	52	6	14	10	24	4	10	1.9
	1	39	13	33	7	18	12	31	7	18	2.3
	2	63	6	10	19	30	21	33	17	27	2.8
	3	66	5	8	11	17	26	39	24	36	3.0
	4	47	4	9	7	15	11	23	25	53	3.2
	5	48	5	10	7	15	9	19	27	56	3.2
	6	1,408	55	4	179	13	458	33	716	51	3.3
	7	1,134	60	5	203	18	309	27	562	50	3.2
	8	768	66	9	134	17	260	34	308	40	3.1
	9	1,053	163	15	226	21	323	31	341	32	2.8
	10	694	45	6	152	22	244	35	253	36	3.0
	11	374	15	4	71	19	121	32	167	45	3.2
	12	249	12	5	41	16	90	36	106	43	3.2
	<b>K-2</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2.4</b>
	<b>3-12</b>	<b>5,841</b>	<b>430</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1,031</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1,851</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2,529</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>3.1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5,985</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1,063</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1,894</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2,557</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>3.1</b>

Source: TELPAS, Chancery

Yearly Progress:

Yearly progress data for the TELPAS are shown in **Table 6** (for CB-ESL) and **Table 7** (for PO-ESL, see p. 7). Shown are the number and percentage of students gaining one, two, or three levels of English language proficiency between 2007–2008 and 2008–2009.

For ELL students in grades K through 2, those in the CB-ESL program showed more gains in English language proficiency. Sixty-five percent of students in the CB-ESL program gained at least one level of proficiency between 2008 and 2009, whereas 53 percent of those in the PO-ESL program made similar gains. For students in grades 3 through 12, there was no difference in performance between the two groups overall. Sixty-one percent of those in both ESL programs made gains in English proficiency between 2008 and 2009.

Table 6. TELPAS Yearly Progress: Number and Percent of CB-ESL Students Gaining English Proficiency, 2008 to 2009

Program	Grade Level	Cohort Size	Gained 1 Proficiency Level		Gained 2 Proficiency Levels		Gained 3 Proficiency Levels		Gained at Least 1 Proficiency Level	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Content Based ESL	1	501	211	42	84	17	32	6	327	65
	2	493	220	45	75	15	21	4	316	64
	3	595	311	52	29	5	0	0	340	57
	4	598	360	60	35	6	3	1	398	67
	5	820	553	67	66	8	3	<1	622	76
	6	945	507	54	26	3	1	<1	534	57
	7	684	434	63	22	3	0	0	456	67
	8	432	196	45	13	3	3	1	212	49
	9	331	155	47	13	4	0	0	168	51
	10	278	122	44	6	2	0	0	128	46
	11	123	75	61	6	5	0	0	81	66
	12	131	65	50	5	4	1	1	71	54
		<b>K-2</b>	<b>994</b>	<b>431</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>643</b>
	<b>3-12</b>	<b>4,937</b>	<b>2,778</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>&lt;1</b>	<b>3,010</b>	<b>61</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>5,931</b>	<b>3,209</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>380</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3,653</b>	<b>62</b>

Source: TELPAS, Chancery

Table 7. TELPAS Yearly Progress: Number and Percent of PO ESL Students Gaining English Proficiency, 2008 to 2009

Program	Grade Level	Cohort Size	Gained 1 Proficiency Level		Gained 2 Proficiency Levels		Gained 3 Proficiency Levels		Gained at Least 1 Proficiency Level	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Pullout ESL	1	36	10	28	8	22	0	0	18	50
	2	50	17	34	10	20	1	2	28	56
	3	53	30	57	5	9	0	0	35	66
	4	41	25	61	3	7	2	5	30	73
	5	39	26	67	2	5	0	0	28	72
	6	1,258	752	60	19	2	5	<1	776	62
	7	969	616	64	26	3	2	<1	644	66
	8	622	313	50	21	3	1	<1	335	54
	9	690	377	55	34	5	2	<1	413	60
	10	545	286	52	15	3	0	0	301	55
	11	305	176	58	17	6	0	0	193	63
	12	208	111	53	9	4	1	<1	121	58
	<b>K-2</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>53</b>
	<b>3-12</b>	<b>4,730</b>	<b>2,712</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>&lt;1</b>	<b>2,876</b>	<b>61</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>4,816</b>	<b>2,739</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>&lt;1</b>	<b>2,922</b>	<b>61</b>

Source: TELPAS, Chancery

### Summary

This is the first year in which the district has attempted to distinguish two different ESL programs, Content-Based versus Pullout ESL. Previously, all district students in ESL programs were coded the same way in district databases and no explicit distinctions were drawn among ESL programs at the various campuses where such programs existed. Performance data from 2008–2009 appear to show that students in the ESL Pullout program did somewhat better than those in the Content-Based ESL program in terms of academic performance, as measured by the English TAKS and the Stanford 10. This is most clearly seen by examining grade-level results, where (in most cases) students in the PO-ESL program had higher passing rates and higher NCEs than those in the CB-ESL program. In terms of English language proficiency, the results are not as clear. Students in lower grades (K through 2) showed higher levels of proficiency and more gains if they were in the CB-ESL program. For higher grade levels, the PO-ESL program resulted in higher levels of proficiency, but gains in proficiency did not differ between the two groups.

Future efforts to assess the performance of students in these two programs should focus on the following. First, adherence to program guidelines should be monitored since campuses may still be somewhat unfamiliar with how to interpret them, and there may be data coding issues as well. For example, a reasonable question to consider is whether students coded as being in a Pullout ESL program might actually be in a Content-Based ESL program. Second, now that these programs are being tracked separately, it will be possible to examine student performance in a more detailed manner. Specifically, any student currently in a Pullout-ESL program may have had experience in earlier grades with either a Content-Based ESL program, or perhaps even with one of the district's bilingual programs. Although it is still too early to perform the appropriate analyses (given the small amount of data available at this time), in the future it will be possible to track performance of all ESL students longitudinally by program type.

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Note that all districtwide performance data includes results from ESL students as well as waived ELLs.

